

# Citizen questions for the BRSHD-1/13/13

## Contents

Costs of the proposed project and alternative solutions .....	1
Educational priorities and the cost to benefit ratio for proposed spending .....	5
Equity between the towns in the current BHRSD .....	10
Consolidation options and the long-term financial outlook for the BHRSD .....	11
Financial outlook for Great Barrington .....	12
BHRSD’s track record related to the building of the elementary and middle schools .....	12

### *I. Costs of the proposed project and alternative solutions*

1. What is the maximum the state would have agreed to provide on this project? We understand that no absolute limit is set, but there is a range established in actual approved projects. Where does the MMRHS proposal fall in that range (per student and per square foot)?

This is an extremely difficult question to answer as the writer correctly points out there is no absolute limit set but a range.

Initially, the MSBA had the District explore three options: bring the building up to code, do a renovation and addition or build a new building. Building a new building was the most expensive and rejected. Bringing the building up to code was the least expensive and rejected because it didn’t significantly address educational needs. The renovation and addition was selected because it was perceived to balance meeting educational needs with costs.

Construction cost ranges available by the MSBA vary from \$12/square foot for construction costs only to \$381/square foot. The variables, which are many, are most likely attributable to the extent of renovations involved.

For instance, it appears from the data available on the MSBA website that the \$12/square foot project is for a very limited scale HVAC and elevator repair/replacement only for a total of \$4.4 million. Therefore there are not new additions or other repairs occurring in this instance. The MMRHS project construction costs are projected at \$303/square foot. Obviously this scope of work is quite extensive as well with all major systems and finishes being replaced. The MSBA does not publish per student ranges, so we cannot compare Monument to other school projects in that area. All data available to us is on the web site below.  
[www.massschoolbuildings.org](http://www.massschoolbuildings.org).

2. Monument Now materials claimed that if voters did not approve the \$56-million project (which would have received 48.52% funding from the state), they would have to spend \$40.2 million to do “business as usual” with 25% from the state – virtually the same amount of money but **no improvements in**

**education.** How was the “business as usual” amount calculated and what exceptions and exemptions were factored in?

“BUSINESS AS USUAL” is really a misnomer. What it entails is performing preventive maintenance, regular maintenance and fixing things as they break. Repairs would be undertaken on an as needed basis within our annual operating budget.

A better term for this alternate proposal is the “UP TO CODE” option. Any substantial repair or renovations that trips the ADA and building code requirement will necessitate that the entire building be renovated or repaired to code.

If repairs were undertaken utilizing other available MSBA funding vehicle it was projected that the MMRHS project would receive base reimbursement of approximately 40% on reimbursable elements only. These reimbursable elements would likely include roofing replacement, window replacement, and boiler replacement. The specific MSBA Accelerated Repair Program currently in place stipulates the following:

***The Program is primarily for the repair and/or replacement of roofs, windows, and/or boilers with the potential to include additional systems as may be determined by the MSBA contingent upon available funding and capacity in the capital pipeline.***

[http://www.massschoolbuildings.org/programs/Accelerated\\_Repair](http://www.massschoolbuildings.org/programs/Accelerated_Repair)

With these guidelines and advice received it seemed reasonable to assume that key elements included in the larger repair context that would be clearly omitted from reimbursement would include the plumbing and sanitary system replacement, ADA and life safety upgrades, flooring replacement, asbestos abatement, electrical system replacement, ceiling replacement, and furniture replacement.

3. What are the demographic trends used in planning this project and what are the sources? How accurate have past projections been? Please show the calculations and projections used for the elementary and middle schools.

MSBA projected enrollment based on census and DESE data. The projected enrollment was set at 570 students. The school district also contracts with NESDEC to do enrollment projections. These projections were provided to the MSBA. NESDEC projections have been accurate and have been used by many districts in the Northeast. [www.nesdec.org](http://www.nesdec.org)

The two reports were consistent. The reports can be found at these links.

