

**AMESBURY SCHOOL COMMITTEE  
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
AMESBURY HIGH SCHOOL  
May 4, 2020**

---

Present were Mayor Gove, Chair; Peter Hoyt, Kate Currie, Jana deBeer, Mel Webster, Maryann Welch, Elaine Bucher, Joan Liporto, and Jared Fulgoni, Superintendent of Schools.

***This meeting was conducted under the 'Executive Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law G.L. c.30A, §20', signed on March 12, 2020.***

***The School Committee meeting was held remotely, and was broadcast on ACTV Channel 18, the ACTV website and on their Facebook page:  
[www.facebook.com/AmesburyCommunityTelevision](http://www.facebook.com/AmesburyCommunityTelevision)***

A video recording of this meeting can be viewed here: <https://amesbury-school.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=8f252724-a90c-4cf8-b6c3-33b9c9465079>

**I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Mission Statement (0:00)**

***Amesbury Public Schools Mission Statement***

***The Amesbury School District is unconditionally committed to every child, ensuring that all students experience success through the development of attitudes and skills necessary for lifelong learning by providing the highest quality staff, meaningful learning experiences, and a vitally involved community.***

***This meeting will be broadcast live on ACTV and will also be recorded.***

---

**II. Executive Session (3:00)**

The School Committee did not enter Executive Session.

**III. Comments by Visitors and Delegations (3:45)**

- Arline Ferguson, 19 Back River Rd – Submitted a letter regarding the AES Building Project (full letter attached).
- Billie McLane – Submitted a letter regarding the AES Building Project (full letter attached).
- Steve Stanganelli, 12 Amidon Ave – Spoke in favor of funding APS Capital Improvement projects through a bond.

**IV. Presentations and Administrative Reports (13:59)**

- A. Superintendent's Report – Superintendent Fulgoni gave an update to the

committee on the following topics: COVID-19/Remote Learning, FY20 Budget, FY21 Budget, and Middle School Principal Search. Ms. Liporto gave AIHS RFP Lease Status.

**V. Communications (35:25)**

The School Committee received no communications.

**VI. Items for Approval (36:00)**

**A. Approval of Minutes: 4/6/20**

*Mr. Hoyt moved approval of the minutes, seconded by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by a roll call vote.*

**B. Approval of Warrants**

1. 4/10/20 - \$554,412.14 – *Mr. Webster moved to approve, seconded by Ms. deBeer. Approved unanimously by a roll call vote.*
2. 4/23/20 - \$755,988.01 – *Ms. Bucher moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Hoyt. Approved unanimously by a roll call vote.*
3. 4/24/20 - \$539,538.09 – *Ms. Bucher moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by a roll call vote.*

**C. Approval of Policies (second read)**

Ms. Currie, Chair of the Policy Subcommittee, provided a summary of each item prior to the committee's vote.

1. GBEED- Online Fundraising and Solicitation-Crowdfunding Policy – *Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, second by Mr. Webster. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
2. IJOA- Field Trips – A discussion was held about how the policy would be applied to the 8<sup>th</sup> grade trip. *Ms. Bucher moved to approve, second by Mr. Hoyt. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
3. FF- Naming New or Existing Educational Facilities Policy – *Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
4. JBB- Educational Equity – *Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Webster. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
5. JFABD- Homeless Students: Enrollment Rights and Services – *Ms. Welch moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Bucher. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
6. JFABE- Educational Opportunities for Military Children – *Ms. Bucher moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
7. JFABF- Educational Opportunities for Children in Foster Care – *Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, seconded by Ms. deBeer. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

**D. Ratification of Memorandums of Agreement**

1. Ratification of Memorandum of Agreement with the Amesbury Federation of

Teachers, Teachers and Nurses Unit relative to Coronavirus related school closure and remote learning issues.

Mr. Hoyt stated that due to his relationship with an employee of school district he would be recusing himself from votes on both MOAs.

*Ms. Currie moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Bucher.*

Mr. Webster stated that due to a disagreement with the process used to reach both agreements he would be abstaining from voting on them.

*Motion to approve passed. 5 yes, 2 abstentions (Hoyt, Webster).*

2. Ratification of Memorandum of Agreement with the Amesbury Federation of Teachers, Paraprofessionals and Tutors Unit relative to Coronavirus related school closure and remote learning issues.

