
RECORD OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL COMMITTEE HELD ON **THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2016** AT 6:30 PM IN BROOKLINE HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM. STATUTORY NOTICE OF THIS MEETING WAS FILED WITH THE TOWN CLERK.

School Committee Members Present: Ms. Ditkoff (Chairman), Mr. Pollak (Vice Chairman), Mr. Chang, Ms. Charlupski, Mr. Glover, Dr. Jackson, Ms. Scotto, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Stram. Also present: Mr. Bott, Ms. Dunn, Ms. Gittens, Mr. Zimmerman, Mr. Lummis, and Ms. Coyne.

Others Present: Ms. Brewton, Mr. Kleckner, and members of the Board of Selectmen: Chairman Neil Wishinsky, Selectman Nancy Daly, Selectman Ben Franco, Selectman Bernard Greene, and Selectman Nancy Heller.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

a. Calendar

Ms. Ditkoff called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. She noted upcoming events on the calendar.

b. Consent Agenda

ACTION 16-69

On a motion of Mr. Pollak and seconded by Mr. Chang, the School Committee VOTED UNANIMOUSLY to approve the item included in the Consent Agenda.

- i. Past Record: October 6, 2016 School Committee Meeting

2. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

a. Finance

Ms. Stram reported that the Finance Subcommittee will be meeting on October 17, 2016. The agenda will include review of FY 2017 Grant Awards, Public Schools of Brookline Scholarship Funds, the FY 2016 4th Quarter Financial Report, and the Financial Projection Plan and Approach.

b. Capital Improvements

Mr. Pollak reported that he will be setting a date for the November Capital Improvements Subcommittee meeting.

c. Curriculum

Ms. Scotto reported that the Curriculum Subcommittee will be meeting on October 19, 2016. The agenda will include a presentation of the draft Brookline High School Education Plan.

d. Government Relations

Ms. Stone had nothing to report at this time.

e. Policy Review

Dr. Jackson reported that the Policy Review Subcommittee met earlier today to discuss the proposed Public Schools of Brookline (PSB) Meal Charges Policy, Policy on Naloxone (also known as Narcan) Use in the Public Schools of Brookline (1st Reading on November 10, 2016), and a potential PSB Prohibition of Hazing Policy. The Subcommittee will continue to discuss these proposed policies at the next Subcommittee meeting on November 9, 2016. The agenda will also include review of a proposed PSB Discriminatory Harassment Policy and Procedures.

f. Additional Liaisons and Updates

There was nothing to report.

3. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Bott provided the following report:

Senior Leadership Priorities for 2016-17

The Senior Leadership Team met yesterday to discuss our priorities for the year in preparation for the School Committee Workshop on October 20. Each member of the team discussed the top priorities they are currently working on, additional priorities for the remainder of the school year and other items that may be longer term. As we continue to focus on getting to know the schools, the district, and how we operate, we are resisting the temptation to create long-term plans until we have a deeper understanding of the strengths we possess and the challenges we face. Over the next week, we will be summarizing the priorities we discussed so that we can share them with the School Committee and allow for a thoughtful discussion.

Townwide PTO/School Council Monthly Meeting

Today I held my monthly meeting with the PTO Presidents and School Council Co-chairs. The agenda of these meetings is jointly developed, with the parent leaders suggesting topics. Although we've only had two meetings, I very much enjoy working with this thoughtful group of leaders. I am impressed with their ability to balance their individual school needs with the broader perspective of the entire district. Today's agenda included a discussion on improved coordination with the district on software purchases for schools. We shared the portions of Section D(7) of the District Policy Manual that relate to PTO and school fundraising in an effort to help them become more familiar with the current policy. Our discussion focused on how to move a pilot effort, funded by a PTO, toward a district-wide program that is integrated into the curriculum approval and annual budget development processes. Other important items we discussed included the 9th school site selection, the process for BHS expansion, an update on contract negotiations, and follow-up to the BHS graffiti incident. For our November meeting we have already identified two agenda items: principal searches and the registration process/welcoming new families.

School Visits

With school only in session for two days since the October 6 School Committee meeting, I have not had the opportunity to complete many school visits. Today, however, I was able to spend time in the afternoon at Pierce administering the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) to students in Mrs. Harvey's 4th grade class. I worked with two students and thoroughly enjoyed the time we were able to read together and to talk about their understandings. The BAS is an assessment that takes time to administer, but my time today reaffirmed my belief that it is a valuable tool for learning about individual students as readers.

4. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS OF CURRENT ISSUES

a. Enrollment Projections

Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Finance Mary Ellen Dunn presented a report on Enrollment Projections (Attachment A). Ms. Dunn referred to her October 3, 2016 memo regarding Enrollment Projections and Reporting, District Boundary Update, Policy Revision Considerations, and Enrollment Projection as of October 1, 2015 (Attachment B).

Ms. Dunn provided an update on Enrollment Projections and School Boundaries (plan for future enrollment projections; redefining our school assignment boundaries, and maps of last year's student enrollment). She explained the redistricting process, which typically takes three years and noted student assignment considerations. Ms. Dunn referred to the maps of last year's student enrollment, which provide a sense of where the population is and what we would have to do to align our district maps. We have growth in all areas of the community except for the Lincoln district.

In response to a question from Ms. Charlupski, Ms. Dunn stated that their demographer is Ruth Quinn Burdell. Ms. Quinn Burdell has done this type of analysis for a number of districts. Ms. Charlupski recommended that *13. Minimize the impact of any change on current students (i.e., explore options such as the grandfathering of students and families)* be more specific. When possible and when desired by the family, we should attempt to keep siblings in the same school, both for the initial redistricting for the new school and in the long term. Ms. Ditkoff noted that there are other considerations that may come into play. The proposed Student Assignment Considerations are not rules and are not ranked; some may conflict.

Ms. Stone noted that the last redistricting effort included the School Committee's establishment of an ad hoc enrollment committee, which included School Committee members, public schools staff, at least one principal, and several members of the at-large community. This was important for accountability and transparency and for the level of knowledge the members brought to the process. The Committee sought broad input from the community. Ms. Stone expressed concern that the process for the 9th school redistricting be similarly inclusive of broad participation and input, informed by the analysis Ms. Dunn presented, but not determined by it. Ms. Dunn clarified that her intent is not to modify the current policy that has the School Committee as the decision maker.

She agreed with the need for a transparent process. Within a few months, the administration will be recommending that the School Committee establish a redistricting committee.

Ms. Ditzkoff noted that we would need to consider how potentially eliminating buffer zones would impact class size. Ms. Ditzkoff stated that it will be important to explain how pedagogical needs factor into the redistricting process. For example, we don't want a dramatic imbalance in the number of low-income children in a building, so considerations like that will be more important than strict geographic proximity. Dr. Jackson emphasized the importance of making sure that the policies and procedures for student assignments and transfer requests are transparent and understood. Ms. Ditzkoff stated that it would be helpful to note which information can and cannot be disclosed because of student confidentiality. In response to a question from Ms. Ditzkoff, Ms. Dunn stated that she will provide the charge for the demographer. Ms. Dunn stated that the Enrollment Report will be updated on an annual basis.

Mr. Pollak referred to the maps of last year's enrollment and noted how helpful it is to gain an understanding of where the children live, not just where they are enrolled. We have overcrowding at certain schools in both North and South Brookline. Today, there is more pressure around Devotion, Pierce and Lawrence. We expect several hundred more units and children from future development in South Brookline. Mr. Chang stated that it would be helpful to hear from the demographer on the state of the art. Ms. Scotto noted that projects that have been approved under Chapter 40B can go forward, even if we meet the 10% threshold. Ms. Dunn stated that the projected increase from new development is 183 students in School Year 2015-2016 and 312 (225 in South Brookline) students in School Year 2016-2017. Ms. Ditzkoff noted that the enrollment projection, which will be updated by the end of the year, will help inform our Capital Improvements Program priorities for the next five years.

5. JOINT MEETING OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF SELECTMEN: 9TH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE SELECTION

a. Discussion and Proposed Vote to Select a 9th Elementary School Site

The Joint Meeting of the Board of Selectmen and School Committee was called to order. School Committee members present: Ms. Ditzkoff (Chairman), Mr. Pollak (Vice Chairman), Mr. Chang, Ms. Charlupski, Mr. Glover, Dr. Jackson, Ms. Scotto, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Stram.

Selectmen present: Mr. Wishinsky (Chairman), Ms. Daly, Mr. Franco, Mr. Greene, and Ms. Heller.

Staff present: Mr. Bott, Mr. Kleckner, Ms. Brewton, and other administrative staff.

