

**MANCHESTER BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SMARTR COMMITTEE MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2013  
Manchester Room, Town Hall**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** M. Crockett, M. Flick, S. Gates, D. Hagenow, B. Murphy, C. Pelletier, L. Stewart, A. Strong, J. Topping, M. Tweedie

**ALSO PRESENT:** S. Shanley

**ABSENT:** J. Doucette, N. Leon, S. Walton

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Chairperson Crockett.

**Motion to accept the February 6, 2013 minutes of the SMARTR Committee.  
Stewart/Strong**

**6/0/2 (Pelletier and Hagenow abstained, two members not yet present)**

**Mr. Shanley** gave the Committee an update on the architect review and named the two firms chosen, one to do the feasibility study for Cheney and the other to do the feasibility studies for both Washington and Robertson. Shanley had authorized the contracts yesterday and there should be enough funds for the initial phase of all three buildings and likely enough for the schematic on Bennet/Cheney.

**Mr. Crockett** was not happy with the cost of the first phase, which is approximately \$170,000. Mr. Shanley noted we should have preliminary numbers at the end of the first phase, but no real concrete numbers until the schematics are complete. The cost for phase one for Robertson and Washington is \$65,000 each and \$25,000 for phase one of Cheney. Mr. Crockett felt the numbers should have been considered in choosing the companies. Mr. Shanley explained that the state process does not allow for looking at costs alone and he reminded us that when doing Highland Park they only had \$25,000 to work with and it was not enough to get a full schematic, necessitating additional time and funding.

**Mr. Topping** wondered how we will be able to fund the second phase in full when we were only given \$200,000 to work with. Mr. Shanley stated we will have to find the money somewhere. Dr. Kisiel is currently working to possibly reduce the costs of the classroom situation at Illing and that might free up some funds.

**Mr. Strong** wondered if the architect for Robertson and Washington might do a concept design if a full schematic cannot be afforded at this point. He also wondered who is on the

committee. Mr. Shanley noted the makeup was 3 from each board and 3 from the building department. Some of those people had been on the selection committee as well.

**Mr. Stewart** asked about the timeline. Mr. Shanley noted the feasibility studies are due by the end of March. By then we should know about the situation at Illing as well.

**Mr. Gates** wondered, if Cheney is not feasible, what is our Plan B.

**Mr. Topping** felt we should stick with the current K-5 model and renovate the buildings as needed.

**Ms. Flick** noted those items were intentionally kept separate on the list so one can move forward without the other.

**Mr. Crockett** noted we could look at a 5<sup>th</sup> grade academy elsewhere, but it didn't really make sense for that. The committee agreed a different location did not make sense.

**Ms. Flick** felt that if Cheney is not feasible we should move forward with Washington and Robertson and then possibly look at expanding the current schools as another option.

**Mr. Strong** felt we should know about the feasibility of Cheney rather quickly.

**Mr. Crockett** wondered which schools would we add on to? He also wondered if the SMARTR Committee would have a say in any of the Cheney design concepts. Mr. Shanley noted SMARTR would be the first step to okay the schematic design and then pass them to the Board of Education and Board of Directors, but the concepts would not be something SMARTR would deal with, that would be for the two boards and the building department.

**Mr. Stewart** asked for clarity – if Cheney is a no, do we still move forward with Robertson and Washington? Mr. Topping replied we do, as we still need to deal with the situations at those schools.

**Mr. Gates** asked if anyone knew the status of the magnet school situation. Ms. Flick stated the planning grant of \$75,000 was in the process and it may be more feasible to use the funds next year to have a full year to look at it, rather than trying to get the work done by the end of the fiscal year.

**Mr. Crockett** noted that CREC is currently saying they are at capacity with 18 magnets and we may be looking at a host magnet.

**Mr. Shanley** noted that the architects will want to meet with the SMARTR Committee at some point over the coming weeks.

**Mr. Gates** asked about the updated list of critical repairs. Mr. Crockett noted that list will be available next week.

Discussion moved to the possibility of a spring referendum. Mr. Tweedie wondered if there would be a higher chance of a referendum passing if we put it out in spring.

The next meeting will be determined when the architects can fit us in their schedule. An email will go out as soon as those dates are determined.

**Motion to adjourn. Gates/Stewart**

**10/0**

**Meeting adjourned 7:19 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

J. Doucette, Secretary  
SMARTR Committee