*Ms. deBeer moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Bucher. Motion to approve passed. 5 yes, 2 abstentions (Hoyt, Webster).*

#### E. High School Schedule Approval

High School Principal McAndrews provided an overview to the committee on the proposed new schedule for the High School. Mr. Webster asked a question specific to band.

*Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, second by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

#### F. High School Graduation Requirements

Principal McAndrews provided an overview to the committee on the proposed new graduation requirements.

Ms. Bucher asked a question regarding foreign language offerings. Principal McAndrews responded.

*Ms. deBeer moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Welch. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

#### G. New High School Class Offerings

Principal McAndrews provided a summary of the new course offerings at AHS.

*Mr. Webster moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Hoyt. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

#### H. Community Service Waiver Approval

Principal McAndrews provided an overview to the committee on the proposed community service waiver.

*Mr. Hoyt moved to approve, seconded by Ms. Bucher. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

- I. Approval of 3 year transportation contract with Salter Transportation, Inc. FY21 – FY23 for a total of \$1,838,960  
Joan Liporto, Business Manager, provided an update to the committee on the proposed contract.

*Ms. Welch moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Hoyt. Approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

## **VII. Informational Items (1:39:35)**

- A. Subcommittee Reports
  1. Mr. Webster provided a report on behalf of the Finance subcommittee.
  2. Ms. Currie provided a report on behalf of the Personnel subcommittee.
  3. Ms. deBeer provided a report on behalf of the Building & Grounds subcommittee.
  4. Ms. Currie provided a report on behalf of the Policy subcommittee.
  5. Ms. Welch provided a report on behalf of the Teaching and Learning Subcommittee.
- B. School Building Committee Report - Mr. Hoyt provided a report to the committee on behalf of the School Building Committee.
- C. SEPAC Liaison Report - Lindsay Pouliot provided a report to the committee on behalf of Amesbury SEPAC.
- D. Handbook Liaison Report – Ms. Currie provide an update to the committee on the procedures for updating the handbook.

## **VIII. Future Meetings (1:55:15)**

The next regularly scheduled School Committee meeting will be held on June 1, 2020 at 7:00pm. Subcommittees and other meetings will be held on the following dates:

1. AES School Building Committee – May 28<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm
2. Finance Subcommittee – June 1, 2020 at 6:00pm
3. Personnel Subcommittee – TBD
4. Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee – May 12<sup>th</sup> at 5:00pm
5. Policy Subcommittee – TBD
6. Teaching and Learning Subcommittee – May 26<sup>th</sup> at 5:00pm

*Mr. Hoyt moved to adjourn, second by Ms. Bucher. Passed unanimously by roll call vote.*

School Committee

May 4, 2020

Public Comments from Facebook

**Steve Stanganelli**

PUBLIC COMMENT, Steve Stanganelli, 12 Amidon Avenue, Councilor-at-Large: I am concerned with the need for capital improvements for many of our other school buildings and strongly recommend that these priorities (HVAC, roof replacement, technology) be included in an intermediate or long-term bond since we are unlikely to be able to fund these priorities from operating budget but these priorities are long overdue.

**Steve Stanganelli**

PUBLIC COMMENT, 12 Amidon: Can the SC revisit the grade configuration vote?

**Patricia Bradley Theriault**

Public record I am asking that Billie McLane's be Read in its entirety. I have read it and it was difficult to understand not in the entire context.

**Submitted Statements**

Arline Ferguson

In reference to the construction of a new school building, I would like to request the town to reconsider the project for the following reasons:

1. At the time the vote was taken last October, the town and state were in a much different place. The economy was thriving, Amesbury had a different mayor and priorities, and the new reality caused by the pandemic didn't exist.
2. Public opinion in town online surveys was ignored (67% of those who voted preferred the AES location).
3. Many of the underlying issues with the Cashman site were minimized and the expenses to mitigate them are now just being revealed (costs for sidewalks, traffic, and keeping the wetlands under control, etc)
4. Many people in town either didn't know, or were misinformed, about the Oct, 2019 referendum. We were told the vote would be a part of either the primary or Nov election. Instead it was held in

between with very little public notice. I had been watching for the date and the only way I found out about it was on a campaign mailing from one of the candidates. There was no reverse 911 call or any publicity except a sign in front of town hall.

