# Warrant Committee Meeting Minutes
## February 25, 2019

| Warrant Committee Members | Present: Michael Pastore (chairperson), Amanda Hall, Jack Wolfe, Joanna Hilvert (arrived at 7:20), Sharon Tatro, Robert Sliney, Jeremy Marsette, Kristine Barton, Newton Thompson  
| Absent: |  
| Guests | Jessica Reilly (School Committee), Christopher Morrison (School Committee), Anna Mae O’Shea Brooke (School Committee), Michael LaFrancesca, Jeff Marsden – School Superintendent, Eoin O’Corcora – Director of IT, Kristine Trieweiler - Town Administrator, Georgia Colivas - Treasurer, Yvonne Remillard - Assessor  
| Meeting Location | Public Safety Conference Room  
| Meeting Times | Meeting convened: 7:02pm  
| Meeting adjourned: 9:07 pm  
| Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes |  
| • Meeting minutes of 2/11/19 approved as amended 9-0  
| Operational Budgets (including votes taken) | School Budget  
| • Overview of schools/School Presentation by Dr. Marsden  
| • Responses to Warrant Committee questions (provided in advance to the School Department) were provided within the presentation  
| • The “Lexington Model” was noted. Dr. Marsden has not discussed the draft model with Selectman Murby.  
| • Dr. Marsden noted that a 3% budget would be a reduction of $537,000 from the current FY20 budget request. Possibly the equivalent of 8.5 FTE and a $20,000 reduction in expenses.  
| • It was noted that the Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Selectmen and School Committee regarding budget understandings for FY20 and future was not signed nor formalized. However, the School Department targeted a 4% budget increase for FY20  
| • It was noted that the Selectmen have indicated that no “free cash” will be used to support FY20 budgets  
| • Statewide Education Funding Reform – not optimistic for Medfield (not all communities will see more, but none should be negatively impacted).  
| • Dr. Marsden noted that new construction/building impacts to school enrollment projections are considered once building permits are issued for a project. Therefore, no enrollment projections are currently considered for the redevelopment of the former Medfield State Hospital  
| Warrant Articles (including votes taken) | • Sharon Tatro discussed the Article 12 funding the repair of the Bridge Street (West Street) Bridge. The bridge is jointly owned by Millis and Medfield. MassDOT has agreed to pay for $500,000 if each town pays $350,000 (total $1.2 million for repairs)  
| • MassDOT is working on Route 109 bridge and is able to assist with the Bridge Street Bridge concurrently, if funds provided |
No source of funds was provided (it was not known if the project would be funded by cash, borrowing, etc), the Board of Selectmen may discuss funding at their next meeting.

Voted 8-1 to recommend approval of Article subject to Millis also providing their share

- Article 19 Sewer Betterments paid-in-advance was discussed. No dollar value was provided for the Article. Voted 8-1 to recommend approval

- Article 3 cemetery perpetual care was discussed. The differing amounts appear to be based on size of lots. Voted 9-0 to recommend approval.

- Joanna Hilvert provided an update regarding the Warrant Article to fund water meter replacements – this would be the first phase to purchase and install a “fixed network” and new Meter Transmitter Units (MXUs) for all meters. Next phases would replace actual water meters

List of all documents and exhibits used
- School Budget Presentation
- WC Questions on School Budget
- Proposed School Budget Summary Sheets

Other Business
- March 4th WC Meeting will be continued review of warrant articles
- March 19th is Warrant Committee Hearing date (must be held 30 days prior to Town Meeting)

- Kristine Triewieler noted that Departments have been requested to provide FY20 budget reductions. Most Departments have submitted, this information will be reviewed by Selectmen at their next meeting

- The Selectmen will likely propose the Building Stabilization Fund budget to increase by 2.5% for FY20

- There was a discussion regarding free cash and a repeated request for a five-year finance model of revenue and expenses (operating and capital)

Follow-ups

| Dates for Meetings Other than WC | n/a |

| Names of people participating remotely and why | n/a |

| Other | n/a |

Respectfully Submitted: Jeremy Marsette
Approved minutes to be sent to: ktrierweiler@medfield.net
Warrant Committee

FY 20 School Budget Questions

Responses by the Medfield School Committee
Jeffrey J. Marsden, Superintendent of Schools
Michael LaFrancesca, Director of Finance and Operations
Background Info for New WC Members

Jeff Marsden- Superintendent
- Year 6 in Medfield
- 7 years as Superintendent in Wrentham
- Former Teacher, Assistant Principal, Principal, and Director/Asst. Superintendent
- 3 years as Adjunct Professor at Boston College- Public School Finance and Facilities

