	Application Feedback:
	I'm open minded and support whatever the committee prefers :) thanks for serving
	I fully support this application!
	I wish the complete application was available to view, the "attached Education Plan, as well as the most recent SOI submission" mentioned in the application was not available. As a nit picker, I noticed that "in earnest" was miSspelled as "in ernest". Is there a way to see the attachments? Thanks.
	My priority is to build a new school as quickly as possible, not an energy efficient school. While energy efficiency is important, it is also more expensive and takes longer to build and certify. Placing our children in a safe learning environment quickly should be the highest priority of the school committee. Dale currently doesn't meet many parents expectations for a safe learning environment. I would like to see continued plans that involve larger classrooms, outdoor space, and flexible spaces within the buildings. I would be open to exploring how additions/enhancements to memorial and wheelock could achieve the same goal. While I personally loved the campus feel the old plan provided- and voted yes- placing two schools together should not be prioritized over getting a passing vote. The mission of the school committee is to make student centered decisions that put our kids first. The committee failed to do that during the last design process, which caused a failed vote and our children not getting a new school. It is my hope the same mistakes will not be made during this process. Incorporating parent and community feedback should remain a top priority during this new design process. Please listen, pivot, and be open to change. We all need to work together.
	I believe that this application addresses the key needs from an educational perspective, as well as some common sense goals such as trying to design the building for uses beyond that (e. g., sports rental facilities).
	The School Committee's application is a good one. They have thoroughly and thoughtfully highlighted the valid and important aspects of the project. Our kids and our teachers deserve a new school NOW. We cannot afford another failed vote.
	This proposal is missing the most critical and fundamental requirement of a new school building: How many students is it expected to service? What grades is it intended to support? I believe that the student population is the single most important factor to determine cost and it is not mentioned at all. 1) How many actual students are expected to be in the building when it opens? 2) How much student capacity is to be added for growth or flexibility (estimates should include supporting data). Proposal has conflicting language about student population expectations. You reference near term residential construction (growth), possible future contraction, and cyclical fluctuations. What is missing is the Committee's best estimate of a student population projection and the data that supports this estimate. The goal of 'reconfiguring' the grade structure of our elementary schools' seems to be a subtle hidden agenda of the prior and proposed school project. I have put 4 children through the entire school system. I believe the grade structure (and associated transitions) were positive characteristics of our school system and something to be preserved. If the cost of the project is being increased/altered to accommodate 'revenue generating programs' and to serve as a 'community resource' then the proposal should identify those programs and the current/projected revenue estimates so that the community can determine the return on that investment and the cost/benefit tradeoffs. Private facilities in town might be better suited to invest their resources in these business opportunities. References in this proposal about the school project being a model for the town's long-term energy strategy and the management of long-term climate change are inappropriate. The School Committee seems to have its hands full just trying to get a school design/location that can get enough votes to be built. I suggest that you focus on the primary objectives of the school and the student population it is to serve. The SBC is a body that will have representatives from across town government - if non-education related requirements are to be added to the project (like energy policy) then the SBC should make design suggestions and defend them vs. alternatives. Hopefully best design practices will yield an efficient sustainable building at the most attractive cost. A proposal to kick off spending $40M - $80M taxpayer dollars should not lack the most basic details and requirements. This is particularly true when so much time and money was already spent on the failed proposal.

	I agree with the considerations highlighted by the Medfield School Committee in this application. I especially agree with the bullet points that specify a unified setting and flexible grade configuration. These are both areas of significant weakness in our current elementary school configuration and limit innovative programming. I believe in investing in our school buildings now to ensure a quality public school system into the future, especially since future housing development within the town is guaranteed by the state hospital plan. My elementary school children have both already experienced compromises in their Medfield elementary experience due to current conditions of overcrowded classrooms, aging building infrastructure, inadequate space for special programs like band, music and special education (especially at Dale Street) and stress due to the multiple campus transitions throughout their elementary years. I was wholly in support of the previous plan and would like to see it reconsidered since considerable research, time and expertise have already been spent on this town-wide need.
	As a mother of a 3.5 year old and a 3 month old I look forward to seeing proposals for combining different grade settings and a proposal to open up preK and Full day kindergarten to the entire town. I also look forward to a plan for more transparency so we do not run into the same fearmongering and false information being spread among the town.
	You need to understand why that last plan falled. You need to get buy in for location. Dale and Memorial are on the same campus. Do they meet your unified location need? If you just run through another Dale at Wheelock plan without buy in, you'll just waste another $1,000,000 on plans that go nowhere.
