

MEETING NOTES

Building communities
 since 1870

To
 Tom Morrill, Jude Cyr, Building Committee Members, JPL, MDL, JBJ, FLC, DPD, SCH, RDM,
 ROM, PRM, PRA, DER, FILE

From
 Jeff Larimer

Date
 September 9, 2009

Project
 Edward Little High School Study - Additions/Renovations
 Auburn, ME
 Project No. 08512

Subject
 BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING #8 – SEPTEMBER 3, 2009

Present

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Tom Morrill | Superintendent, Auburn School Department |
| Jude Cyr | Business Manager, Auburn School Department |
| David Das | School Committee Chair |
| Jim Miller | Principal, Edward Little High School |
| Billy Hunter | Auburn School Department |
| Larry Pelletier | School Committee |
| Bonnie Hayes | School Committee |
| Valerie Ackley | ELHS Staff Member |
| Pat Gautier | ELHS Librarian |
| Chris Camire | ELHS Student |
| Dick Gleason | Community Member |
| Chip Morrison | Community Member |
| Larry LaBrie | Community Member |
| Jeff Larimer | Harriman |

Not Present

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Laurie Smith | Assistant City Manager |
| Annie Helmkamp | Former ELHS Student (Off to College) |
| Ray Berube | Auburn City Council |
| Tara Paradie | Community Member/Parent |
| Debora Philbrook | Community Member/Parent |
| Louise Nunn | Community Member/Parent |
| Ron Lebel | Community Member |
| William Luce | Adult Ed Director |

1. David Das presented a summary of the work that has been done to date and set the goal of the meeting of making a decision on what recommendation should be made to the school committee.
2. It will be the school committee who makes the final decision on whether or not to accept the building committee's recommendation, how to proceed forward with the project and how the project would possibly be funded.

H A R R I M A N

3. A geotech study was conducted over the summer on the southern portion of the site that was understood to have been fill material to determine the suitability of constructing a building in that area. An environmental assessment of the site was also conducted to determine if any hazardous materials might have been placed on site.
 - a. The geotech report, although preliminary in nature, confirmed that the fill material was primarily demolition debris deposited there by the city of Auburn. There was also some evidence of miscellaneous debris that may have come from other sources.
 - b. The preliminary findings indicated that the site was suitable for development but should be verified once a building design and location is developed.
 - c. The preliminary environmental assessment concluded that there were no known hazardous materials found at the site.
4. Jeff Larimer gave an overview of the three options that had been discussed to date. The advantages and disadvantages of each option were highlighted.
 - a. Option 1 – Renovations and additions to the existing high school.
 - b. Option 2 – New school constructed on a new site.
 - c. Option 3 – New school constructed on the existing site with the existing school being demolished.
5. Jude Cyr gave a presentation on potential sites that met the criteria for a new school based on location, acreage and availability of utilities. Jude had met with the city planning staff to help identify what sites might be suitable should the committee opt to build a new school on a new site. This was strictly a cursory overview to see what was out there and, therefore, did not determine if any of the sites were actually available.
6. Each committee member was polled as to which option they preferred for recommendation to the school committee. Of the thirteen members present, 12 members preferred Option 3 and one member preferred Option 2. One member who preferred Option 3 also suggested acquiring the open land adjacent to the middle school for possible development of additional athletic facilities.
7. Those favoring Option 3 cited the advantages of keeping the existing site that was centrally located within the community, kept the existing traffic patterns and would avoid sprawl. It was also noted that the students preferred a new school vs renovating the existing school.
8. The building committee's recommendation will be presented to the school committee at their regularly scheduled meeting on October 7, 2009.
9. There are no further meetings of the building committee scheduled at this time.

If written notice is not received within two weeks of receipt, the above meeting notes represent an accurate summary of the meeting and its conclusions.

jplar