5. The school was billed as State of the Art. In the New Reality post pandemic, there will be a new reality for State of the Art. So a new design to reflect the future should be considered. All proposed plans should include possible renovation of the AES building since large public groupings will probably be discouraged in the future. So putting 900 students together on one site would not be healthy.
6. The AES site had previously been considered "too wet". Now that the real cost of wetlands mitigation as the Cashman is known, the cost to control water at the AES site will be considerably less. There have been many new wetlands mitigation proposals which the planners chose to ignore. Now is the time to seriously give them some consideration.
7. Due to the pandemic, town resources from taxes will decrease. The state is also not going to be sharing as much money with local governments due to their decreased income from taxes. So this does not seem to be the appropriate time for our town to greatly increase property taxes to build a new school. Renovations to the existing AES building would be considerably less. In the new reality people will not value a shiny new building as much as a safe, stable education for their children.

There will be enough changes for the schoolchildren in the coming years due to the pandemic. Rearranging grade configurations should not have to be added to them. Fixing AES problems (leaky roof, etc) and upgrading the building to accommodate the latest computer technology should be the priority for now. Once the economy returns to a new normal then a major school project could be reconsidered if that is what the voters still want.

Arline Ferguson

Billie McLain

Dear Members of the School Committee,

Attached you will find a letter I have submitted to the Conservation Commission. Originally, the AES project was on the agenda for the ConCom meeting tonight, However, at DiNisco's request that has been moved to the June meeting. My comment will be entered into public record tonight. Since the issues are concerning a public school building project, I would also like them to go on record with the school committee.

Additionally, I attended the March Planning Board meeting and voiced many concerns about the design of the building. Mayor Gove was at that meeting, and asked if I would share those concerns with her. I did that. We were planning to meet before all of our lives were changed by Covid 19! Mayor Gove does have a copy of my concerns, but I will also attach that to this notice. I truly have many concerns about this project. As crazy as it seems, I sometimes wake up wondering and worrying about what we are getting ourselves into. Since this virus has changed the world, I see even more reasons to rethink this project.

If anyone has questions I can be reached at [billiemclane@mac.com](mailto:billiemclane@mac.com).

Thank you very much

Billie McLane

I am sending the list of concerns I brought up a Planning Board in March.

I'm concerned about the meetings going forward and not being able to share comments by visitors. This project is really a HUGE mistake. I do not hear anyone throughout the town speak in favor of it. Interestingly enough the whole "say yes" group is silent now!

In other news.... you are doing a great job et me first say I am a retired Amesbury educator. I taught at CES from 1976 until 1999, and then at AES from '99 to 2012. I have been very vocal about my inability to support this plan for a new school. I have voiced my concerns at school committee meetings, public forums, and on social media. I clearly see the need for a new school, and out of a true desire to support education I attended every public forum and school committee meeting where the issue was discussed and met privately with a member of the building committee to try to get a clearer idea of the benefits to the location and the grade configuration. I still see no benefits to the plan as an educator, a taxpayer and an abutter. When the vote passed, those of us who were not in favor of the plan were asked to stay involved and help make it the best it can be. I have been trying to do that, and I am still filled with questions and concerns. I am not sure where to go with these concerns, but I would like to publicly express some of them tonight. Some of these concerns are not directly about the new AES, but they are a direct result of the project.

I'm not sure how we can approve on aspect without considering the consequences of that action.

In looking at the plans I noticed several concerning points:

The current AES has 16 exits (not including the kitchen and loading dock) The proposed new building has 7 exits. Of those 7, 6 are in the southern wing (at the front of the building) and two of those 6 are located in the gym. The only other exit is at the far end of the Academic wing (Kindergarten classroom hallway). In my estimate,, in case of an emergency at least 9 classrooms would be using the exit located at stairway C and 6 of those nine would be coming down the same stairway (three classes from level 1 and three from level 2). This does not seem safe to me. If for some reason that exit was inaccessible the entire school would be using one hallway to exit the building.

We are building a school twice the size with less than half the number of exits that we currently have.

