

DUDLEY-CHARLTON REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
 Meeting of the Shepherd Hill Regional High School
 School Building Committee
 Thursday, February 6, 2022
 6:00 PM

Shepherd Hill Regional High School
 68 Dudley-Oxford Road
 Dudley, MA 01571

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order – 6:00 PM

| SH-SBC Meeting | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|
| Monday, February 6, 2023 | | | |
| 6:00 PM | | | Meeting No: 2 |
| Present | Name | Affiliation | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Dan Edmiston | Member at large - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Stephen Lepper | Member at Large - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Richard Lucht | Member at large - Charlton | Voting Member |
| | Michael Jacobs | Charlton FINCOM | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Eric Hansel | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Thomas Courtemanche | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Lisa Fitton | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Joseph Caron | Dir. DCRSD Public School Facilities | Non-Voting Member |
| ✓ | Jeanne Costello | DCRSD School Committee - Charlton | Voting Member |
| | Cathleen Carmignani | Chair, DCRSD School Committee - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Andrew Golas | Town Administrator - Charlton | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Darren Elwell | Principal, SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Richard Mathieu | Dir. of Finance and Operations, DCRSD | Non-Voting Member |
| ✓ | Steven M. Lamarche | Superintendent, DCRSD | Voting Member |

Additional Guests included:

Caitlyn Panczyk – DCRSD School Committee
 Henry Camosse – Town of Charlton FINCOMM – Chair
 Michael Resener – SHRHS Assistant Principal
 Greg Duval – SHRHS Head of Maintenance and Custodians

2. Approval of the meeting minutes December 8, 2022

Motion: A. Golas Second: D. Elwell YA: Unanimous NA: A:

3. Tour of SHRHS – Item 4 was moved up – SHRHS Tour was 6:20 - 7:36 PM

Below are notes submitted by SH-SBC member Dan Edmiston of the walk-through

At the February 6th, 2023 School Building Committee meeting, the Committee was able to walk through the Shepherd Hill High School building with representatives from the school. The purpose of the walk-thru was to show the Committee first-hand the deficiencies of the fifty-one-year-old building as well as to impart the urgency and depth of the Committee's purpose to its members.

Notes taken during the walk-thru include:

1. There isn't a vestibule associated with the main entrance. This allows cold air to blow down the long corridor whenever the doors are opened during the winter.
2. There is a stairwell and a classroom (now used as conference room) directly adjacent to the main entry. When visitors enter the building, they can theoretically use the stairs or enter the classroom before being noticed / detected by the main office.
3. There isn't any security or access control at the main entry.
4. The main entrance to the building doesn't appear to be or isn't clearly marked or emphasized as the main entrance. Visitors are typically unsure on how to enter the building.
5. The main portion of the building isn't protected by a sprinkler system. The building is outfit with heat detectors.
6. The reception counter in the main office doesn't meet ADA standards.
7. The phone, fire alarm, intercom, and clock systems are all original to the building. The clocks are no longer functional and have been augmented by wall hung clocks. The 'bell' system signifying the end of periods, etc. has to be adjusted each Friday to keep it fairly accurate. The intercom system doesn't work in some parts of the building.
8. Although the office sizes are sufficient for a lone staff member, they aren't large enough to accommodate visitors, students, etc. The office area in general lacks sitting spaces, conference rooms, and quiet zones, all of which are necessary when speaking confidentially with students and / or meeting with parents.
9. The guidance office is also cramped. There isn't any room to house a mental health therapist or other counselor in the space.
10. The academic spaces are scattered instead of being clustered, which cuts down on efficiencies of scale, general shared storage, and specific ancillary spaces (conference rooms, labs, etc.).
11. The nurse's office is extremely cramped. There isn't enough space to bring in a stretcher or wheelchair. Rest spaces for sick students are small and limited and lack privacy. Again, there isn't a space in which the nurse team can speak with students confidentially.
12. The original building design allowed for possible expansion by planning for corridors to future wings of the building. Since an addition was never built, a handful of classrooms are 'hidden' in these tucked away locations and are difficult for students to find.
13. In order to access the faculty restroom, the student restroom has to be traversed.
14. The custodial space is generally limited. Instead of 'satellite' locations scattered throughout the building, there are two larger areas. The space on the first floor is packed with electrical panels (bad mix near a source of water).
15. The electrical panels were all manufactured by Federal Pacific, which has been defunct for quite some time. Spare parts are no longer manufacture for Federal Pacific equipment, which forces staff to browse secondary markets to try to find replacement parts.