	The application seems very similar to last year's school request. Let's get away from trying to build at Wheelock again with the well issues, etc. Please explore keeping the Dale Street campus through renovation. We already have a great location for the school in an area of town that welcomes the building. It is close to Memorial for the campus flexibility you describe. There is extra room in the field behind the school. Keep Dale as a 2-year school, we don't need a giant building. My son loved going to a different location for school every few years; the transitions made him feel like he was always moving ahead.
	If Dale St is chosen as the location for a new or renovated school, under no circumstances should children be housed in modulars during construction. This is especially true when there is a perfectly adequate piece of land at Wheelock that would negate the need for modulars. Any construction, regardless of location, should limit the impact on existing students at affected schools.
	I agree with the considerations outlined by the school committee in the application and the proposal to examine grade structures. I also want to express that I am very supportive of a new school. But am less likely to vote in favor of a school proposal if it is not fiscally reasonable. I thought the last proposal was but I am highly skeptical of any path forward that does not include MSBA funding, which some suggest we pursue. If you were to edit the application, and I don't think you need to, I recommend you strengthen the section on the MSBA funding.
	I am writing to express my support for the School Committee's application for the construction of a new elementary school, and for the five main factors outlined as priorities for new school. Given my recent experiences with elementary school-aged children, I am in particular support of the goal of identifying a new school setting in which at least 2 elementary school can be unified.
	In the second bullet, it is implied that transitions between schools is a bad thing and one that needs to be "minimized". I consider school transitions to be an opportunity for our children to develop skills and resiliency for handling with change and resiliency as life and circumstances will throw countless chances at them as they grow up. We change class composition, teachers, rooms, and curricula each year. Why is the maximum 2 miles distance between elementary schools such a formidable transition challenge? Perhaps more to the point, the second bullet hints at the idea that adjacent grades must be housed at adjacent schools. Instead of a new Wheelock-sited school, an option is to place the 2nd and 3rd graders at the Dale site and 4th and 5th graders at Wheelock. PreK-3 colocated and 4-5 nearer to Blake 6-8. Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to provide feedback.
	I was for the new school in the last go-round, and still am. The Town needs a cohesive structure for the elementary grades, and a single building housing all of them will make grade transition easier, staffing easier, and provide the opportunity to have a modern structure for our children to learn in.
	Thank you for requesting feedback; I'd like to provide a few comments: 1) I find the sentence "While the project as proposed failed at the November 7, 2021 Special Town Meeting by a 4% margin..." misleading. The 11/7 meeting needed a 2/3 vote of the 1,901 attendees and only had 1,118 yes votes. That failed to pass by a greater percentage than 4%. The 4% margin must refer to the Special Town Election on November 15, 2021. 2) I'm afraid that bullet-point two will set this up for failure again; since a unified setting will force the school to only two sites (Dale and Wheelock). I'm weary that the space at Dale will meet the space requirements needed in bullet-points three and four. Thus, this will lead back to the Wheelock site, which I can not see passing. 3) I think you might want to reconsider bullet-points three and four. Those points are attempting to accomplish too much and will make a new school too big and expensive. Plus, some issues are being addressed by other new buildings (like the Bellforge Cultural Center). The new elementary school doesn't need to be a community resource or host things for other grades. I think the new school should focus on replacing the current school, not fixing all problems with others schools or the town infrastructure. 4) I strongly feel the best way to ensure a new school will pass is to focus on a school in the current location (maybe combining it with the Pfaff center).
	I think that Dale at Dale should be strongly considered. The location allows independence for walking uptown on half days. Wheelock site is not a good match with the town. And I think no matter the cost people still will not approve it at town meeting if your location remains at Wheelock.

	I am in full support of the priorities that you have put forth. Space to allow for enrollment flexibility is integral. There is continual new construction in town and the renovation of Medfield State Hospital is right around the corner. Some grades are already bursting with high enrollment. Consolidating resources and proximity of 2 schools will offer opportunities, ease of collaboration and transportation. Providing equal access to education for students on IEP's and 504 Plans also requires space for staff to make appropriate groupings and room for instruction in quiet, clean and well lit rooms. Properly implementing accommodations and modifications requires space. An energy efficient building will save money in the long term. Medfield doesn't have space for our youth to gather, especially teenagers. Winters are long. Courts and indoor space are severely restricted. This has a direct negative impact on social and emotional growth, as well as limits opportunities for connection and belonging. Space that can be accessible to the community, in addition to providing a revenue stream, should be well thought out and prompt, as there is no longer time to wait. The space and environment where learning takes place does make a difference. Any teaching and learning environment needs to be able to meet the needs of all teaching styles and learning needs. Supporting various modern day teaching techniques, including project based learning, group work, research and upgraded technology all require appropriate infrastructure. Thank you for working to increase opportunities for Medfield educators, students, and the greater community. Opportunities are severely limited right now due to aging buildings and lack of space. Investing in the future of our school system is a high priority.
