

From the Office of the Superintendent of Schools

SCHOOL BOARD NEWS

November 8, 2019

Congratulations to Kimberly Carr for her re-election to the School Board and a warm welcome to School Board Member-Elect, Philip Soucier! Philip will take the seat of Chair, Susana Measelle Hubbs, once she steps off the Board in December. Congratulations to Penny Jordan and Caitlin Jordan for their re-elections to the Town Council! The School Board looks forward to continuing collaborative efforts with the Town Council. In an “off-election,” it is heartening to see a good turnout from Cape Elizabeth voters.

BUILDING COMMITTEE:

The newly formed Building Committee participated in the School Board workshop on October 22nd for the first of four scheduled meetings. After several posts calling for community volunteers, the composition of the Building Committee includes: 2 Town Councilors, Jamie Garvin and Valerie Adams; 5 parents collectively representing the three schools — Jenn Edelmann Grymek, Derek Converse, Carla Bryant, DJ Nelson, and Terri Patterson; 3 community members — Mary Ann Lynch, Andrew Patten, and Tim Thompson; 3 administrators — Jeff Shedd, Troy Eastman, and Jason Manjourides; 5 directors — Cathy Stankard, Del Peavey, Perry Schwarz, Jeff Thoreck, and Peter Esposito; 2 teachers — Steve Price and Caitlin Ramsey; 1 nurse, Erin Taylor; 7 School Board members — Susana Measelle Hubbs, Heather Altenburg, Kimberly Carr, Elizabeth Scifres, Hope Straw, Nasir Shir, and Laura DeNino; Town Manager, Matt Sturgis and Superintendent, Donna Wolfrom.

Dr. Wolfrom started the meeting by stating the charge of the Building Committee is to: review the Needs Assessment Report; determine

priorities; determine the size and scope of a future building project and bond; and then make a recommendation to the School Board.

The remainder of the meeting entailed a presentation by James Hebert of Colby Company Engineers (CCE) which included an update on the recently submitted application for the School Revolving Renovation Fund (SRRF), a summary of the completed Cape Elizabeth Schools Needs Assessment Report, and a lengthy opportunity for Q&A. The entire 330-page [Cape Elizabeth Needs Assessment Report](#), [Powerpoint presentation](#), and **Minutes** can be found on the CESD website under the Building Committee tab at the top of the homepage.

Due to the short window of time in which eligible projects must be completed (as stipulated by the SRRF), a total of 12 projects in the amount of \$988,341 were identified for funding consideration through the individualized project data sheets produced by the Needs Assessment research. Improving indoor air quality by cleaning all ductwork and re-commissioning HVAC systems, as well as addressing emergency plumbing fixtures (e.g., ADA compliant eyewash/shower fixtures) are projects identified in all three school buildings. Specific to the high school, identified projects include the correction/replacement of existing intercom and public address systems; providing a new ADA compliant lift; NFPA-33 compliant paint spray booth, metal dust collection system, and ventilation for the welding system within the Metal Shop; and roof structure reinforcement. CEMS projects include removing and replacing failing precast window sills with new windows, new flashing, and the replacement/repair of brick. In both CEMS and PCES, the replacement of a three skylights within each building is included in the application.

The Maine DOE will announce recipients of the loans by February 1, 2020. Should Cape Elizabeth be awarded any funds, preparation of bid documents will begin as soon as possible in order to have any applicable projects completed by July of 2021. Otherwise, any and all projects identified in the SRRF application that are not funded will roll into the overall Needs Assessment Report.

The Needs Assessment Report identified 220 projects. Each of the 220 projects are categorized as being either: red priority — needing to be

addressed within 0-3 years before something will fail; yellow priority — needing to be addressed within 3-7 years; or green priority — not needing attention sooner than 7 years. Each identified project is documented on a separate data sheet which provides recommendations, next level recommendations (in some cases), site photos, scope of work, and a cost analysis. A cost estimate cannot be assigned to some projects that would be considered new building and/or additions without a design in place (e.g., new cafeteria for PCES & CEMS). However, in these cases a general cost range based on square footage is provided with high and low margins.