16. None of the science classrooms have enough space to properly run lab work since the lab and classroom functions both take place in the same room. Student's desks are extremely cramped as are the lab tables.
17. Storage in lab spaces and in the classrooms in general is woefully lacking. Many teachers have brought in shelving, storage units, etc. to try to create storage space in their classrooms, which makes each classroom even more cramped.
18. The school's heating system is hot water radiator system. The radiators in the classrooms are controlled by an obsolete pneumatic tube system that constantly fails and leaks.
19. Most of the school is without an air conditioning system. On an annual basis, when the student body is asked what the #1 improvement they would like to see made to the school, the answer is always the addition of an air conditioning system.
20. An air conditioning system is in place for the auditorium and the library. However, due to limitations of the system, EITHER the library can be air conditioned OR the auditorium, but not both simultaneously.
21. As a side note, it was mentioned that most of the town seems to think the middle schools are 'new'. In reality, both are already 23-years old.
22. The security cameras are over 21-years old. They are part of an old analog system. Only the system in the cafeteria is modern. There isn't any security camera coverage in the gym or the main office.
23. We passed the teacher's lounge but didn't go in or discuss deficiencies.
24. The lighting system throughout the school has to be switched manually. There aren't any occupancy sensors or other power saving features.
25. All of the millwork (cabinets, etc.) in the art room showed signs of wear, tear, and age. In-house repairs had been made in many instances to try to keep the millwork serviceable.
26. None of the art rooms had real display space for the student's work.
27. In general, the acoustic ceiling tiles viewed throughout the walk-thru showed major signs of age, wear-and-tear, and of damages.
28. In many of the classrooms the light-gauge metal covers over the radiators and heaters showed signs of wear-and-tear and damages.
29. The dark room was viewed. The equipment was dated. An exhaust system was not observed in the space.
30. The storage cabinets near the science rooms in which chemicals are stored are not suited for the task. None of the shelving is impervious, the doors and drawers are without locks, and an exhaust system was not observed in the space.
31. The school only has one exhaust hood for chemical experiments. It looks like it has seen better days. It's assumed the hood exhaust to the exterior of the building.
32. Only one emergency eye-wash was observed in the lab spaces. It looked to be at least 20 years old. It most likely doesn't meet any of the standards for a modern eye-wash.
33. Roof access is possible through a roof hatch and ladder located in the third floor copy room, which doubles as a storage room.
34. There is roughly 48" of space above the ACT ceiling system in the third floor.
35. The roof of the building is twenty-seven years old and leaks.
36. None of the doors separating the stairwells and other means of egress were fire rated (no labels were observed).
37. The weight room is finished with carpet flooring. The weight room is suited for use by PE classes, but is not suited for use by sports teams.
38. Lockers in the weight room are wood.
39. The shower in the girl's locker room is blocked off and isn't used.

40. The drinking fountain in the girl's locker room is out of order.
41. The lockers in the boy's locker room are all too small. Football pads won't fit in them. These are hung on the wall on hooks installed by the staff.
42. The locker rooms don't have any space for team meetings, conferences, or for the viewing of video. It also lacks white boards, etc.
43. There is one basketball gym in the school, but the school has five basketball teams. The teams have to practice using a staggered schedule, which keeps some student athletes in the school well into the night.
44. The loading dock isn't suited for delivery trucks.
45. Gas powered equipment is stored inside the garage. The garage doesn't have any CO sensing equipment or exhaust fans, nor are there any floor drains / an oil-water separator.
46. The school has two oil-fired furnaces / boilers. Both appear to be at the end of their life cycle.
47. The emergency generator is diesel powered and is inside the building without any CO sensing equipment or exhaust fans.
48. The emergency generator only powers certain portions of the school during an emergency. It wasn't discussed, but there most certainly isn't an automatic transfer switch. It's assumed emergency lighting in the school is for the most part battery powered.
49. The electrical switchgear and all distribution panels in the main electrical room were manufactured by Federal Pacific.
50. The school has three pumps to circulate hot water to the radiator heaters, any two of which are running at the same time. Although there is a 'back-up' pump, the system doesn't have any redundancy.
51. This type of heating system does not introduce fresh air into the building. The school is devoid of any mechanical means of air movement or introduction of fresh air (the exception appears to be in the gym and possibly in the auditorium).
52. The student body is 940 strong. The gym only seats 680 students (at capacity).
53. The sports flooring in the gym is original. It's been sanded so many times over the past decades that there isn't any more wood surface to refinish.
54. The cafeteria is the one space in the school that is large enough for the student body. The school runs four lunch periods. The cafeteria lighting isn't up to current standards (foot candles) and appears 'dark'.
55. Some of the cooking equipment in the kitchen is original to the school.
56. The kitchen is experiencing drainage issues that require frequent maintenance
57. The school building is connected to town sanitary
58. All of the water piping is copper and is original to the building. There aren't enough shut off valves in the kitchen, so performing any maintenance work means shutting down most of the water to the kitchen
59. The kitchen electrical system is powered from Federal Pacific panels
60. The kitchen exhaust system is in good working order.
61. The kitchen cooking equipment is not protected by an Ansul (or equal) fire suppression system
62. The capacity of the auditorium is only 660.
63. The auditorium doesn't include any storage for drama or music
64. The auditorium doesn't have a functioning audio or AV system. The school has to rent a system for all functions.
65. The stage wood flooring is damaged in many areas and is still original. The flooring doesn't have much 'wood' left to be refinished. The wood on the stairs leading from the seating area to the stage has been replaced numerous times.