MSBA enrollment certification letter:

[http://www.massschoolbuildings.org/news\\_events/7.31.13Board/Berkshire\\_Hills](http://www.massschoolbuildings.org/news_events/7.31.13Board/Berkshire_Hills)

NESDEC enrollment projections:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/\\_wPCaB\\_/a4ceca1e026c8cf03745a49013852ec4/MMRHS\\_NESDEC\\_Enrollment\\_Projections.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/_wPCaB_/a4ceca1e026c8cf03745a49013852ec4/MMRHS_NESDEC_Enrollment_Projections.pdf)

4. What is in the scope of the project that has escalated our estimated costs over what Williamstown has projected for both the “new school” option and for renovation? The estimate for our new school \$70+ million and the renovation \$56 million. How do these figures compare on a square-foot basis per student with Williamstown and other schools?

Williamstown is in the very early stages of its project. Financial projections for the Mt. Greylock project are speculative at best as they have neither done a feasibility study or schematic design. While Williamstown in some ways is similar to Great Barrington, Lanesboro is financially needier. We can't make a reasonable comparison as they are so early in their project.

5. How much has been spent so far on the plans and promotion of the failed proposal? Where did it come from (district/state/etc.) and whom did it go to? If the project does not go through, will the BHRSD need to bear the entire burden? How much was reimbursed by the state and where will planning funds come from going forward?

\$733,771.95 was spent on the Feasibility and Schematic Design project. \$750,000 was appropriated by the School Committee from Excess & Deficiency to fund the project. The MSBA participated through our reimbursement agreement and we received \$320,091. The MSBA participated based on their approval of the District being a part of their Feasibility and Schematic Design project program; we do not have to repay the MSBA even though the project didn't pass.

The funds were used for the Owners Project Manager (OPM) (required by MSBA) and the architect. Additionally we needed site work, engineering, and hazardous materials assessment, as well as a traffic study. Except for \$2,000 all of the funds went to either the OPM or architect and they hired sub-contractors for specific analysis.

As it stands right now, the MSBA, in its letter to the District, has stated that if the district chooses to change the proposed project we will need to submit a new Statement of Interest (SOI) and get back in line. There is no guarantee we will receive funding for a different project.

The funds for the project came from Excess and Deficiency and were approved by the School Committee on three different meeting dates. #1 Feasibility Study 3/10/11, #2 Schematic Design 5/31/12, #3 Completion of both 11/15/12.

Feasibility study funding:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/wPDBS\\_/ab39b44bc87802e13745a49013852ec4/Vote\\_for\\_Feasibility\\_and\\_Schematic\\_Design\\_Study\\_11\\_15\\_12.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/wPDBS_/ab39b44bc87802e13745a49013852ec4/Vote_for_Feasibility_and_Schematic_Design_Study_11_15_12.pdf)

Extension of Feasibility study funding – balance of first vote:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/wPDAj\\_/b294363c9fba8ac23745a49013852ec4/Vote\\_Feasibility\\_Funding.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/wPDAj_/b294363c9fba8ac23745a49013852ec4/Vote_Feasibility_Funding.pdf)

Schematic Design funding:

At this point we are moving forward with a blank slate until we get input from the community about any potential options.

Monument Now, a registered ballot initiative committee which is now defunct, spent \$2,579.65. Those funds were based on donations and in-kind contributions.

6. Has the School Committee looked into financing the project over 25 to 30 years to lessen the impact on taxes? Williamstown High School is being financed over 30 years. Why are we using 20 years for the amortization period?

Both a 20 year and 25 year financing option were evaluated during the planning phase of the proposed project. Working with the District's financial advisor, who handles dozens of these types of financings a year, a detailed analysis showed (1) extending the term by 5 years would add \$3 - \$7 million to the project - depending on the bond rate at the time of sale, while (2) decreasing the tax burden on the average homeowner by about \$40 per year. The cost-benefit analysis also showed that while there would be a slight annual decrease, the taxpayer would pay more in total.