Current size of classrooms at AES is from 960 sq. ft. to 980 sq. ft. Even though the new school is of 98k square feet - almost double the size of AES- the classrooms for first and second graders is 900 sq. ft—smaller than we currently have .

We are building a school twice the size with smaller classrooms than we currently have at AES

On level two at current AES we have 13 classrooms and 14 student bathrooms The proposed school has 8 regular ed classrooms on the first floor and second floor with only 2 designated student bathrooms on each level for those classrooms.

We are building a school twice the size with fewer bathrooms.

The gym is 6,000 sq ft. Almost twice the size of the current AES gym. There is no access to the bathrooms from inside the gym.

We will have a gym almost twice the size of our current gym with basketball hoops too big for the children it will services The budget for the new gym includes glass backstops, volleyball, scoreboard and a climbing wall.

With the exception of the climbing wall NONE of this is appropriate equipment for the ages of the children the school will service. There is a climbing wall at the current AES. Could that be taken down and reused rather than buying another one?

Six electric basketball backstops are in the budget at a cost of \$57,000. Those backstops will never be used by the children at that school—inappropriate use of funds!

The music room shows two practice rooms totaling 235 sq ft. The school houses children ages 3-8. The music teacher at this level should be focusing on the performing arts- music, theater and dance. Practice rooms are unnecessary. This is an inefficient use of space.

A more beneficial use of that space would be stage enabling the teacher to encourage performance within the small group setting.

All first and second grade classrooms have lockers located in the hallway.

Closed lockers for first and second graders are not ideal. Their winter clothing takes up quite a bit of space and they will have difficulty fitting snow pants boots and jackets inside the closed lockers depicted in the schematic. Also, although it will keep the classrooms neater, children need to get to lunch boxes and coats at least three times a day, often times requiring adult assistance. Storage inside the classroom would make more sense.

The small group project areas are surrounded by these lockers. The space is tight and will not be useable when entire classes are getting snacks, and/or coats.



The entrance to the art room is directly adjacent to a second grade small group project area. This room will have traffic every hour all day long with classes coming and going to art. That in addition to the number of trips children in the classrooms will make to their lockers will leave the small group area in that location an inefficient use of space.

\$300,000 was allocated for playground equipment. There appears to be very little equipment in the illustrations. What is included in the \$300k? Does that include the rubber surface covering on the playground.

The area where the playground will be built is very wet, and unusable for a good part of the year. A rubber surface is planned for this area. I'm assuming this is due to the wetness of the field. The rubber playground surface has a cost est. of over \$202,000. The surface needs to be recoated yearly and has a life expectancy of up to 10 years. It is made from recycled tires. There has been concern over the safety of these surfaces when the crack and pieces become exposed. Who will be responsible for the upkeep of the playground? And keep in mind within 10 years we will need another quarter of a million dollars to replace it.

Both schools currently have a playground specifically for pre-school located in a separate fenced in area of the schoolyard. Has one been planned for the new school? If so, where is it located?

At one of the forums, it was mentioned that the CES playground would need to be updated for 3-5. Is that money included in this budget.

The cafeteria has a stage, however it is located at the far end of the cafeteria, next to the exit to the playground. There is no space for performers to enter/exit the stage from behind and there is no backstage/wings area for the performers.

The report states all classes at each grade level will eat lunch at the same time. That will be 7 to 8 classes getting lunches at the same time. Will there be an increase in lunchroom staff. Currently 4 classes eat at a time and the wait time for lunches is often a problem. Young children do not move through these lunch lines quickly and frequently require assistance. This also puts 200+ children on the playground at one time. NOT a good idea!

We still have not been told how CES retrofit will be done. Bringing 5th grade back to CES means those children lose access to many opportunities they now benefit from at AMS including science rooms, shop, two art rooms, band, performing arts programs, photography, ceramics, and library and technology materials beyond 5th grade level. Will the furniture come from the AMS, leaving empty rooms there, or will it be purchased new for all 5 grade classrooms?

DiNisco has \$320,000 allocated towards the relocation of the baseball fields on Woodsom Farm. How much more will the town need to add to that to complete the relocation and add the snack shack and bathroom facilities to the farm property?