66. The 'back of stage' area and equipment is obsolete
67. The music room adjacent to the stage doubles as a classroom. Storage space is extremely limited. Instead of proper sound absorbing materials, the walls are covered in carpet.
68. The computer room, with its sensitive devices, neighbor the wood shop, which is a producer wood dust.
69. The exhaust fans and filters in the wood shop appear to be undersized and the exhaust equipment appears to be dated.
70. The lockers for the students in the wood shop are damaged due to years of wear-and-tear
71. There is a severe lack of storage space for wood and materials in the wood shop.
72. The PA system isn't available in the library
73. A portion of one corner of the library has been partitioned off into a new hallway for another area of the school.
74. At the end of the walk-thru, the school was characterized as a 20th century building in which 21st century programs are being conducted.
75. It was noted that there are asbestos containing materials in the school (none of which are damaged or friable, meaning in their current state these materials don't pose a risk).
76. It was noted that the school was built at a cost of \$7 million in 1972.
77. The 'white gym' was originally intended to be a swimming pool.
78. It was noted that the original design allows for the construction of one more level in the D building area, and to be expanded out into the area of the fire lane.
79. A personal observation made after the walk-thru was that the group didn't discuss what programs typically offered in a high school setting couldn't be offered at Shepherd Hill due to a lack of space, equipment, technology, etc.

4. Feasibility Study (vote) – was taken before item 3

Motion: D. Elwell Second: L. Fitton YA: Unanimous NA: A:

Discussion

Superintendent Steven Lamarche presented the 02.06.2023 Feasibility recommendation memo to the SH-SBC. Members discussed the value and raised questions regarding what the outcome of the study would provide. Steven Lamarche shared that it is feasibility through schematic design and could take up-to 2-years to complete.

A request was made to provide the SH-SBC members with a sample MSBA Feasibility Study. S. Lamarche indicated one would be placed in the SH-SBC shared folder.

A motion was made by D. Elwell and seconded L. Fitton to set the value of the Shepherd Hill RHS feasibility study at \$1,000,000 for local authorization funding. The motion was unanimously passed by all present SH-SBC voting members.

| Vote | Name |
|------|---------------------|
| ✓ | Dan Edmiston |
| ✓ | Stephen Lepper |
| ✓ | Richard Lucht |
| | Michael Jacobs |
| ✓ | Eric Hansel |
| ✓ | Thomas Courtemanche |
| ✓ | Lisa Fitton |
| ✓ | Joseph Caron |
| ✓ | Jeanne Costello |
| | Cathleen Carmignani |
| ✓ | Andrew Golas |
| ✓ | Darren Elwell |
| ✓ | Richard Mathieu |
| ✓ | Steven M. Lamarche |

5. Next Meeting Date – March 27, 2023 - 6:00 PM SHRHS

6. Future Agenda Items

- Enrollment Agreement
- Update Feasibility Study

7. Adjourn

Motion: A. Golas Second: D. Elwell

YA: Unanimous NA: A:

| Vote | Name |
|------|---------------------|
| ✓ | Dan Edmiston |
| ✓ | Stephen Lepper |
| ✓ | Richard Lucht |
| | Michael Jacobs |
| ✓ | Eric Hansel |
| ✓ | Thomas Courtemanche |
| ✓ | Lisa Fitton |
| ✓ | Joseph Caron |
| ✓ | Jeanne Costello |
| | Cathleen Carmignani |
| ✓ | Andrew Golas |
| ✓ | Darren Elwell |
| ✓ | Richard Mathieu |
| ✓ | Steven M. Lamarche |

DUDLEY-CHARLTON REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Meeting of the Shepherd Hill Regional High School
School Building Committee
Thursday, February 6, 2022
6:00 PM