30 years is not considered a viable option, because many systems have a useful life of 20 - 25 years. It would not be cost-effective or financially wise to bond for 30 years. Additionally, as seen above, an increased borrowing would cost the taxpayers more.

The District has appointed an ad-hoc financing committee to explore a range of financing options. They will evaluate different time spans as well.

Williamstown has not yet borrowed; they are at the very beginning stages of their Feasibility and Design project. They have not made any determination of the length of time to set up for the borrowing.

7. Can a revised project be approved and funded in two stages? Presumably two bonds could be floated, but could the State hold the reimbursement in that same way? Is the current plan phased in such a way that this could be reworked?

The MSBA language in regard to votes and project approvals is pretty clear and requires the district to seek and receive full project funding authorization within 120 days of Board of Director approval of the project. In this instance we have requested an extension and been granted an extension but we are still required to obtain full funding approval without any allowable stages.

8. Could all the students go to Mount Everett for a year, allowing Monument to be closed for the renovations? How much would this cut from construction costs? How many students can Mount Everett accommodate in total, and what is its current population?

Mount Everett is a part of the Southern Berkshire School District. We have no jurisdiction over it and sending our students there for a year would be disruptive to all educational processes. The 7-12 enrollment is 337 students. There is not room for our 571 students.

9. Assuming we can use local contractors if we reject state funding, why doesn't the school committee put out bids for each of the separate capital projects? This would provide voters with a fresh way to assess options for the repair and renovation of MMRHS.

Any projects performed at MMRHS, whether by the District itself or with state funding, must be publicly bid under Massachusetts procurement laws and, for project costing over \$100,000, must be performed by contractors certified by the Massachusetts Division of Capital and Asset Management & Maintenance ("DCAMM"). The use of state funds does not change any of the bidding and regulatory requirements currently in place for work at MMRHS and local contractors are free to submit responses to any invitations for bids for work at MMRHS. If the project proceeds, invitations to bid will be publicized in the Berkshire Record and Berkshire Eagle and the District will mail the bid packages directly to any interested contractors certified by DCAMM in Berkshire County.

The mandated DCAMM requirements are intended to help ensure that only qualified contractors are eligible to perform the required services. Criteria for being DCAMM certified include experience completing project work of similar scale and positive references from those projects, financial stability, and experience of individual's team members.

Given the scope of the proposed project and its significance to the community, the School Committee very much desires to maximize local contractor participation whenever possible and help ensure that local contractors are given every opportunity to participate in the renovations. The assistance that will be given will be through direct outreach, focused workshops, facilitation of communication between smaller local firms and larger regional firms or help understanding the "DCAMM" regulations. "DCAMM" is conducting a workshop for contractors to become certified at Springfield Technical College on January 30, 2014 from 11 am to 1 pm.

<http://www.mass.gov/anf/property-mgmt-and-construction/design-and-construction-of-public-bldgs/contractor-certification/workshop-on-dcam-certification.html>

## II. *Educational priorities and the cost to benefit ratio for proposed spending*

1. What are the education success trends in the district (exam results, AP courses offered, etc.)? A simple chart comparing our district to the rest of MA and to other similar states would be helpful.

The data relative to MMRHS's student and overall performance can be found in the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education "report card." This report is based on MCAS performance and DESE requirements for Massachusetts public schools, which can be found at:

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/general.aspx?topNavId=1&orgcode=06180505&orgtypecode=6&>

Additional data includes the following:

### Student Achievement Data

#### MCAS 2013

Subject	Proficient or Higher		Advanced		Proficient		NI		W/F		Total Students	CPI	SGP	Included in SGP
	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State				
ELA	94	91	51	45	43	46	5	7	1	2	117	98.5	48.0	98
Mathematics	89	80	64	55	26	25	8	13	2	7	121	95.7	55.0	101
Science and Tech/Eng.	87	71	19	26	68	45	12	24	1	5	106	95.5	N/A	N/A