	I have two small children and voted for the Wheelock proposal. I know that it wasn't perfect, but it was a solid plan with a timeline that a lot of our kids could benefit from. The main reasons that the Wheelock proposal failed, in my opinion, are cost and location. Many voters found the design to be overly extravagant on our dime. Another subset of voters felt that we did not take into account the importance of the school downtown, the drawbacks of Elm, and what to do with an empty Dale. With that said, I unfortunately don't think a cheaper version of the Wheelock proposal will pass. I think we need to go back to the drawing board entirely and get creative with our options. The number one factor for me is timeline. My kids could possibly benefit from a new school if we get our act together. I want us to be having conversations with each other, sharing our differing perspectives, being willing to listen, compromise and find some common ground. That's the only way we'll find a solution that the bulk can get behind. If we're not a town that can get buy-in for the cost of a brand new school, then what does that mean for all of our aging buildings? Will we be stuck in this same situation 10 to 15 years from now with Memorial and Wheelock at the end of their useful lives? If we decide as a town that we can only tolerate add/renos, then maybe it is worth exploring moving to a two-school configuration now. We add brand-new wings to Memorial and Wheelock to accommodate a grade each. Parks and Recs can work with the Dale space. Down the road, we look into renovations for Memorial and Wheelock. While I've been told that this could be more costly than expected, I would at least like to explore it. I understand that Memorial is currently configured to accommodate younger students, so if we were to add a wing to Memorial, initially we may need it to accommodate Pre-K thru 2 and Wheelock grades 3-5. However, perhaps the long-term plan with future renovations could allow us to move the older students downtown and younger students to Elm. I think it is important to consider all these options and have a long-term plan, especially considering how long it takes to get these projects done and the age of our buildings. Time is of the essence, and I look forward to us coming up with a solution that the town can get behind. Thank you.
	I was an ardent supporter of the previous project, and I appreciated that a new building on the Wheelock site was the least intrusive construction project for current students (of which I have 2). But it seems clear to me that to reach consensus, this new project MUST NOT be proposed at Wheelock. The neighborhood opposition, open space concerns and other issues (many I thought to be unfounded and some based on disinformation - which unfortunately is irrelevant) are enough to prevent a new project from getting approved. That's why I worry about the application language suggesting a "unified setting of at least two elementary schools." We have that now in Dale and Memorial. Obviously a renovation of Dale would preserve that - even if it doesn't provide the preferred grade alignment at one site. And it does make it sound, however unintentional, as if the School Committee and/or administration is trying to push the old project and build a new building at the Wheelock site. I strongly suggest removing that from the application. As an aside, after much thought - it might make the most sense to build a new 4/5 building on the site of the Pfaff Center and attempt to integrate the most-favored parts of Dale (the gym and columns) into the new building. This also preserves the open field between Dale and Memorial. I'd reconfigure Memorial into a 2/3 building for grade continuity (hopefully not requiring major work) and renovate Wheelock into a PK-1 early elementary center. This also preserves the ability of 4th and 5th graders to walk into town on half days.

	With the failure of last year's proposed school, I am disappointed to see much of the same requirements in this proposal. The way this is written, it sounds like we are headed straight back to elm street and doomed to fail again. Was there a request for input on what was important to the town as far as requirements? I may have missed something but I don't remember seeing any touch point asking for what is most important when considering a school. I appreciate all of the work in this situation that feels like a little bit of a lose-lose scenario - but the feedback I've most heard is a lack of input from the folks that ultimately need to vote to pass any proposal (town residents), and I fear we are headed right back in that direction.
	It's hard to understand due to the continued lack of transparency and community engagement on this specific project how/why we would be leveraging supposed data gleaned from the failed process. Had there been a comprehensive effort to learn from our collective mistakes, I might be more open to understanding how the first 2 bullets in the proposal are being brought forward to the new process. Without the work to understand what worked and didn't in a transparent manner, this appears to be another attempt to push thru a pre-determined agenda that may or may not be in the over all best interest of both the kids and the town I am ecstatic that my kids will get to stay in the smaller elementary environment while this is being sorted for future generations. There are many studies that point to smaller being better for the educational and emotional well being of our kids at elementary ages. Where is the healthy (transparent) debate on the merits of 800 kid elementary campus vs 2 - 400 kid elementary schools? Where is the research/data to back up the requirement that the larger combined experience is what is best for our kids social, emotional and academic well being?