Shepherd Hill Regional High School
68 Dudley-Oxford Road
Dudley, MA 01571

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the meeting minutes December 8, 2022
3. Tour of SHRHS
4. Feasibility Study (vote)
5. Next Meeting Date – TBD - 6:00 PM SHRHS
6. Future Agenda Items
7. Adjourn

Shepherd Hill School Building Committee

Richard Lucht - Chair
Dan Edmiston – Vice Chair
Steven Lamarche - Secretary

DUDLEY-CHARLTON REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
 Meeting of the Shepherd Hill Regional High School
 School Building Committee
 Thursday, December 8, 2022
 6:00 PM

Zoom meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87121390887>

AGENDA/ MINUTES

1. Call to Order – 6:01 PM

| SH-SBC Meeting | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|
| Thursday, December 8, 2022 | | | |
| 6:00 PM | | Virtual Meeting | Meeting No: 1 |
| Present | Name | Affiliation | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Dan Edmiston | Member at large - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Stephen Lepper | Member at Large - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Richard Lucht | Member at large - Charlton | Voting Member |
| | Michael Jacobs | Charlton FINCOM | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Eric Hansel | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Thomas Courtemanche | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Lisa Fitton | Teacher - SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Joseph Caron | Dir. DCRSD Public School Facilities | Non-Voting Member |
| | Jeanne Costello | DCRSD School Committee - Charlton | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Cathleen Carmignani | Chair, DCRSD School Committee - Dudley | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Andrew Golas | Town Administrator - Charlton | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Darren Elwell | Principal, SHRHS | Voting Member |
| ✓ | Richard Mathieu | Dir. of Finance and Operations, DCRSD | Non-Voting Member |
| ✓ | Steven M. Lamarche | Superintendent, DCRSD | Voting Member |

2. Introductions

Each member introduced themselves and added a statement.

3. Election of the Shepherd Hill - School Building Committee (SH-SBC) Chair

Rich Lucht put his candidacy forward as Chair of the SH-SBC

A motion made by Andrew Golas, seconded by Cathleen Carmignani to elect Rich Lucht as Chair of the SH-SBC – the motion was passed unanimously.

| |
|----------------------|
| Dan Edmiston - yes |
| Stephen Lepper - yes |
| Richard Lucht - yes |

| |
|---------------------------|
| Eric Hansel - yes |
| Thomas Courtemanche - yes |
| Lisa Fitton - yes |
| Cathleen Carmignani - yes |
| Andrew Golas - yes |
| Darren Elwell - yes |
| Steven M. Lamarche - yes |

Dan Edmiston put his candidacy forward as Vice-Chair of the SH-SBC

A motion made by Andrew Golas, seconded by Cathleen Carmignani to elect Dan Edmiston as Vice - Chair of the SH-SBC – the motion was passed unanimously.

| |
|---------------------------|
| Dan Edmiston - yes |
| Stephen Lepper - yes |
| Richard Lucht - yes |
| Eric Hansel - yes |
| Thomas Courtemanche - yes |
| Lisa Fitton - yes |
| Cathleen Carmignani - yes |
| Andrew Golas - yes |
| Darren Elwell - yes |
| Steven M. Lamarche - yes |

A motion made by Andrew Golas, seconded by Cathleen Carmignani to elect Steven Lamarche as Secretary of the SH-SBC – the motion was passed unanimously.

| |
|---------------------------|
| Dan Edmiston - yes |
| Stephen Lepper - yes |
| Richard Lucht - yes |
| Eric Hansel - yes |
| Thomas Courtemanche - yes |
| Lisa Fitton - yes |
| Cathleen Carmignani - yes |
| Andrew Golas - yes |
| Darren Elwell - yes |
| Steven M. Lamarche - yes |

4. SH-SBC Folder

Secretary Steven Lamarche shared the purpose and contents of the SB-SBC folder to the members. The folder contains files and MSBA deliverables.

5. Massachusetts School Building Committee Deliverables
 - a) Statement of Interest (SOI – 06.18.2021)
 - b) Initial Compliance Certification (09.14.2022)
 - c) Enrollment Questionnaires (11.30.2022)
 - d) Educational Profile (11.30.2022)
 - e) Enrollment Certification (02.28.2023)
 - f) Maintenance and Capital Planning Information (02.28.2023)
 - g) Local Authorization of Funding [Feasibility] (05.29.2023)

Superintendent Steven Lamarche reviewed the process and completed deliverables to MSBA, available in the SH-SBC folder. In addition, pending items and due dates were presented as listed in the agenda item.

6. Next Meeting Date – Monday, February 6, 2023 - 6:00 PM SHRHS

This is an in-person meeting at SHRHS. The plan is to tour SHRHS. The meeting is open to the public.