#### 2012

Subject	Proficient or Higher		Advanced		Proficient		NI		W/F		Total Students	CPI	SGP	Included in SGP
	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State				
ELA	95	88	47	37	48	51	3	9	2	3	126	98.8	59.0	103
Mathematics	87	78	58	50	29	28	10	15	4	7	126	94.6	55.0	104
Science and Tech/Eng.	76	69	18	24	58	45	23	25	1	6	109	90.6	N/A	N/A

#### 2011

Subject	Proficient or Higher		Advanced		Proficient		NI		W/F		Total Students	CPI	SGP	Included in SGP
	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State				
ELA	91	84	34	33	57	51	8	13	1	3	124	97.2	47.0	97
Mathematics	82	77	47	48	35	29	15	16	3	7	124	92.3	52.0	97
Science and Tech/Eng.	66	67	10	20	56	47	32	27	1	7	105	88.1	N/A	N/A

SAT					
Year	#	Test	MMRHS	MA	National
2013	87	Cr. Reading	541	515	
		Math	525	529	
		Writing	540	509	
2012	96	Cr. Reading	544	513	
		Math	513	530	
		Writing	525	508	
2011	101	Cr. Reading	552	513	
		Math	531	527	
		Writing	539	509	

SAT II Subject Tests						
<b>2013</b>	# Students: 21 # Tests: 50 SAT Mean Scores: CR: 658 M: 646 W: 658			<b>2012</b>	# Students: 31 # Tests: 69 SAT Mean Scores: CR: 636 M: 585 W: 615	
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Tests</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>		<b>Subject</b>	<b>Tests</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>
Literature	13	674		Literature	20	602
Mathematics	10	629		Mathematics Level 1	14	568
Mathematics	5	730		Mathematics Level 2	11	638
Chemistry	11	730		Chemistry	7	663
Spanish	3	n/a		Spanish	3	661
Biology E, M	4	n/a		Biology E	5	n/a

Advanced Placement						
<b>2013</b>	<b>Total # of Tests: 96</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
	Number of Exams	2	2	3	1	3
	Percentage of Total	2	2	3	1	3
<b>2012</b>	<b>Total # of Tests: 93</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
	Number of Exams	2	2	2	1	1
	Percentage of Total	2	2	2	1	1
<b>2011</b>	<b>Total # of Tests: 70</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
	Number of Exams	1	2	2	6	2
	Percentage of Total	2	3	3	9	3

ACT																
Year	#	English			Math			Reading			Science			Comp.		
		MM	MA	US	MM	MA	US	MM	MA	US	MM	MA	US	MM	MA	US
<b>2013</b>	13	22.5	23.8	20.2	21.6	24.4	20.9	24.9	24.4	21.1	22.5	22.8	20.7	23.6	23.9	20.9
<b>2012</b>	18	25.1	23.9	20.5	22.5	24.5	21.1	27.1	24.2	21.3	23.4	23.2	20.9	24.7	24.1	21.1
<b>2011</b>	7	25.0	24.1	20.6	25.1	24.6	21.1	24.9	24.4	21.3	22.1	23.2	20.9	24.4	24.2	21.1

- Should we continue to support the programs that Peter Dillon has enumerated in his email: “The District has robust vocational programs in horticulture, automotive, computers, wood working/property management, early childhood education and culinary arts? There is also a big internship program.”

These “extras” require more equipment and support. Are these “frills”? Do we cut these to meet our budgets? Or do we continue programs and share the costs across a wider population?

**Future Career Vocational Technical Education (CVTE) Programming: presented to and approved by the BHRSD School Committee in August 2012**

Monument Mountain Regional High School maintains a legacy of providing educational opportunities that are student-centered, collaborative and innovative. Our students are well- prepared for college and the workplace, our faculty is inventive, and our community invested.

CVTE programming at MMRHS is integral to the school culture, serving the needs of a relatively small but important population. The nearest alternatives for students interested in vocational programming are Taconic High School in Pittsfield, McCann Technical High School in North Adams, or Smith Vocational in Northampton.