Michael LaFrancesca- Director of Finance and Operations
- Year 5 in Medfield
- Putnam Investments
- Assistant Business Manager at Blue Hills Regional
- Assistant Superintendent for Finance in Dedham (2 new building projects with MSBA)
New in the Past Three Years…

• Completed our strategic plan, *Medfield 2021-Our Vision for the Future*
• Expanded elementary school day to 6.5 hours
  • Longer specialists times for students
  • Additional “before school” recess
• Moved from three tier bus routes to two tier bus routes
• Added Chromebooks for all Grade 11 students (Grade 12 previous year)
• Expanded Chromebooks to all levels K-12
• Implemented RISE program for Grades 9-12 and hired a Director of SEL
• Created a SEL Task Force of students, parents, teachers, and administrators
• Expanded counseling staff at all elementary schools
• Implemented new Homework Policy
• Hired Town/School Facilities Director
Recent Improvements Continued...

- Welcomed Franklin, our therapy dog to Wheelock
- Partnered with Beginning Years for onsite staff daycare at the HS
- Partnered with the Medfield Police Department to create an SRO
- Became a Challenge Success district (Blake and MHS)
- Restructured Special Education administrative support
- Collaborated with school groups for “Medfield Talks” speaker series
- Implemented numerous security upgrades
- Completed the new turf field and track project
- Completed new boiler project at Wheelock
- Accepted into MSBA program for a new Dale St. School and moved forward to feasibility study
Cost saving measures through collaboration with the town:

- Utilities
- Trash Removal
- Vendors (Electrical, HVAC, Plumbing, Security)
1. The Superintendent has been in possession of an initial draft of Selectman Murby’s “Lexington Model” budget plan; does he have a position on this and whether it or something similar, is workable?

   I have not spoken to Mr. Murby about the “Lexington Model”. It appears this model would necessitate the need for an override each year. If that is the case, it doesn't seem doable.
2. In general, what can be done in the near-term and over the longer term to slow down the large yearly increases in school budget requests?

Please define “large” (Former budgets were: 05-7%, 06-5%, 07-9%, 08-5.2%, 09-4.9%)

Reduce personnel

Increase fees or establish new fees

Accept a lower standard of education/Higher class sizes/Reduce programs for students
3. The Superintendent has spoken about items that the schools are expected to pay that other districts were covered by the Town side; can these items, along with this year’s request for those items, be identified?

- Water/Sewer Costs = $83,500.00 (with a large Enterprise surplus)
- Building Inspection Fees = $250.00
- Health Inspection Fees = $250.00
- Rent for Central Office = $12,500.00
- Medicaid Filing Fee = $5,500.00
- Total =$102,000
FY20 School Budget - Warrant Committee Questions

4. Is it possible to identify or segregate spending as mandatory (e.g., contractual or mandated by regulation) vs discretionary and therefore that which is controllable? Can this be done for the FY20 budget request for Warrant Committee review?

- Special Ed. Cost = $2,028,328.00
- ELL Cost = $30,500.00
- Payroll/Contracts = $29,967,600.00
- Utilities = $1,058,500.00
- Vendor Contracts = $2,838,376.00
- Total= $35,923,304 mandated
5. Please provide a list of teacher headcount changes over the last 5 years (or starting from whenever the headcount decline began). Where is the headcount now and where it is going?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>198.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>194.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>197.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>201.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>209.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Provide actual spending for each budget line (salary and expenses) for FY16, FY17, and FY18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By DESE Expense:</th>
<th>FY2016 Actual</th>
<th>FY2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY2018 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Professional Salaries</td>
<td>$20,792,925</td>
<td>$21,985,512</td>
<td>$23,464,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clerical Salaries</td>
<td>843,057</td>
<td>848,589</td>
<td>850,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other Salaries</td>
<td>2,712,949</td>
<td>2,855,648</td>
<td>3,052,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Services</td>
<td>2,055,745</td>
<td>2,184,380</td>
<td>2,158,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supplies</td>
<td>1,304,900</td>
<td>1,149,442</td>
<td>1,174,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other Expenses</td>
<td>1,106,732</td>
<td>1,173,215</td>
<td>1,079,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tuitions (net)</td>
<td>1,540,886</td>
<td>1,365,347</td>
<td>1,224,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                | $30,357,193   | $31,562,132   | $33,005,917   |
7. Provide organization charts and actual personnel headcount breakdown by function (FTE’s).
7. Provide organization charts and actual personnel headcount breakdown by function (FTE’s).
8. Provide an explanation for any staff salary/pay adjustments beyond step increases (if any).