	I understand the benefits of pooled resources, but I feel strongly that developmentally K-1 fits better with the 2-3 site than 4-5. If we move the younger kids, then Dale can stay at Dale, and we can still build in progressions so current students are not displaced until their new facilities are complete. K-3 by Wheelock and 4-5 at Dale also allows for the “up town” freedom for the 4-5 kids which many seem to cherish AND might also allow for an improved P&R facility (or shared facilities) at this same (currently Dale/Memorial) site. I know it’s a lot, but it honestly makes the most sense in terms of duel purpose, pooled resources, best use of resources overall or however you want to phrase it.
	I have read the letter and feel that this is another attempt to put Dale Street School at the Wheelock site. The town voted no! I feel that if this is your intent you are really going to cause so much conflict and unrest and anger in this town. People have spoken. I dont feel that you ignore that. It may be what you all want, but consider the residents.
	It’s my hope the new elementary school would be environmentally centered. I hope for a renovation of the current building as the thought of taking green space for the new school is so, so wrong.
	Desire, need is for new build/additions to portion of existing structure at the Dale Street site. It was clear from the override not passing that the site location was paramount for both the community connection and benefit of its location, ample cost savings, less detrimental to the environment, town traffic and overall citizen tax impact. Must include community in sharing information and feedback throughout the process.
	The prior plan failed because it didn’t reach two thirds majority - mainly attributed to the expense and the location. Two asks for the committee: 1) Nothing has happened for 10 months. Please move with increased haste so more Medfield children don’t have to attend the Dale Street school which most parents in town believe is an unsafe environment (asbestos, electrical issues, roof leaks, structural issues, etc). 2) The school will likely be more expensive now with interest and inflation - and the lack of MSBA funding if we want to move forward quickly at a smaller scale. This means people on a fixed income are unlikely to support it because they can’t afford that cost plus increased energy costs, water bills, etc. The utility isn’t there for them and that will make it incredibly difficult to get to the 2/3 majority. Please look at what Westwood did to pass their schools - joining a tax break for the elderly with their new school proposal to bring the two sides more into alignment and give us a shot at passing this school.
	The majority of the town wants to keep the school at the current Dale St. location. It is frustrating, passive aggressive, and a waste of time for all that you don’t look past your own personal preferences to just finally move forward with the town’s wishes. And you are risking another disaster of a vote like last time. Stop looking for loopholes and start working on a plan for a Dale St. school.
	I would like to see the current configuration of 2 school locations kept to better meet the needs of the whole community. the consolidation of services leaves sections of town without a public school within their district. That is the reason that towns, including Medfield ;have their elementary school system configured that way.
	Na
	Unified setting of two schools to minimize transition for the children as well as allow teachers to work in both places with minimal disruption or wasted time seems like a wonderful idea. That being said it also seems to be the biggest hurdle to clear for the school to be built at its current location. The transition from school to school may be difficult for some students but for the overwhelming majority it is a learning experience that will prepare them for adversity later in life. Don’t let perfection be the enemy of good. 4 out of the five “must haves” suggested by the school committee ain’t bad. The town wants the school. Don’t stand in the way.

	Can you focus on expenditures that will address the pandemic created educational gaps and delays in learning? STOP focusing on brick and mortar, when your own policies to mask, online learning and all the BS that delayed normalized learning when even the CDC stated they were clueless. Get your heads out of your asses and get our rankings better. A new building sure as hell won't do it.
	Keep Dale at Dale. Enrollment is declining. High taxes in this town and a looming recession will prohibit new families from adding to the school population in the future. There is plenty of land around the Dale Street School to expand if necessary. The quality of education should not be judged by the quality of the classroom or the building in which that education is taught.
	It appears this Proposal, chooses to ignore the will of the previous town votes. This isn't isn't surprising given that the previous effort ignored every warning that they were proposing the wrong school in the wrong location. Can the committee also focus on maintaining a school district that isn't dropping in the state rankings, like a rock?
	For many of us who have been here a long time the fear is that this expense will mean even higher taxes in a town where taxes have already forced many people to leave. We have to figure out a way to support education and young families in this town while allowing those of us who have raised our families here and had hoped to stay not to be saddled with expenses that we simply can not afford and ultimate forcing us out of our homes. Can you do that? (And for those with means to tell the rest of us it's only going to raise your taxes about a $1000 a year isn't comforting in the least.) How about a tax freeze/grandfather clause for anyone who's been here 20 years or more? How about we take care of the young people AND the older people in this town?
	Open to having multiple schools at same site, but the location should be at Dale St not Wheelock. Please explore this legitimately as there is clearly strong desire from the town to have this location.
	I feel very very strongly that Grades 4 and 5 remain close to the center of town. I support this statement 100%: Massachusetts School Building Authority statutes state, "To the extent feasible, the site selected shall be proximate to other facilities such as libraries, museums, parks, natural resources, nature study areas, and businesses, which would enhance the proposed educational program." When schools are located in close proximity to densely populated neighborhoods (such as those associated with town centers), students are more likely to walk and/or bike to school compared to students attending a school farther away.