When considering future programming in the area of career, vocational and technical education, the school district should focus on our educational community and maintain its commitment to a comprehensive high school structure. Emphasis should be put on providing programs that prepare our students for post-secondary education **and** training as well as employment in Berkshire County. **Given the current and future employment opportunities in our communities, MMRHS should provide for its students and community upgraded vocational spaces including:**

<i>CVTE Program Improvement</i>			
<i>Program</i>	<i>Facilities</i>	<i>Programming</i>	<i>Program Outcome</i>
Automotive	Updated, renovated space	1 automotive-experienced paraprofessional	Internship, NATEF Certificate
Horticulture	Updated, renovated space	Collaboration with science	Internship, Articulation Agreement
Property Management (Carpentry)	Updated, renovated space	Transition from basic woodworking curriculum to property management curriculum	Internship, Articulation Agreement
Culinary Arts	Updated, renovated space	Focus on industry level standards and practices in addition to personal culinary skills	Internship, Articulation Agreement
Allied Health	Collaboration with BHS, BCC	1 teacher (shared), curriculum development, internships	Certificate (CNA)
Early Childhood	Updated, renovated space	Ongoing collaboration with BCC and community partners	Internship, Articulation Agreement
Business	Updated, renovated space	Revised curriculum, focus on entrepreneurship, internships	Internship, Diploma
Television/Media, Computer	Updated, renovated computer lab space that allows for mixed platforms, editing and production technology	Continued collaboration with community partners, internships	Diploma, internship, Articulation

- Since a main justification for school expansion was the concept of "Building for 21st Century Education," please explain the goals of such an education and provide citations for the research used by the BHRSD. Some of the questions about this include: What assumptions were made about the new



challenges that students are likely to face over the next 10, 20, 40 years? To what extent does 21st Century Education focus mainly on preparation for college? How does 21st Century Education help develop the interpersonal skills valued by employers? Does it provide entrepreneurial training for those who want to start a business? Does it encourage the creativity, love of learning, and collaborative skills needed to adapt to a rapidly changing world?

The catch-all phrase [21<sup>st</sup> Century learning/skills, etc.] covers a spectrum of skills and abilities ranging from critical thinking to creativity, innovation to leadership, global awareness to media and financial literacy.” (DESE)

Sources that informed decisions to ensure a renovation design that could facilitate and ensure programming for 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning included but were not limited to:

- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Common Core, MA Core, College and Career Readiness) <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/delivery>
- The College Board <http://www.collegeboard.org/>
- The US Department of Education <http://www.ed.gov/>
- Berkshire County Regional Employment Board <http://www.berkshirereb.org/>
- The Berkshire Compact <http://www.mcla.edu/compact/>
- National associations including ASCD, NASSP, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Science, English, Social Studies, etc., National School Libraries Association, Columbia Teachers College, Harvard Graduate School of Education, architectural and engineering firms specializing in public school facilities.

Additionally, all decisions were based on ensuring a comprehensive educational experience for our young people, preparing them for college and careers, preserving the humanities and the arts while providing industry standard CVTE facilities and the best STEM classrooms and labs available. Additionally, learning spaces, health and wellness spaces and a focus on security and safety remained prominent throughout the design process.

4. Were local residents invited at any point to suggest their views on a 21st Century Education? What do the students think?

Students participated in interviews with the architects in April 2012 and represented all MMRHS programs. Local residents were invited to participate throughout the process including but not limited to:

- Representation on the building subcommittee;
- Faculty, student and school council/parent interviews April 2012;
- October 2012 meeting between the Horticulture Advisory committee building subcommittee representatives;
- The CVTE Advisory Committee
- Community informational meetings on: May 2012, August, 2012, October 2012, November 2012, December 2012, January 2013, February 2013, June 2013

Notes from the interviews and handouts from the community outreach sessions are available.