- **Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)** - Contracts with Teachers, Custodians, Secretaries, Cafeteria Workers and soon Teaching Assistants
- **Teacher CBA-Steps/Lanes/% Increase/Longevity/Stipends/PD Reimbursement** - Pay structure in CBA. Step is a yearly increase on the salary grid. Lanes are an increase based on degree attainment. % Increase is the amount added to the base. Longevity based on years of service. Stipends additional salary paid for activities. Reimbursement for PD-Capped at $42,000 a year.
- **Non union** get a % increase
9. Provide an analysis of accounting (revenue, expenses, and balances) for all revolving funds and special revenue funds.

- State & Federal Grants $622,048
- Tuitions (Pre K, Kindergarten) $600,000
- School Lunch $700,000
- Athletics $350,000
- Undistributed Receipts $380,000
- Private Grants/Gifts $165,000
- Circuit Breaker $591,090

**Amount of FTE’s funded outside operational budget is 40.6**
10. What are the material changes in the current (2019-2022) teacher collective bargaining agreement compared to the prior CBA?

- Cost of living increase
- Three year stipend review/adjustment increase
- Half Sick Days/Half Personal Days
11. Actual expenses paid for non-personnel expenditures show a history of turnbacks (FY15 to FY18). With this data, it would seem that the overall budget for expenses would not need to increase by the amount requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13,904.74</td>
<td>$5,954.46</td>
<td>20,152.17</td>
<td>$28,190.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. The budget book forecasts an increase of 100 students in FY20 student enrollment. What is the basis for this forecast? The actual enrollment for FY19 is lower than all years back through FY10. How did last year’s forecast match with actual enrollment this year?

Each year NESDEC provides projections to the district. NESDEC projections are lower than the MSBA projections.

We’ve been consistent with our message of enrollment growth; it’s happening K-5.

NESDEC was off by 1 student K-5 in their projection for 18-19. (1151 vs. 1152)
13. The “FY20 benchmark” data is confusing as it appears to be based on prior a fiscal year budget (not including the operating budget override for FY19). Please provide actual fiscal year used in the peer town comparisons.

Both Clear.gov and DESE comparisons use data up to FY17. FY18 is still under review by the state and not published. We are currently in FY19 so it obviously can not be used in benchmarking yet.
14. Provide actual energy usage metrics (therms, kwhs, etc.) for FY16, FY17, FY18, and forecasted for FY19 and FY20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KWH</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2,883,631.17</td>
<td>546,181.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>2,919,170.52</td>
<td>589,680.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2017-2018</td>
<td>2,846,127.19</td>
<td>542,682.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 Request</td>
<td>2,882,976.29</td>
<td>615,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Warrant Committee asked us to move operating cost to revolving account for FY18 $62,157.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Therms</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>225,618.00</td>
<td>209,637.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>254,109.00</td>
<td>229,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>252,775.00</td>
<td>300,261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 Request</td>
<td>244,167.33</td>
<td>285,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Warrant Committee asked us to move operating cost to revolving account for FY17 & FY18 $79,917.96
15. Please provide an update on the special education transportation arrangement with ACCEPT; is the $190,000 increase for FY 20 finalized and what are your expectations/plans for future years’ special ed transportation arrangements? This is the final number which is less than the other two projections we received. This increase is for both in-district special education transportation and out of district transportation. We are exploring collaboration with other towns for future in-district special education transportation.
16. Please provide a breakdown for technology infrastructure expense budget request.

**Proposed Infrastructure Upgrades**

- Replace 35 Aerohive Access points (WIFI) which have reached EOL (End of Life) and are not longer being supported by the Manufacturer for upgrades or security patches. 
  Estimated cost of replacement $34,000

- Replace 20 iRover Projectors at Memorial School. The current iRover units are 8 years old and are failing constantly. 
  Estimated cost of replacement $36,000

- Replace 15 Epson Projectors at Blake Middle School and High School. We are currently refreshing approximately 15 projectors per year between both buildings. 
  Estimated cost of replacement $30,000
16. Please provide a breakdown for technology infrastructure expense budget request.

Proposed Computer Replacement

- Replace 150 classroom desktops with Chromeboxes. The current classroom desktops were purchased in 2010 and have reached EOL. Estimated cost of replacement $38,000

- Purchase 60 Ipads for incoming 6th grade students. Approximately 30% of incoming students avail of school owned devices. Estimated purchase cost $38,000

- Replace 80 chromebooks to cover devices which are unrepairable and to add to existing inventory of devices for students for daily use and MCAS testing. Estimated cost $19,000
16. Please provide a breakdown for technology infrastructure expense budget request.