	I have several concerns: 1. Need to base the need and feasibility of the two school alternatives on accurate, up-to-date, school-age population forecasts. I understand that the prior studies were based on old, out-dated population forecasts. Need to clearly present the forecasts, sources, and methodology in readable, publicly available documents. This must be based on very current assumptions which are much different that out-dated historical assumptions. 2. Need to estimate and explain the full environment impacts of the two choices. This must include ground-water; impacts on aquifers; impacts on wet-lands; air, water, and ground pollution, and total carbon dioxide emissions and absorptions including long-term effects of reduction in forests and open spaces for CO2 capture and sequestration. 3. Must show and clearly present the full costs of both alternatives and the impacts on individual household property taxes. Should include the costs of re-use of Dale School facility if it is abandoned as an educational facility. Need to put this in the context of other major capital intense projects that the Town is considering in order to understand how this will affect households budgets over the next 15-20 years. 4. Very concerned that Town is critically ignoring several very critical issues: (a) exceeding overall impacts on our infrastructure including highways, water resources, wastewater, electric power, and natural gas capacity. (b) chronic mistake of repetitively overbuilding new facilities such as Public Safety Building and Public Works Building. Thanks for considering my comments. Be glad to explain or present more details if it would be helpful. Gil Rodgers 617-792-0583
	What are the plans to provide the necessary resources (additional teachers/staff, materials, technologies to "populate" this new building? What will the costs be for this? I would like to see what programs and curriculum will be enhanced and/or developed to improve the quality of education. The application includes references to " revenue generating programs", "contraction of schoool age population", etc. I would like to see more detail on these.
	My kids are out of the school system now but I 100% support the building of a new school. My biggest concern is the impact a new school built on any open space will have on the town's resources, especially water. The Climate Emergency is real and will only get worse in years to come. Experts can say that "probably everything will be fine" but we can't be assured 100%. Nothing can be. We need to find a way to utilize existing structures or modify them to fit new grade configurations. I would rather pay higher taxes and utilize existing buildings that tear up any piece of land!

	An opportunity not addressed in the school application is the long-overdue construction of a new facility for the town's Parks and Recreation Department. By using the footprint of the existing Pfaff Center as the core of the new building, which would be contiguous with and make use of the amenities of a new Dale Street School, the town can have a first-class, multi-purpose facility that does not require replicating expensive spaces (e.g., gymnasiums) at two sites. A further thought is that School Building Committee should not wed itself to re-entering the MSBA program. Throughout the 2020-2021 campaign, the SBC justified the high cost of the new elementary school in large part by the need to meet MSBA's strict, non-negotiable requirements as to provision for enrollment growth, physical classroom size, etc. (MSBA apparently would also not permit a contiguous P&R facility as described in the first paragraph). By 'going it alone', the SBC can seek to build a more economical facility that still meets all educational requirements. Finally, the SBC should keep foremost in its planning that the structure it is charged with building is one in a town of 12,000 people that has no meaningful commercial or industrial tax base to defray the cost being borne by residents. To compare Medfield with Westwood or Needham (as was done in the last campaign) is to ask residents to overlook those two town's diversified tax base.
	Thank you to the committee for all of their time and effort on behalf of the community. Given the community wide vote, environmental issues related to water (natural resource at Wheelock), and traffic issues it seems most prudent to spend the time and tax payer dollars to develop a plan to renovate Dale to suit community school needs.
	I want to support the current school application made by the SC and add one observation that I haven't heard mentioined. The Dale building has an extraordinary resource in its gym/auditorium. That space has outstanding acoustics and should be preserved for the music program. Also, I know much weight has been given to "minimizing transtions" for elementary students, but as a child and adolescent psychologist, I think transitions are growth-producing in children, especially in manageable doses. And I question whether changing buildings across campus really minimizes the transtion. The big change is the new building and the new classroom.
	I applaud the school committee on this well-thought-out plan. I believe that in order to really prepare Medfield schools for the future, we need to have a learning space that is flexible - this would allow for fluctuations in class size over the years. One thing that kept coming up from the folks against the Elm Street location last time was that the new school was "too big" - I believe the opposite is true. Having extra space would allow for the years when we have larger-than-average class sizes. Extra space could allow more kids to be learning in person during the next global pandemic. Extra space would allow for flex space to be used for the next school renovation project down the line. I would also like to see a campus-type environment. This would allow for more resource-sharing among schools - both in things like books, technology, etc and in staff. I still firmly believe that the Elm Street location was a great option for what we need going forward. I do not see the Dale Street location as offering enough space to really get all that we need without losing a lot of the field between Dale and Memorial and even then where would people park?