The original school, now CEMS, was constructed in 1934 and has gone through expansions nearly every decade since (1948, 1955, 1960, 1962, 1994, 2004), increasing the envelope of the original building and adding new systems onto old ones. Within PCES and CEMS, the report finds that the physical condition of these two schools are “functionally satisfactory.” Basic education needs are met through the maximization of space and dedicated maintenance of buildings. However, the report lists numerous issues within the two schools which fail to meet satisfaction and/or incur significant annual maintenance costs. For example, safety is compromised due to the fact that several entrances to both PCES and CEMS are located far from and out of view of the front offices. The sprawling layout of the conjoined schools requires that heating elements must travel along an indirect and exceptionally long path which results in energy loss, poor environmental controls, and excess costs. Furthermore, the overall appearance of the schools reflects fatigued buildings that no longer match the high caliber of education expected from our schools nor do they incorporate contemporary best practices in education.

CEHS, built in 1969, has seen one significant renovation in 2004 which included the addition of a main entrance and smaller interior upgrades. Similar to PCES and CEMS, the physical condition of this building is “functionally satisfactory,” but otherwise “not outstanding.” There are numerous points of entry which create security challenges and there are no gender neutral facilities — which was repeatedly mentioned by various stakeholders.

In the case of *all* three schools, there are some issues which create significant annual maintenance costs due to the use of older materials and/or outdated systems. For example, the estimated annual cost of

maintaining the Vinyl Composite Tile (VCT) flooring of all three schools is \$1.2M. Additionally, the use of Concrete Masonry Units (CMU) throughout the entire campus makes addressing various issues, such as upgrading bathroom needs, extremely challenging and conveys an “institutional feel.” After a certain point, it is prudent to evaluate whether it makes sense to invest more money in an old system or consider other options.

Three basic options were presented for the Building Committee’s consideration during the first meeting.

1. Do nothing, knowing that the maintenance curve will begin to fall off rapidly due to the age of all three school buildings and their systems — and accepting that there will be costs associated with repairing and replacing aging parts.
2. Selectively renovate and restore all three schools, requiring the relocation of students for at least one year into temporary portable classrooms while renovations take place in phases.
3. Phased renovation and new construction over a period of 10 - 15 years. This option would propose renovating the high school, while constructing a new building in a different location. Once completed, PCES & CEMS could conceivably move into the renovated building and CEHS would move into the new building. Plans for building a new elementary and middle school could be approached at this point.

The general consensus of Committee seemed to rule out the option of doing nothing. Jamie Garvin commented that there are some projects that need to be addressed immediately, even if the repairs might be replaced by new buildings in the future; “This is the unfortunate reality of some of these projects.” Tim Thompson pointed out that based on the FY20 school budget being approximately \$27M, “we are spending approximately 1/26th of the entire school budget polishing floors” and that perhaps priority should be given to rectifying this issue. Hope Straw

commented that if the Building Committee is ultimately charged with making a recommendation, they “need concrete data around the costs of running the existing buildings today in order to be able to compare that to the costs of potential options.”

Perry Schwarz shared that the load on Cape Elizabeth school buildings are currently at a maximum; “We have cold floors and walls, the heat is going through the roofs.” His hope is that the committee will look longterm for both the school department and the town. Right now, Mr. Schwarz stated, his staff is consumed with spending their work hours addressing problems related to the age of the buildings ... “much like the carnival game, Whack a Mole.” He feels comfortable stating that the amount of money we might spend renovating the schools to make them what we need and want, would not be worth the money and that “we cannot do what we need to do with the buildings we have.”

On November 5th, the Building Committee and the team from Colby Co. and Scott Simons Architects met a second time to flesh-out options and potential timelines. In one option, three new separate buildings could be built over the course of no less than 10 years. This option would require various athletic fields to be temporarily unavailable during construction phases and would require three bonding cycles, but would not entail utilizing temporary portable classrooms.

The second option revisited the idea of combining renovations with phased construction of two new buildings over a period of potentially 6 years. This option would entail seeking two municipal bonds and would not require temporary portable classrooms. A new high school would be built while renovations addressing security concerns at PCES/CEMS are tackled. Once the construction of the high school is completed, the process of building a second school (which would continue to house both the elementary and middle school) could begin.