Mr. Wishinsky opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He talked about the extensive process thus far and noted that it is clear from the presentations that we can build a great school on each of the sites. Once we select a site, we will move forward to the Feasibility phase. Each site has pros and cons and choosing a site will require some level of compromise. Mr. Wishinsky described the robust public process to date, and the

ambitious timeline yet to come. The Board members have listened to and read all of the comments and take them very seriously. It is clear that we need a new school and the time has come to make a decision. Mr. Wishinsky described the format of the evening's presentation (Attachment C) and deliberations. After some updates, the Boards will have an in-depth discussion and then will proceed to a vote. The site that gets a majority of support of each Board will be the site selected. Each board is voting independently because each board has a critical role to play with distinct roles over the course of the building and financing process.

Ms. Ditkoff noted what an incredibly exciting moment this is – we haven't built a new school in Brookline in over 50 years. The Boards feel privileged to be part of this. Ms. Ditkoff provided an overview of the anticipated next steps after a site is selected: November 2016 – establish a School Building Committee and begin feasibility study part of project, duration five months; April 2017 – complete feasibility study; public presentations and hearings; May 2017 – present 9th school building project to town Meeting to begin process of attaining funding for schematic design phase; October 2017 – complete schematic design and public presentation and public hearings; seek funding for construction documents and construction. While each site has challenges, everyone is committed to making sure this will be a great school. Ms. Ditkoff expressed appreciation to the many people who contributed to this process, including Kara Brewton, Ben Lummis, Mary Ellen Dunn, Ray Masak, Alison Steinfeld, Melissa Goff, Mr. Kleckner, Mr. Bott, and our consultants from Civic Moxie and JLA Associates. Lastly, she thanked the Board members, with special thanks to Selectman Wishinsky. The Boards worked very well together and the level of cooperation is unprecedented.

Mr. Wishinsky then called on Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects, and F. Giles Ham, Vanasse & Associates, Inc. to provide some additional information. Mr. Levi noted several examples of schools placed in close proximity to another, including examples in Weston, Newton, and Lincoln. This is a very common practice, and some believe it increases efficiency and provides advantages for students.

Mr. Ham referred to his October 7, 2016 memo, which provides a summary of their transportation review (Attachment D). He referred to maps showing current traffic at the sites and projected traffic at the sites with a new school. Mr. Ham presented two traffic proposals for the Baldwin site, one which would require modifying Woodland Road for two-way travel to accommodate bus parking queue storage for drop-offs and pick-ups. This would require a permitting process and availability of Soule for pick-up and drop-off. The Boards discussed the feasibility of this option.

In response to a question from Ms. Heller, Mr. Ham stated that the state controls the signal at the intersection of Hammond and Route 9, with the primary goal of processing the Route 9 traffic. The signal and timing have been reviewed many times. In response to a question from Ms. Charlupski, Mr. Ham stated that the potential impact of eliminating parking on Hammond from 7:30 AM to 9:00 AM would be marginal. In response to a question from Mr. Greene, Mr. Levi stated that the two-way Woodland

proposal poses a schedule and cost risk, with potential hurdles at the local and state levels.

Ms. Dunn provided an update on Enrollment Projections and School Boundaries. She explained the redistricting process, which typically takes three years, and noted student assignment considerations. Ms. Dunn referred to the maps of last year's student enrollment, which provide a sense of where the population is. The current projected increase from new development is 183 students in School Year 2015-2016 and 312 (225 in South Brookline) students in School Year 2016-2017, but this number will be updated. In response to a question from Mr. Wishinsky about whether the School Department would consider one 1,600 student school on the Baker site, Mr. Bott stated that any school we open will be an incredible school and that two schools at the Baker site would have their own unique culture and characteristics and would not be one "megaschool," because that would not make pedagogical sense.

Board members provided their thoughts on the sites, including the most important criteria, pros and cons, and preference.

Mr. Glover: The Boards will get behind whichever site is selected and are committed to making sure it will be a great school. We have significant need in both North and South Brookline, so all three sites are appropriate from a demographic standpoint. He considered walkability. The Village site is the most walkable. Baker is walkable to a lesser degree. This is a challenge for Baldwin and makes it the least desirable site in his mind. He likes the Village site, but believes it is problematic because of complexity of development, with the need to keep a supermarket. A supermarket operator might not think the site will provide a sufficient return on investment, given the relatively small size of the site. Baker has significant walkability and there is real need. The site is large enough to allow two schools to be separate communities. Investment in this site can alleviate much of the traffic issues. We would need to address concerns. He supports the Baker site.