	To our School Committee I attended the 8/30 BOS meeting in person. Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts. I am in agreement with some of the opinions expressed that evening: I would be in favor of undertaking this building project as a town to eliminate MSBA support/control and moving the needed building forward in a timely fashion. The "unified setting" requirement must not preclude consideration of the current Dale school site. In my experience as a Medfield elementary educator, the students transitioned smoothly between buildings. Keeping in mind cost and the projected school population through 2030 we should not be planning a larger building with the intent to "serve the community outside of the typical school day." Our priority needs to be building a space to continue to provide the quality of education for which we have been so well known. I am looking forward to a new beginning of cooperative effort among our town leaders. Most sincerely, Kathy Belmont
	If the object is to re-configure grades at two different schools then why wouldn't the objective is to do it at Dale and Memorial? The project would have one job site, materials, machines, supervision, work crew; etc all on the same Campus. This would save money and time, and the efficiency of the project would be less disruptive to the environment. Also, I do not want to provide space to citizens of the town or rent out any of our school facilities. We have a huge DPW building that has empty rooms that town organizations could utilize, can we not try to keep the cost of the additions low and not add any extra space increases the cost? I am an educator and work with schools across the State, the research that I did state that: Massachusetts's average primary school enrollment is 398. Let us keep in mind that the smaller the school produces the most desired benefit.
	I would like to see our schools renovated, I am against a new campus.
	Voting for a new school has already been defeated twice. Why are we going through this again?
	Seems very high level. It mentions an attached education plan, but there is no link. Where can I find that plan?
	In order to provide a more accurately plan for taxpayers and provide for an additional layer of fiscal oversight by trusted community members, I would feel more comfortable if the town-wide plan that gets so much community involvement include school buildings. I think the size of a school should be able to support a full time Art and Music teacher but no bigger. I feel strongly that the site should remain in the Dale/Memorial location due to known problems associated with a Wheelock consolidation, and walking/biking proximity to downtown, neighborhoods and newly constructed housing. The town watershed needs to be protected, not burdened with unnecessary construction and use.

	My family wants to see the dale street school remain in it's downtown location. It was a major factor in the purchase of our home that our children could walk to and from school. We believe the connection / expansion of memorial street school and relocation of the parks and rec building provide ample opportunity for a downtown elementary campus. Having an elementary school campus located next to the public safety building keeps our children close to police, fire, and ems in the event of any form of emergency, provides walkability, and is in line with environmental sustainability goals. It additionally meets the goal of co-joining multiple elementary buildings for shared resources. We will not vote in favor of taking dale street school out of downtown Medfield under any circumstances.
	I hope the new plans will revolve around rebuilding the Dale Street school at its present location, even if it means using a portion of the field adjacent to it as building space.
	I was sure that the community had already answered the question about a "unified campus" for the two elementary schools and the answer was no. If it was a 4% margin (I don't recall that it was that close) it was still a no. We want to keep the Dale St school at Dale St. Let's follow the will of the voters and look closer at improving the property for continued use.
	We do NOT need to have all elementaryl grades in one building. I want the new construction to be at the Dale St. School.
	I commend the work you all are doing. I feel strongly that rebuilding Dale at the current location is preferred.We can have Dale and Memorial on the same campus. It keeps the school close to our low income housing and the downtown merchants. It won't risk harm to our shallow well by toxic spills, fertilizers, pesticides, etc. It won't hurt the Elm St neighborhood. We desperately need a replacement and I appreciate your efforts to expedite the process. Thank you.
	One of the greatest failings of the last project was the fact that the MSBA steamrolled us into a school which was much to large and overpriced for the tax base that we have in town. When you look. the same school was proposed and succeeded in Westwood for $400 tax increase a year on an average home. Our increase was almost $1000 mitigated down to ~$850 for the average home because the length of the loan was increased. MSBA was a large contributing factor to that. We can't go back down the same road again. The MSBA has stringent "rules" and a philosophy in place which in my opinion is predatory towards residential based towns. Do this or "don't" get the funding. Somehow they have a model which "fits" all 300+ communities in the Commonwealth. I find that hard to believe when tax bases and populations differ wildly across the state. Location and price were the top two driving forces behind why this failed last time around. If they aren't addresses in a meaningful way we run the risk of pitting the town against each other again. Other issues after the process was completed about the level of transparency and honesty about thing like traffic mitigation and even the cost of other projects being affected by the school process came to light. That should not happen again. I believe that going into the MSBA process again BEFORE we have an idea about what we might want to build and what our options are without using the MSBA or even knowing if the MSBA offers new flexibility or a new outlook on school building is irresponsible. I think we should have the MSBA be represented at a Select board or SC or joint meeting to get the temperature of the organization before reapplying to a process which had a great negative influence on our town. Have them address our concerns before going back into a process we might want to withdraw from and have a second failure which would have a very bad look for the future. Will they even participate if we propose additions to two existing schools?