Mr. Hebert stressed that these options are merely meant to serve as a starting point for determining best steps forward by outlining possible solutions and timelines. Dr. Wolfrom stated that creating a “masterplan” which could outline a course over the next 20 years would be very helpful and likely be more acceptable to the community. Mary Ann Lynch

suggested creating another option which would keep all the buildings, but modernize them, make them more energy efficient, and complete the projects listed in the Needs Assessment Report.

Andrew Patten added that if all the 220 projects were completed, the cost to do so would be approximately \$12.8M for the elementary/middle school, and approximately \$7.5M for the high school — which does not include projects that were listed as “TBD.” With modern building methods that utilize materials that have much longer lifespans and can potentially provide net zero energy costs, “would we be throwing good money after bad,” by staying in the buildings? Susana Measelle Hubbs asked the architects if they could provide any case examples of other schools that have opted to pursue building more energy efficient buildings which could demonstrate how the savings found in sustainable buildings eventually pay for the construction over time? Scott Simons answered that they would provide examples from clients who have faced this similar issue, including an addition at Waynflete which eventually improved energy performance by over 80%. Mr. Garvin added that it would be important to determine what the town’s capacity for borrowing might be in order to lay out a viable plan.

Valerie Adams referenced the town’s recently adopted Comprehensive Plan in which data indicates that a majority of citizens want to see the town move towards more sustainable building efforts. Ms. Measelle Hubbs, citing her two-year term on the Comprehensive Planning Committee, indicated that in addition to a majority of citizens supporting sustainable projects, data also showed an overwhelming demand by community members for renovating and modernizing the town’s school buildings.

The next Building Committee meeting is scheduled for December 3rd at 6:30PM at the CEHS Library. Community members are always welcomed and will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion.

POLICY:

The Policy Committee would like to thank the staff, administration, and students who attended the October 22nd policy committee meeting and provided valuable input in the discussion. At the meeting the Committee reviewed the following policies for Second Reading:

AC – Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action
ACAA – Harassment and Sexual Harassment of Students
ACAA- R - Student Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedure
ACAB – Harassment and Sexual Harassment of School Employees
ACAB -R – Harassment and Sexual Harassment of School Employee
Complaint Procedure
ACAD – Hazing

Of the Second Reading policies, the Committee elected to send only two policies, AC- Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and ACAD – Hazing, to the full School Board for a vote at the next Regular Business Meeting of the School Board.

The Board will vote on a proposal to include the term “gender identity and expression” to Policy AC. In the ACAD Hazing Policy, the current policy includes the statement that “Injurious hazing also includes any hazing activity that is expected of a student as a condition of joining or maintaining membership in a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses or endangers a student.” The Committee will propose the addition of the new clause “regardless of the student's willingness to participate in the activity” to this provision. The School Board will vote on the adoption of these changes at the November 12th School Board Meeting.

Also at the October 22nd Policy Committee meeting, the committee reviewed the following policies for First Reading:

JLF - Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting

JLFA - Child Sexual Abuse Prevention and Response

JLF-R - Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting - Administrative Procedure

Other policies appeared on the October 22nd agenda, but were not discussed due to time constraints. The Committee held an additional meeting on October 29th to continue the review of ACAA, JLF, JLFA and JLF-R.

The Committee will continue discussion and review of these policies at the next committee meeting.

All policies are posted on the [CESD website](#) in the School Board section policy tab.

Policy committee meetings are open to the public, including students. *The next policy meeting is scheduled for **November 26th at 3:00** in the Jordan Conference Room.*

FUTURE DATES:

- Tuesday, November 12th, Regular School Board Business Meeting, 6:30PM - 8:30PM, Town Hall Chambers
- Tuesday, November 19th, “Gratitude Gathering” with CESD and School Board, 2:30PM - 4:00PM, CEMS Cafetorium.
- Tuesday, November 26th, Policy Committee, 3:00PM - 4:00PM, Jordan Conference Room.

- Tuesday, November 26th, School Board Workshop, 6:30PM - 8:30PM, CEHS Library.
- Tuesday, December 3rd, Building Committee Meeting, 6:30PM - 8:30PM, CEHS Library.