**District Wide Security**

- Replacement of video storage server. The current server is 4 years old and is in operation 24 x 7. To prevent a catastrophic failure of the camera system responsible for the Middle School and High School this server should be replaced. Estimated cost of replacement $15,000

- Upgrade of PA system at High School to install speakers in rooms/locations which have been identified from previous building Security Drills as having gaps in coverage. Estimated cost of installation $10,000

Reduced by $30,000 from Public Hearing after evaluating security priorities.
17. Please provide an explanation (including headcount) for tuition to MA schools expense budget request vs. FY 19.

Five students from Medfield who attend approved special education schools that best fit the child's needs. These needs are dictated by the Individualized Educational Programs (IEP). The difference this year is because students transferred from more restricted private placements to Mass State Schools.
18. A question regarding marginal return for our education dollars.

a. **BACKGROUND:**
   - In FY 2010, our School Operating Budget was $26.0M, and our school population was 3020; in FY 2020, those same numbers are proposed to be $36.7M and 2658 students - that means gross operating cost per student has gone from $8,609 to $13,807, a 60% increase, or an AAGR of 6.0%
   - For eight years in a row, Massachusetts has let the nation in K-12 public education - we are consistently in the top 20 in Massachusetts

b. **QUESTION:**
   
   Given the preceding statements, does saturation occur, and do 6%/pupil marginal investments really yield true educational change
By any school rankings, MCAS scores, % attending college, admission to the Ivies, etc., we were excellent in 2008, and with no seeming changes in performance. Excellence cost us X/Student in FY 2008, and now, FY 2017, it costs us 1.5X/Student. Paying that much more for essentially the same product? BTW, the CPI is up only 12% from 2008-2016, so it might be 14% for this year - 3X the rate of inflation.

Let’s provide the budget context...school budget increase in 2007 was 9%, 2008 was 5.2%, and 2009 was 4.9% In terms of “the same product”...Not even close...

*Rankings in Boston Magazine, US News and World Report, Newsweek, are all up from 2008*

*AP scores were #1 in MA in 2015*

*MCAS scores are higher in Grades 3-10; especially at the elementary level and mathematics district wide*

*One of only 476 school districts nationwide chosen for “Best in Music Education 2016”*
“Marginal” return for our educational dollars?

Example:

Home purchased in 1995 for $350,000

Home Value today (according to Redfin and Zillow) $800,000

Return in 24 years = 128.57% (up 12% in the past year)
19. We are facing a Dale Street replacement - what are the total and annual costs of that capital and operating both, starting in when?

We are currently working on the schedule established by MSBA. We are about to enter the “feasibility study” phase. This will last about a year and we will have a better sense of the costs/timeline after the feasibility study phase.
20. Does the School Committee have a long term Budget plan, Capital and Operating? How will such a plan affect our longer-term collective bargaining?

Medfield 2021

Medfield 20 Year Facilities Plan
21. Please provide an analysis that compares the current custodial workforce model used in the school system and a partial or full outsourcing to an external contract service. Identify the costs and benefits under both models (or a partial, combination model, if appropriate) and the risks mitigated or assumed under both.

This has been answered at more than one meeting. The answer will not be different.
## PAYROLL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>$9,017,899</td>
<td>$8,816,655</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>$672,000</td>
<td>$654,475</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>$9,689,899</td>
<td>$9,471,130</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>$6,840,696</td>
<td>$6,588,396</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>$418,800</td>
<td>$400,300</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>$7,259,496</td>
<td>$6,988,696</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE STREET</td>
<td>$3,744,712</td>
<td>$3,661,907</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>$259,250</td>
<td>$255,500</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>$4,003,962</td>
<td>$3,917,407</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEELOCK</td>
<td>$3,841,782</td>
<td>$3,545,563</td>
<td>8.35%</td>
<td>$225,450</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>$4,067,232</td>
<td>$3,763,563</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMORIAL</td>
<td>$3,197,027</td>
<td>$2,932,586</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
<td>$252,500</td>
<td>$239,600</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>$3,449,527</td>
<td>$3,172,186</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SVS</td>
<td>$1,180,140</td>
<td>$1,138,237</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>$2,063,028</td>
<td>$1,770,632</td>
<td>16.51%</td>
<td>$3,243,168</td>
<td>$2,908,869</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT SVS</td>
<td>$1,251,703</td>
<td>$1,175,076</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>$2,134,576</td>
<td>$2,108,800</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>$3,386,279</td>
<td>$3,283,876</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY &amp; ADMIN</td>
<td>$764,341</td>
<td>$749,442</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>$795,500</td>
<td>$815,600</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td>$1,561,841</td>
<td>$1,565,042</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$3,196,184</td>
<td>$3,062,755</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>$4,995,104</td>
<td>$4,695,032</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>$8,191,288</td>
<td>$7,757,787</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$29,838,300</td>
<td>$28,607,862</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>$6,823,104</td>
<td>$6,462,907</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
<td>$36,661,404</td>
<td>$35,070,769</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPLANATION OF YEAR-OVER-YEAR PAYROLL INCREASE:

- **EXISTING STAFF TEACHERS**: $924,859
- **PARA-PROF'LS**: $121,995
- **OTHER STAFF**: $61,519

### EXPLANATION OF YEAR-OVER-YEAR -NONPAYROLL INCREASE:

- **TRANSPORTATION**: $190,000
- **SPECIAL ED GENERAL**: $24,376
- **SUPPLIES/SVS/OTHER EXPENSES**: $52,125

### TOTAL PAYROLL VARIANCE:

$1,220,438

### TOTAL NON-PAYROLL VARIANCE:

$360,197
1. The Superintendent has been in possession of an initial draft of Selectman Murby’s “Lexington Model” budget plan; does he have a position on this and whether it or something similar, is workable?

2. In general, what can be done in the near-term and over the longer term to slow down the large yearly increases in School budget requests?

3. The Superintendent has spoken about items that the schools are expected to pay that in other districts were covered by the Town side; can these items, along with this year’s request for those items, be identified?

4. Is it possible to identify or segregate spending as mandatory (eg., contractual or mandated by regulation) vs discretionary and therefore that which is controllable? Can this be done for the FY20 budget request for Warrant Committee review?

5. Please provide a list of teacher headcount changes over the last 5 years (or starting from whenever the headcount decline began). Where is the headcount now and where it is going?

6. Provide actual spending for each budget line (salary and expenses) for FY16, FY17, and FY18.

7. Provide organization charts and actual personnel head count breakdown by function (FTE’s).

8. Provide an explanation for any staff salary/pay adjustments beyond step increases (if any).

9. Provide an analysis of the accounting (revenue, expenses, and balances) for all revolving funds and special revenue funds.

10. What are the material changes in the current (2019-2022) teacher collective bargaining agreement compared to the prior CBA?

11. Actual expenses paid for non-personnel expenditures show a history of turnbacks (FY15 to FY18). With this data, it would seem that the overall budget for expenses would not need to increase by the amount requested.

12. The budget book forecasts an increase of 100 students in FY20 student enrollment. What is the basis for this forecast? The actual enrollment for FY19 is lower than all years back through FY10. How did last year’s forecast match with actual enrollment this year?

13. The “FY20 benchmark” data is confusing as it appears to be based on prior a fiscal year budget (not including the operating budget override for FY19). Please provide actual fiscal year used in the peer town comparisons.

14. Provide actual energy usage metrics (therms, kwhs, etc.) for FY16, FY17, FY18, and forecasted for FY19 and FY20. What measures are being taken to reduce energy use and to mitigate energy costs?

15. Please provide an update on the special education transportation arrangement with ACCEPT; is the $190,000 increase for FY20 finalized and what are your expectations/plans for future years’ special ed transportation arrangements?

16. Please provide a breakdown for technology infrastructure expense budget request.

17. Please provide an explanation (including headcount) for tuition to MA schools expense budget request vs FY19.
18. A question regarding marginal return for our education dollars.
   a. BACKGROUND:
      i. In FY2010, our School Operating Budget was $26.0M, and our school
         population was 3020; in FY2020, those same numbers are proposed to
         be $36.7M and 2658 students - that means gross operating cost per
         student has gone from $8609 to $13,807, a 60% increase, or an AAGR of
         6.0%.
      ii. For eight years in a row, Massachusetts has led the nation in K-12 public
          education - we are consistently in the top 20 in Massachusetts.
   b. QUESTION:
      i. Given the preceding statements, does saturation occur, and do 6%/pupil
         marginal investments really yield true educational change?

19. We are facing a Dale Street replacement - what are the total and annual costs of that,
capital and operating both, starting in when?

20. Does the School Committee have a long term Budget plan, Capital and Operating? How
will such a Plan affect our longer-term collective bargaining?

21. Please provide an analysis that compares the current custodial workforce model used in
the school system with a partial or full outsourcing to an external contract service.
Identify the costs and benefits under both models (or a partial, combination model, if
appropriate) and the risks mitigated or assumed under both.