7. Future Agenda Items

Feasibility Study

8. Adjourn

A motion adjourn made by Andrew Golas and seconded by Dan Edmiston to adjourn was passed unanimously.

| |
|---------------------------|
| Dan Edmiston - yes |
| Stephen Lepper - yes |
| Richard Lucht - yes |
| Eric Hansel - yes |
| Thomas Courtemanche - yes |
| Lisa Fitton - yes |
| Cathleen Carmignani - yes |
| Andrew Golas - yes |
| Darren Elwell - yes |
| Steven M. Lamarche - yes |

The meeting adjourned at 6:29 PM

DUDLEY-CHARLTON REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

SH-SBC

Feasibility Recommendation

02.06.2023



To the Committee,

As required during [Module 1](#), the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Eligibility Period, the Shepherd Hill School Building Committee (SH-SBC) must work with the communities of Charlton and Dudley to establish financial and community readiness that supports an invitation by MSBA into [Module 2 - Forming a Project Team](#) and [Module 3 – Feasibility Study](#). Readiness includes the submission of the following required documents: SOI (06.18.2021), Initial Compliance Certification (09.14.2022), Enrollment Questionnaires (11.30.2022), Educational Profile (11.30.2022), Enrollment Certification (02.28.2023), and Maintenance and Capital Planning (02.28.2023). Enrollment Certification and the Maintenance and Capital Planning submissions are on track to be completed as required by MSBA this February 28, 2023.

An invitation by MSBA into Module 1 Eligibility Period is not an invitation to a Feasibility Study. In order to move the project forward and receive an invitation to Module 2 and 3 a Local Authorization of Funding is required. Specifically, the SH-SBC must set the value for completing a Shepherd Hill RHS Feasibility Study and receive local authorization for such.

Please note that MSBA requires feasibility and schematic designs on the continuum of a renovation through new construction for invited projects. Additionally, the Feasibility Study will require utilization of MSBA specific procurement processes, standard Requests for Services (RFS) templates and contracts to procure a team of professionals to include Owners Project Manager (OPM) and Designer Selection Panel (DSP) Process.

The MSBA does not provide a recommended value as every community is different. The MSBA does provide a list of recent “like” projects for the SH-SBC to consider in their process for setting the value.

Below you will find a list of MSBA considered “like” projects. In addition, I reached out to all listed Superintendents seeking the following information;

“I write as we are embarking on setting the value for a feasibility/schematic design for our regional high school. If I could take a few minutes of your time, I was hoping to get insight on how you [school building committee] arrived at [value]. From there, I know MSBA requires a schematic on all possibilities from raze and reconstruct to renovation, but I am curious if your preliminary understanding or strong belief was that [school name] would be a raze and new construction or a renovation.”

I received responses from five out of six requests. Below are the highlights;

- We matched up similar projects and worked with an OPM from a MSBA accelerated project we recently had to arrive at our value.
- Knowing our community, our strong belief was that renovation was the only path forward
- Our building committee has not decided at this time, but we are concerned with the logistics of a renovation project.
- The project was started before my tenure began.
- Our preliminary understanding and strong belief was a add/renovation, but during the feasibility study, new construction became a more viable option due to swing spaces and educational challenges that would occur during renovations.

| District | School | Grades | 2021-2022 Enrollment | FSA Appropriation |
|--|--|--------|----------------------|-------------------|
| East Longmeadow | East Longmeadow High School | 9-12 | 816 | \$1,260,000 |
| Nashoba Regional School District | Nashoba Regional High School | 9-12 | 894 | \$1,500,000 |
| Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical School District | Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High School | 9-12 | 939 | \$1,000,000 |
| Wakefield | Wakefield Memorial High School | 9-12 | 846 | \$2,000,000 |
| Webster | Bartlett High School | 9-12 | 403 | \$1,000,000 |
| Whittier Regional Vocational Technical School District | Whittier Regional Vocational Technical High School | 9-12 | 1,282 | \$1,800,000 |

In conclusion, the value appears to be consistently at or around 1 million for similar building projects. From that starting point, I believe communities added value to Local Authorization in combination of an intent to renovate or build new construction and the means/support for fiscal/capital expenses for said community.

With that said, I recommend a Feasibility Study value of \$1,000,000 be set and established by the SH-SBC for Local Authorization for Funding (LAF). As required by MSBA, LAF must be approved by May 29, 2023. The LAF will be reimbursed at a rate set by the MSBA. The MSBA reimbursement rate is set through the Enrollment Certification process.

Respectfully Submitted By:



Steven M. Lamarche
Superintendent