Ms. Stone: We need to support the final decision even if it is not our personal preference because the need is great and she is confident that wherever the school is located, it will be a great school. She started her decision process by eliminating Baldwin. As the B-SPACE analysis also concluded, there are very few students living nearby so this would not be a neighborhood school and the redistricting needed to fill it might distort other elementary school attendance boundaries. She is not convinced that there would be willingness on the part of the Park and Recreation Commission to accommodate the high level of vehicular traffic at Soule that the school will require. The available public transportation is not useful for five- to ten-year-olds. Choosing Baldwin for the 9th school would also eliminate it as a possible expansion site for the high school, which she believes is a far better use of the site. Both Baker and the Village site could accommodate queuing, so she put aside traffic and focused on physical challenges. With pros and cons at both sites, she supports the Village site. The Village site draws off from three of the most crowded schools. She believes that building at the Village site

offers the best chance of keeping a supermarket at the site. The high price tag for the Village site is a concern, but it is possible that rent could offset some of the costs. The site could offer amenities for the neighborhood including a green buffer and gathering places. Queuing is a solvable problem. Takings and engineering could be very difficult, but we should not be afraid to take longer, if necessary, to do the right thing. Baker is workable, but vehicle access would require eliminating old growth trees abutting a nature sanctuary, objections that caused Amory to be dismissed as a site, and she feels growth at Baker should be expansion of the existing school, not a second elementary school.

Dr. Jackson: She would support any of the three sites for a great school. She weighed the various pieces of data, is taking a long-term view (the next 50 to 100 years), and is considering the potential of the sites. A school, when done well, can be a hub and a center of a community. She believes the Village site is the best site as a community school. She supports the continued existence of a grocery school at the site.

Mr. Pollak: He is very excited about the potential of each of the three sites and the wealth of possibilities for excellent education outcomes. He discussed the high level opportunities that each site offers. Village site-incredible positive investment in our community and making a better environment in the Village; redevelopment of existing land and worn out facilities for a well formed solution that addresses supermarket and school needs. Baldwin site-a very large campus; great promise for the community to derive greatly increased values from assets already in hand; agree that significantly fewer school children live near Baldwin and that is a concern; there is no elementary school near the site; a new school in the area may attract families that choose to live in Brookline because of the schools. Baker-an enormous asset with 11 ½ acres; adjacent to the sanctuary, a teaching and learning asset for sustainability and environment; much anticipated demand; a neighborhood school to families that live in the area, assuming all Hancock Village units will be built; significantly fewer delivery risks to producing an excellent outcome for the school and the neighborhood.

Ms. Stram: She will get behind any of the sites and believes we can build a great school. In looking at the options, she kept at the forefront, our goals and desired outcome, while not minimizing implementation risks and potential challenges. The site needs to address our enrollment pressures that are in both North and South Brookline. This is part of a package and won't be the only or last step. We want to maintain a commitment to neighborhood K-8 schools and keep in mind what kind of assets we will create or want to preserve. Her preference is for the Village site (maintaining a supermarket). Building in North Brookline needs to be the first step because that is where the need is most urgently felt. Building at the Village site can enhance assets such as providing parks and play space and may make it more likely that we preserve the supermarket at the site. Baldwin would be her second preference, because the site could draw from both North and South Brookline, and leverage and improve existing assets for outdoor play space. She views Baker as a future site for a smaller expansion and would want to preserve the forested land.

Ms. Daly: She would not be in favor of the Village site because of the significant legal hurdles and the concerns expressed by so many neighbors regarding the impact on their properties. Her strong preference is for the Baldwin site. The Baker site presents a quality of life issue (1,600 kids, some very young, on one site). We would need to alleviate the traffic concerns at Baldwin and she would recommend that we build a three-section school. More children may need to be bused, but it will be to a great school.

Mr. Franco: He would support any of the options. He considered traffic, the appropriateness of co-locating schools on one site, and ability to deliver a school. The Baldwin site has many issues. The complexity of the site could impact our ability to deliver a project on time and without significant complications. He has not heard evidence that co-locating two schools at Baker would have a negative educational impact. He has concerns about the Baker traffic and Article 97 issues, but noted that we control the site, which will help us to deliver the project on time. He supports the Baker site.

