

Introduction- Harry Zipse

Purpose - I have been communicating by email with Mr. Jurrens recently.

He has been very cooperative to answer any questions I sent him.

As the result of the recent communication, it has brought up two issues that I would like to discuss here tonight.

1. The two contracts that the board signed in April with FCMG.
2. Discuss the possibilities of a study on the present building site.

The 1<sup>st</sup> item- Recently Mr. Jurrens wrote an editorial in the NH paper, and was followed with another on the front page. I did like his enthusiasm to better NH and to work together. The contract "Owners Representatives" that he talked about in the paper, he indicated it was a "Limited Basis" contract . If that is true, that will make many "No Voters" happy, including myself! Also he indicated in the editorial that the board looked at signing a "Long -Term" contract with FCMG. It is presumed the two contracts that were signed in April last spring were the "Long Term" contracts. This is confusing, we just don't know what these terms mean. I'm not a lawyer but I have read both contracts several times.

These contracts are very very complicated.

Most contracts are made to protect the people that provide them.

As a friend and I do want to be a "friend" of all the board,

I suggested on Wed. Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> to Mr Jurrens it might be a good idea to have the school board attorney review the contracts and see if they can be terminated and or if the board has further liability if they pursue the project without them.

He advised me as part of the discussion in looking at future options, the board attorney will be reviewing the contracts.

With that I would like to hear from the board attorney.

The Second Item is based on "The Plan for a School Bond Election".

I have reviewed the plans on the internet and asked Mr Jurrens to send me a copy of Steps One and Two. I also asked if the school has a "Master Facilities Plan". The school does not have one. What I was looking for in steps one & two to see if the board had secured or hired an architect to make an unbiased, non-political study of the present uptown site. I think everyone is convinced that the 1913 bldg. needs to be torn down. But it seems unusual that the board did not hire a professional architect and have a feasibility study on the rest of the downtown site. I asked Mr Jurrens in an email and his reply and I'll quote him: "We did not do a formal study on those areas. Last year, I had an engineer come to look at the 1939 building as we had a floor crack and then a drop in the music room. I was concerned about safety. The engineer said there were no safety concerns with the structure of the building and it was a solid bldg. We did not look at the elementary wing to the south, but I would expect the same results. I've always said with the exception of the size of classrooms and thirteen different levels- all other concerns can be addressed with enough money. In other words, I do not believe there are any issues with the 1939 Bldg. to the west or the elementary to the South. When the engineer was here, I asked about taking down the 1913 bldg and leaving the other parts intact. On a quick once over it sounds like it is doable. One of the concerns is the boilers and utilities are located in that bldg." End of quote. The two concerns in the 1913 bldg are problems that engineers can probably solve. This bond issue had a lot to do with spending monies on all new facilities. I want to encourage the board before they do anything else, to hire a good local professional Architect and do feasibility study to see what options they would have after tearing the 1913 bldg down. Thank You Harry Zipse