Value Engineering has already cut over \$500K from the original plan with an additional \$600k on hold to stay on budget should additional cost arise. So, before we start we have already reduced the quality of materials we are using by over 1/2 million dollars. Much of this change seems to be directly related to additional drainage due to the high water table and the close proximity to wetlands.

Another cut under Value Engineering was a 40% reduction in the stone wall with the name of the school on it. This savings was \$19,000. The total cost of the wall should be eliminated. There are granite pillars with the CES sign at the entrance to the driveway. Just change that sign to names of both schools. Both schools have the name on the building. no additional sign is needed.

Twenty benches have been added to the budget at a cost of \$76,190. Where are these benches located and why are they necessary?

In the paperwork sent to the state I found a page stating an abutters meeting was held at 5:30 on May 14, 2019. My family owns property that abuts the project (Lindbergh Ave). We were never notified of this meeting.

There was also a form submitted to the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth with specific questions about the project. One question asked if the project included any demolition? The answer was incorrect and stated "The project does not include demolition of any building." In fact, it does. The snack shack will be demolished as part of this project.

Another question on the same form asked the total acreage of project and broke it down to woodland, wetland, floodplain, etc. The form shows 0.9 acres of woodland and 0 acres of wetlands, 3.5 acres of open space, and 8.9 developed acres. Wetlands ARE part of this project and millions of dollars is being spent to fix the problem being created. Yet, that was not listed on the form submitted to the state.

I have great concerns about the water issues at the site. There will be 7.69 acres of impervious surface. That is a 4.54 acre increase. CES has suffered severe mold issues in the past. This will affect the water at the back of CES (the area of original mold problem) and it will also increase water problems at Lindbergh Ave.

I don't understand how we can okay the building of a new school twice the size of the current school but with smaller classrooms, less than half the number of exits, and fewer bathrooms, inappropriate equipment, lack of functioning performance area and safety issues with the number of exits and distance to exits in case of an emergency.

Millions of dollars is being spent to mitigate the water problems at this site. NONE of that money will have any relationship to the education of our children. We are creating a problem by building on the wetlands at this site.

Instead we should have be building an appropriately sized building at the current AES site and FIXED the water problems we have created on that property

This project is fiscally and environmentally irresponsible.

Dear Members of the Conservation Commission,

As a life-long resident, taxpayer, former Amesbury educator and an abutter I have many concerns in regards to the proposed AES. I have voiced my concerns regarding this project to the school committee, planning board, members of the school building committee, at open forums, and recently at a conservation committee meeting. When the vote passed last October, residents in opposition to the project were asked to stay involved. I have done just that, and the more I look into the project the greater my concerns become. Although many of my concerns are focused on design and safety, for purposes of your committee I will just focus on environmental/conservation concerns.

I am part owner of property located at 12 Lindbergh Ave. My mother is 100 years old and has lived at that address for 90 years. We have seen the land behind our house change over the years. Land that was once used for a large garden is now so wet it is unusable most of the year. This change began when CES was built and got increasingly wetter with the completion of the soccer field. I have listened to the design team present their plans to mitigate the water issue in order to build on this location. I am not convinced it is going to avoid even further water issues to our property.

At the March 2nd CC meeting the designer was asked about the runoff that would add to the water issues behind CES (just beyond the future AES playground). Her response was, "They will have to look into that." Who is 'they,' and why isn't this part of the project since it will be a direct result of adding an additional 4+ acres of impervious surface to the site? More that half of the total 13.3 acres will be impervious surface!

With the large amount of impervious surface comes other concerns. The driveway and parking lot will be paved with porous pavement to help with the runoff. From what I have read, I understand this surface needs to be vacuumed at least twice a year, and may need to be power washed occasionally. It is also suggested that snow not be stockpiled on the surface as it can lead to premature clogging. In

winter sand should not be used on the surface and plows should lift the blade one to two inches above the surface to avoid damaging the system. I am sure this can be accomplished and it offers benefits of better drainage than typical asphalt. However, my question is does the town own the necessary equipment (vacuum)? If not, what is the cost of the equipment and maintenance? Who will be in charge of the maintenance? How much of the roadway and parking lots will be using porous asphalt? Will the entire area be paved with this material? What is the life expectancy?