Mr. Greene: We have received many comments from the community and have read all of them. We also need to consider the experts' analysis and recommendations. All three options are difficult, but he believes the Village site is unreasonably difficult. Perhaps, we could pursue an option at this site in the future, but only after we have laid the foundation with agreements that address the complexity and risk. In looking at the JLA Matrix, the Baker site makes the most sense. Baldwin would also be a great option if we could work out access to the site. Baker has a number of issues. He would prefer Scheme A, which has a smaller profile, and would not create a feeling of a "megaschool." A new school should not be seen as a wing of existing Baker. He is leaning toward Baker as his preference, but we should think about other options, e.g., more than one school or a smaller school with a technology or environmental focus. It is very important that we make sure the community knows that we will build an excellent school and try to address concerns, regardless of which site is selected.

Mr. Chang: We need a school by 2020. Time is his biggest concern and he gave the most weight to schedule and cost factors. The Village site is least desirable. He would support either Baker or Baldwin. He hopes that regardless of which site is selected, we can work together to ensure that the 9th school is ready by 2020.

Ms. Charlupski: She will support whichever site is selected. We need a school as soon as possible. The Village site will take too long and is too complicated. She has visited both the Baldwin and the Baker sites. Baker, with 1,600 children at one site, does not make sense. It is too many students on one site without enough play space. Baldwin is the least expensive of the sites. She believes there will be collaboration and that the traffic issues can be mitigated.

Ms. Scotto: Once a choice is made, we all need to support it. None of the sites are ideal. All have issues that can be dealt with, but not necessarily overcome. Traffic issues are different at the sites and none of them will go away so that cannot be the deciding factor.

She considered which site will really work for children. Baker would have too many children in a space that is too small. Baldwin is smaller, but with more outdoor space. The drawback is the relatively small number of children living nearby, but this may change. The majority of children would be bused. Baldwin meets the criteria of building a school that really works for children and helps with enrollment. We would have to endure the cost of busing students for years. We could build a very good school at the Village site that will address the needs of North Brookline for many years. Rooftop green space is a concept used in many places. The Village site meets her criteria.

Ms. Heller: She will commit to whichever site is selected. Each site has complexities. She would eliminate the Village site, because it is too complicated and risky at this point in time. It would require negotiating with many different owners. It may be a viable site in the future. She visited both the Baker and Baldwin sites. We need to consider options for traffic mitigation. Placing a second elementary school on the site of an existing school does not make as much sense as placing it elsewhere in town. Baker may offer possibilities for future expansion on a smaller scale. She believes that the Baldwin site makes much more sense than Baker for a 9th school. The Baldwin site may require more busing initially, but we don't know about the future. It is closer to North Brookline and is a beautiful site. She is hopeful we will be able to collaborate with the Park and Recreation Commission.

Ms. Ditkoff: Traffic is bad and would need to get mitigated at every site. Each site has detractors who the Selectmen and School Committee have heard from and listened to. She did consider parity with other sites and supporters for the sites. Baldwin has a lot of supporters; Village, some; and Baker, not many. She does care about where there is need and there is current and projected need in both North and South Brookline. She considered where in town there is not only 40B growth but also where current zoning provides ability to build by right. Pedagogy is extremely important to her and she holds this constant across the sites. There were robust conversations about concept schools during the B-Space process. That is not what we are talking about now. A capital solution requires the ability to assign children. It is clear that this community wants neighborhood K-8 schools. She would not support placing all non-resident children in one school. We care about Brookline core values and will need to balance for economic and racial diversity. She is worried about affordability, given the need for two debt exclusions for the 9th school and high school and an operating budget override to open the building. Her first choice is for the Village site because it accomplishes multiple goals for the community. She likes the notion of upcycling properties; believes in smart growth; believes this would create an exciting opportunity for children; believes we can deal with school security; and likes that there will be more integration with and a centrally-located facility for the broader community. She agrees that the site is complicated, but noted that ownership of the other sites may make them better options for future expansion. Baldwin is at the lower end of the cost range; has a lot of constituent support relative to other sites; provides opportunities for exciting partnerships. Fewer children will be able to walk to the school, but we don't know the district-wide impact on busing because redistricting will include multiple factors

(including income status of students and effect on the boundaries of neighboring schools).