	I strongly support a renovation/addition to the Dale Street School ON Dale Street. The current neighborhood is an excellent location for renovation/addition. Surely some talented architects can use the setting to create a renovation/addition. Look what some creative minds built at the Natick Public Library. The interior of the Dale Street School's auditorium is a classic. Please save the Dale Street School on Dale Street.
	Please to not dismiss a renovation of Dale Street. Dale Street provided the "campus" the school committee discussed with two schools in close proximity: Dale and Memorial. Dale is established in a neighborhood that likes the school there. Moreover please do not dismiss the opinions of the majority of voters who prefer the Dale location. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback about the application.
	Yes
	Yes

	I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the application and recommendations for the Select Committee and am overall supportive.two pieces of feedback: (1) I don't know if it's part of the role of this committee, but was hoping to see a recommendation about the composition of the new SBC (eg ensuring there was adequate representation across dimensions such as male/female, minority, etc as well as specific skills). (2) Additionally, calling out explicitly a recommendation who the committee should make sure to take input from would go a long way to removing the past concerns that not everyone's voice was heard. For example, calling out that there should be adequate input from teachers, past students, those in various parts of town (in town, outer edges of town); those who are newer to town or with young children, etc. While I believe the committee in the past explicitly did take this feedback into account, the fact that some in town felt their voices weren't being heard means taking extra effort to call that out as a specific goal from the start is important.
	Renovate Dale Street. There is no need to build a whole new school.
	Dale at Dale sums it up.
	Thanks for your hard work on this. I read the application and also watched the meeting with the BOS. I am in agreement mostly w/ Ms. Murphy and Mr. Murby that I'd really like to see the SC determine their preferred grade configuration PRIOR to the start of the project and prior to signing off on the application and starting the new process. I think the community has strong feelings about this and about the potential size of the new school(s) and it would be a mistake to not have this out in the open and not take the feedback from the community about what they want to see (which may not align with what the school committtee thinks is the best plan).
	I believe the document is too general/high level to be called a "proposal". It is rather an inventory of ideas and assertions. Last year's failed plan was fiscally irresponsible and poorly sited. We should not allow potential partial funding from the MSBA to drive us to a total budget that is unrealistic given the state of the economy. However, I don't see any recognition of these factors in the "proposal". Such recognition would be a positive sign that we are truly heading in a new and positive direction that folks can get behind. If the town can avoid the third rail of the old proposal we may indeed be able to move ahead with confidence. I suggest we need more detail. Thank you
	Cost, speed to completion and flexibility in the future are my key concerns. Location does not matter and I am not wedded to Dale or the Dale location. I would be happy if the school were demolished and turned into a park as part of the project. If Dale is not the sight of the new school, a clear estimate of the cost to repurpose or demolish it must be presented as part of the proposal. One of the other elephants in the room beside the deplorable condition of Dale, is the condition of Wheelock. Wheelock will need to be replaced or renovated in the near future. Neither Dale or Wheelock have potable water and lead pipe issues. Whatever the location, the project needs to be a replacement or renovation of both Wheelock and Dale. It could be in either location or perhaps some other location. Also, the level of misinformation if not outright lies by Dale at Dale need to be addressed head on and the SBC and building committees must be providing ongoing information to ensure that the town has actual verifiable information. As part of the education process, we should be very clear that if we move to a consolidation plan that addresses both Dale and Wheelock that the overall cost of such a plan is likely to be more than the rejected Dale at Wheelock plan but overall benefit the town by being more cost effective in the long run.