The information presented by DiNisco states "The existing Cashman parking lot will remain, providing 58 parking spaces." This is in fact, a change to the CES parking lot. The plans show additional parking spaces located along the current driveway (facing Lindbergh Ave). This is a sloping hillside. Will the driveway be widened to include these additional spaces? If so, Is a retaining wall being built?

The proposed playground is located in a very wet area. I taught at CES for 20 years. That space is unusable throughout much of the year. DiNisco Design has proposed using poured in place rubber surface for this area. While that will allow for better drainage, it will cover what is now an open field with recycled tires! The cost to install the surface is \$202,163. Maintenance requires it be coated yearly, and has a life expectancy of 10 years. So, in ten years, (less in not properly maintained) the town will be responsible for another quarter of a million dollars to resurface the playground. Beyond the monetary and aesthetic concerns, I have concerns about putting a surface that contains known carcinogens on the ground where our youngest children will play.

This is the response DiNisco Design provided to Councilor Wheeler's question regarding the playground:

Rubber surfacing is warranted for 7 years, likely will last at least 15 years. No special routine maintenance is required.

Everything I have read states yearly sealing of the surface is necessary to prevent the surface from cracking and crumbling. If that is necessary, it is concerning that DiNisco is not recommending the proper care of the surface. It is extremely important to keep that surface from coming loose when young children will be using it daily.

I noticed two inaccuracies in response to questions from the Office of the Commonwealth about the project One question asked:

"Does the project include demolition? If so, specify nature of demolition and describe the building(s) being which are proposed for demolition."

Answer: "The project does not include demolition of a building"

FACT: The project does include demolition of two baseball fields, lighting, fencing, and the snack shack.

Secondly:

"What is the total acreage of the project area?"

Answer: Woodland 0.9 acres Open Space 3.5 acres  
Wetland 0 acres Developed 8.9 acres

Floodplain 0 acres

FACT: The project does include wetlands on the CES site and on Woodsom Farm where the exit road will be built

I am also concerned about the money that will be spent to relocate the baseball fields. There is no definite plan in place for the location of the fields, snack shack, bathrooms, accessibility, soccer fields, etc. Will electricity, water and sewer be brought into Woodsom Farm? Where will parking be for the proposed fields?

It has also been stated publicly if the fields go in at the farm, the current fields will be leveled. It would seem that would add to the water issues at the new AES, CES and on Lindbergh Ave. Has this been addressed? What will the cost of that be to the taxpayers? It seems foolhardy to approve one of these projects without knowing the impact of the total plan and the domino effect it will create.

I feel it is important to note the proposed school is 30,735 sq ft larger than the state guidelines. This is partially due to all pre-k and kindergarten located in one building. It should also be noted the reimbursement from the state does not include money for preschool classrooms. The new school will be over 98,000 sq ft. That is twice the size of the current AES and about 30,000 sq ft larger than CES, it will house the youngest children. That seems like an inappropriate use of funds.

This project is costing the taxpayers millions of dollars due to water mitigation even before the fields are discussed. Traffic and sewage are also major issues for the residents of the CES neighborhood, and will cost the town additional monies to improve. NONE of these costs directly effect or improve the education of the children. That is the original intent. The project won the public vote by a very slim margin. At that time voters were led to believe building on the current AES site was not possible. It is. I went on the AES tour last fall. Donna DiNisco was asked if the lot was buildable. To which she answered yes.

Instead of spending this money at the CES location with materials requiring regular maintenance and the costly replacement of the PIP playground surface, it would make sense to look at this project again. Build on the current site of AES. By building on that site the town could fix the water issues created by the development at the top of the hill, use and improve existing property, increase property values in AES neighborhood, keep a neighborhood school, decrease the traffic/increase walkers and eliminate the need for a road through Woodsom Farm.

It seems contradictory to promote the fact the proposed school has been rated with a silver leed certification, when we are abandoning a structurally sound building with no definite plans to reuse it, destroying two very well kept baseball fields, demolishing a building, pouring rubber surface on an open field, and building a road through open space at Woodsom Farm.

Please think about the impacts this project has on the entire town. What we do as a town says who we are. It is important to act environmentally, educationally and fiscally responsible.

Thank you,  
Billie McLane