Mr. Wishinsky: He is relying on what the experts are telling us. Superintendent Bott stated that if we select Baker, we will not be voting for a "megaschool." We would have two schools with separate identities. He considered the risk of the sites. The Village site presents the most unknowns and is the most complex. He could support either the Baldwin or Baker site. Baldwin has a few more unknowns, but we could end up with a very successful partnership with Park and Recreation. Traffic is an issue at this site and is a risk, but there may be mitigation strategies, such as starting school earlier or other traffic patterns. If we choose Baker, we would need to be voting to create two schools with distinct cultures. He thinks choosing Baker is the best way to keep neighborhood schools in Brookline. He thinks that the site is big enough. Scheduling of recess is a surmountable problem. Baker offers the lowest level of unknowns. The loss of trees is an issue, but this would also occur at Baldwin. He would commit to working with the immediate community to attempt to mitigate the impacts of a new school. He believes that having a new school is a plus for a neighborhood.

Ms. Ditkoff noted that after the first round of preferences expressed, it is clear that the Village site has zero votes of support from the Board of Selectmen. According to the ground rules, this means it will not be chosen as the final site, so Ms. Heller moved to remove the Village site from consideration. Ms. Stone stated that she will support the outcome of tonight's vote, but noted that the Village site was the first choice of five members of the School Committee. Mr. Greene stated that the Village site may make sense in the future if we can address the complexities and ensure that a supermarket remains.

The majority of the School Committee voted against the motion to remove the Village site from consideration: 4 in favor of removing it (Mr. Pollak, Mr. Chang, Ms. Charlupski, and Mr. Glover) and 5 opposed to removing it (Ms. Ditkoff, Dr. Jackson, Ms. Scott, Ms. Stram, and Ms. Stone). The Board of Selectmen voted unanimously (Mr. Wishinsky, Ms. Daly, Mr. Franco, Mr. Greene, and Ms. Heller) to remove the Village site from consideration.

The Boards then continued to discuss the Baker and Baldwin sites. Mr. Pollak cautioned that we should compare the sites using the same assumptions, e.g., a 600- vs. an 800-student school. He suggested that we leave programmatic refinement to the feasibility stage. At that point we will have a better sense of enrollment. Ms. Charlupski noted the lack of transportation to the Baker site. Ms. Daly stated that Baldwin may require more busing, but it is in a better location to alleviate some of the North Brookline problem as well as the South Brookline problem. Baker is not convenient to many parts of town. Ms. Heller noted that "D" line is a ten-minute walk from Baldwin. Ms. Stone disagreed, noting that public transportation mostly works when children can take themselves. Baker offers a better solution for addressing demand while we wait for the impact of new development. Ms. Stone stated that this would not be a useful option for adults dropping

their children off before going to work. Mr. Glover agreed. Very few parents would use public transportation to get to Baldwin and students won't be traveling alone. Mr. Greene asked if a September 2020 opening is a hard date. Baldwin may be more feasible if we can extend the time period by a year. Ms. Stram stated that we are trying to pick a site for the long term.

The Chairmen called for a vote. The School Committee voted 6 in favor of the Baldwin site (Ms. Ditkoff, Mr. Chang, Ms. Charlupski, Dr. Jackson, Ms. Scotto, and Ms. Stram) and 3 in favor of the Baker site (Mr. Pollak, Mr. Glover, and Ms. Stone). The Board of Selectmen vote 2 in favor of the Baldwin site (Ms. Daly and Ms. Heller) and 3 in favor of the Baker site (Mr. Wishinsky, Mr. Franco, and Mr. Greene).

Since it was a split vote, discussion continued. Mr. Wishinsky stated that he would support either site, but prefers Baker. The Baldwin site has difficulties, but he believes that there are strategies that will help mitigate the impact. We could build a great school at the Baldwin site. Mr. Wishinsky stated that he would change his vote to Baldwin to break the tie. Mr. Franco stated that the School Committee members are the stewards of the educational quality of the school system and he trusts their knowledge. He will change his vote to Baldwin. Mr. Greene stated that solving the traffic issues at Baldwin may require additional time. He will support the Baldwin site. The three Selectmen who had voted for the Baker site (Mr. Wishinsky, Mr. Franco, and Mr. Greene) changed their votes to Baldwin, so Baldwin had the unanimous support of the Board of Selectmen (5-0).

A general statement of acclamation supporting the Baldwin site was made. Mr. Wishinsky and Ms. Ditkoff thanked everyone for their participation and reviewed next steps.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Ditkoff adjourned the meeting at 10:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robin E. Coyne, Executive Assistant
Brookline School Committee