5. In considering future spending allocations, how did the BHRSD balance proposed spending on the building with the need to support high-quality continuing education and training for teachers and administrators?

The BHRSD operating budget has maintained funding for professional development. Peter Dillon has been and will continue to be designed in alignment with emerging best practices in the various content areas, District and state initiatives, and current research on both pedagogy and instructional methodologies.

### *III. Equity between the towns in the current BHRSD*

1. This is a general issue that people are deeply concerned about. The overarching question is this, I think: What is the school committee doing to ensure that there is equity between the towns and taxpayers in the district, and that choice-in students are fairly funded, too, by their own towns? What is the timeframe for a revised system?

Each individual town's share of the budget is determined by the regional agreement. Great Barrington, Stockbridge and West Stockbridge are assessed based on their percentage of students. About 69% of students live in Great Barrington while the remaining 31% live in Stockbridge and West Stockbridge. Choice and Tuition students are calculated differently.

There are two basic models for accepting students from other districts: Choice and Tuition.

Choice enables any student in Massachusetts to request a seat in one of our schools. The state rate for Choice is \$5,000 per student. There is an additional amount for special education students. BHRSD closely monitors available seats and only accepts choice students when there is room in existing classes. Tuition: Agreements enable students from with other districts to enroll their students. BHRSD has current agreements with Farmington River for 7-12<sup>th</sup> grades and Richmond for 9-12<sup>th</sup> grades. The 7/8<sup>th</sup> grade amount is \$6,627 and the high school amount is \$7,305. Both agreements are in active negotiations and the School Committee hopes to set new rates by the start of the 2014 school year.

School choice is governed by Chapter 76 12B of Mass General Laws.

<https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleXII/Chapter76/Section12B>

2. Is it true that we are committed to choice K and 1<sup>st</sup> graders for 12 years? If so, how can this be used in negotiations for a better pricing structure in the short and long term?

Once a district accepts a choice student, it is obligated to keep them until they graduate or transfer. The choice rate is set by the state and cannot be negotiated.

From a historical perspective, choice started in BHRSD in 1991. The first vote on the issue by the School Committee was on August 6, 1991 and allowing the enrollment of choice students was unanimously accepted choice for a year. On April 9, 1992, the School Committee again unanimously accepted the continued enrollment of choice students. This issue is revisited on an annual basis by the School Committee.

IV. *Consolidation options and the long-term financial outlook for the BHRSD*

1. In an environment of a shrinking and aging population, is it not inevitable that a different solution for building and funding schools is needed, including the consolidation of school districts and locations?

BHRSD has explored and continues to explore a range of options from collaboration to consolidation. Conversations with neighboring districts are on-going. Our data suggests that school age population is flat and then increases according to the MSBA data.

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/\\_wPCaB\\_/a4ceca1e026c8cf03745a49013852ec4/MMRHS\\_NESDEC\\_Enrollment\\_Projections.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/_wPCaB_/a4ceca1e026c8cf03745a49013852ec4/MMRHS_NESDEC_Enrollment_Projections.pdf)

2. What special programs that require expensive build-outs are already available at the Mount Everett High School such as culinary arts facilities? Has a comparison of facilities from nearby schools been done to show our voters what is duplicative vs. what is unique? Please provide a chart of both vocational and advanced college-prep courses offered in all adjacent districts.

Each high school in South County offers a core curriculum that meets DESE requirements and includes a number of Advanced/AP courses in the core content areas. Additional courses in technology, art, music and other electives are also offered. Graduation requirements and course offerings can be found in each school's Program of Studies:

Mt. Everett:

Program of Studies: <http://www.sbrsd.org/academics3.html>

DESE Data:

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/general.aspx?topNavId=1&orgcode=07650505&orgtypecode=6&>

Lenox:

Program of Studies <http://www.lenoxps.org/lmmhs/departments/office/programofstudies10-12.pdf>

DESE Data:

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/general.aspx?topNavId=1&orgcode=01520505&orgtypecode=6&>

Lee:

Program of Studies:

<http://www.lee.k12.ma.us/LMHSv2/documents/2012-2013ProgramofStudies.pdf>

DESE Data:

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/general.aspx?topNavId=1&orgcode=01500505&orgtypecode=6&>

Monument Mountain:

Program of Studies:

[http://www.edline.net/files/\\_raBt6\\_/38816bef3f18c8c53745a49013852ec4/2014\\_Program\\_of\\_Studies.pdf](http://www.edline.net/files/_raBt6_/38816bef3f18c8c53745a49013852ec4/2014_Program_of_Studies.pdf)

DESE Data:

<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/general.aspx?topNavId=1&orgcode=06180505&orgtypecode=6&>

3. What work is being done to consolidate at least two school districts? Steve Bannon has alluded to more work planned or underway. Please specify what steps are being taken.

There are on-going discussions with neighboring districts with multiple facets to consider. Educational impact is a primary consideration. The discussions are preliminary and may or may not bear fruit. The goal of using resources more effectively may be met in multiple ways and may change and develop over time.

#### V. *Financial outlook for Great Barrington*

1. There's been a call for integrated financial projections that would guide decisions made by all boards and also by voters, to include not only the school project but debt service for past projects, the future sewer project, and the Main Street renovation project, as well as the town's and the school district's unfunded liabilities for healthcare and pensions.

The Town of Great Barrington maintains all information related to the town's bonded projects, with principal, interest and annual payments detailed. That information would be available through the Town Manager's office. The District publishes the debt service annually, with principal and interest detail, with its budget.

The Town would have information on its unfunded liabilities.

The District does not have unfunded retirement liabilities on record. "Unfunded" health insurance obligations are funded in the annual budget as it comes due.

2. It would be useful to have a simple table listing each debt the town or the district presently has outstanding. For each debt (i.e., bond), I would like to see at least two pieces of information: 1) the cost per year in property taxes (i.e., \$ per \$1,000 of assessed value) to service the debt and 2) when the debt will be retired.

This information is available through the Town of Great Barrington; the District does not maintain these records.

#### VI. *BHRSD's track record related to the building of the ES and MS*

1. How accurately did costs and outcomes match the projections made then? Please provide the original estimates and actual spending.

Elementary and Middle School Construction Estimates:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/\\_wPDcS\\_/88bdf8239838dce33745a49013852ec4/ES\\_MS\\_Estimates.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/_wPDcS_/88bdf8239838dce33745a49013852ec4/ES_MS_Estimates.pdf)

Elementary and Middle School Project Budgets:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/\\_wPDdB\\_/c61592ad25149e653745a49013852ec4/ES\\_MS\\_Project\\_Budget.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/_wPDdB_/c61592ad25149e653745a49013852ec4/ES_MS_Project_Budget.pdf)

Elementary and Middle School Project Actuals:

[http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/\\_wPDdt\\_/3dac201d369c57b93745a49013852ec4/ES\\_MS\\_Construction\\_Budget.pdf](http://www.mmrhsproject.org/files/_wPDdt_/3dac201d369c57b93745a49013852ec4/ES_MS_Construction_Budget.pdf)

2. What companies did the work and what were they paid? Where are they based?

Kingscott Associates (Designers); Kalamazoo, MI; \$2,064,312

Vincent Guntlow (Designer of Water & WWTP); Williamstown, MA; \$531,326

Construction Monitoring Services (Proj. Mgmt); Marlborough, MA; \$232,320

DA Sullivan (Gen. Contractor); Northampton, MA; \$26,862,318

3. Is the bond for these schools being refinanced since the rate is currently low? If so, what is the impact?

The bonds were refinanced and the savings was \$1.76 million or approx. \$176,000 per year. The savings is shared with MSBA, which will reduce the reimbursement by about \$93,000 to \$1,121,000. We basically reduced the true interest cost from 4.06% to 2.06%

###