	To every member of the School Committee: FAIL. This "application" is a sheer waste of time, much like the several years wasted in which you did not produce a viable school plan for our town while propping up a failed superintendent and trying to implement his tone-deaf plans that the town does not want. The town does not want a campus. The town does not want an overbuilt monstrosity at Wheelock. The town is not interested in pursuing Jeff Marsden's shiny new resume bullet. This document is positioning an attempted run at the same project that failed which clearly shows that you have not paid any attention to the town's referendum against expansion at the Wheelock site as shown AT EVERY POSSIBLE TURN DURING THE PAST FAILED EFFORT. You will shortly face a recall effort against this entire committee and to remove the failed Superintendent should you try to propose another attempt at Wheelock, any attempt at a campus, or ANYTHING BESIDES THE REPLACEMENT OF THE DALE STREET SCHOOL WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT YOU HAVE AVOIDED DOING SINCE YOU WERE CHARGED WITH THAT SPECIFIC EFFORT IN 2018. Please stop disgracing our town with your feeble attempt to pander to the uselessness of Marsden and his idiocy; you are embarrassing yourselves and going against the repeatedly expressed wishes of the town which you have repeatedly chosen to ignore. Despite the exhortations of two-thirds of the Select Board to do your job, you still refuse. Despite your commitment to find out what happened last time (which was YOUR commitment and entirely unnecessary to anyone who paid even a minimal amount of attention to your failure; it was clear to everyone in town what happened, you put forth a failed project because you refused to solicit input from the town's voters and refused to listen to that input when it was provided to you anyway) you are going to try to do the same thing again, attempt the same project, and meet the same failure you met last time. Stop wasting our time, don't force a recall effort, and please all resign at the September 12 meeting rather than waste even one more moment of our time. We need a school and won't get one with any of you people driving the bus. The arrogance and ignorance out of this group seems to be boundless and endless and it's time for that to end. Yours in complete disgust and frustration, George P. Gallagher

	Please learn from the last efforts and focus on the school that has the best chance of getting a 2/3rds vote. The keys: 1) Done in a smart way, add/renovation is cheaper-- simply go to the MSBA site and look at the difference in cost for new construction versus add/reno--they are cheaper. Also, at a recent MSBA meeting,' MSBA encouraged towns to think of renovation if possible given the lower costs and reuse saving the environment It is critical for the town to see a real proposal for the Dale campus using add/reno as the model, keeping the open field and using smaller/more realistic numbers for enrollment (see #2). 2) With enrollment dropping again according to the newest data, there is capacity in the district if the administration re-thinks grade configuration including middle school and high school. Commission an objective population and enrollment analysis projection. Birth rates are down and they continue a long-term trend projecting a smaller student population. Be honest, admit it and plan for real objective numbers so we build a reasonably sized building. 3) The voters didn't want the project done at Wheelock. It wasn't just the cost, it was all the concerns raised about open space, pressure on water resources, being too far away from down town, traffic (which was validated in last year's traffic analysis that was not released to the public before the vote) and the campus being too large/having 700 to 800 students in one place. The SBC and School Committee refused to listen to this feedback and, still to this day, the SC still doesn't recognize this being the reality. 4) Provide balanced information to the public using credible sources as soon as possible to to ensure the 3 or 4 most critical issues are truly vetted and discussed before final decisions are made.

	Medfield's 3 separate elementary schools is dated, ineffective and costly to our town. Consider adding on to Memorial and cutting the duplicate administrative costs. Perhaps the Dale building could be used as adult education, esl, shop, hands on. Would be a nice revenue source for our town/schools. Jessica brought up a great point when there some grades have higher needs for classroom space by the number of students. But also consider that our schools do not have enough space for special education classrooms. Medfield needs to accept neurodiversity, make programs and space for children who learn differently. Classrooms that run the gammit of sub separate partial inclusion is needed. Looking at the special Ed classrooms now and understanding children who have high behavior needs need not be lumped in a one class fits all. Medfield 2 highest disability categories are autism and learning disabilities. Lumping all sped kids behavioral or not to one classroom is ancient thinking. None of our "competitive" towns do this. If we are rethinking elementary school structure leaving room for influx in students we must also leave space for different disability needs. The space proposed for special education in the prior proposal was not consistent with the need of our town. Nor was a space for esl students in this vision. The laws around construction to accommodate these students are quite clear. As the prior plan showed plans for Children of special needs a with a mall sized classrooms outcasted from other students it will not fly. Before constructing a school and allocating spaces I encourage the committee to consult the laws with respect to disabilities with construction. The Smaller classrooms shoved aside away from the general education isn't leagle and is dated thinking. Inclusion of diversity of race, gender identity, color, ethnicity, language and disability is forward and future thinking. Our schools like our competitor towns should allot space to accommodate greater diversity. Leave room for esl, different disabilities and differnt incision models as well as influx in class size. Construction of a school that is set up for inclusion of all students that has the space for all diversity of student needs is the best way forward. We also need leadership and culture that does not quash special education students through allowing a culture of under servicing, attitude these children are not worth equal education. Medfield by far has the highest budget for leagal services and uses it. ($ 100kannual Uses 30-60k annually) Westwood for example budgets 15,000 annual and uses 9-16k). Medfield families with students with disabilities are leaving the distict nearly 3 times the rate as families without disabilities. (DESE churn data). In our town the frequency of use of the state bsea (hearings, mediation, facilitated IEP meetings) than our competitor town combined. (Data from bsea). Why is the IDEA funds meant for students with disabilities not being used for programs for these students but being used for example school security, music, band and gym? (Medfield's submitted budget to dese) How can Medfield be a high ranked town if this protected class is being undercut to a point families, our neighbors leave town. Our neighbors who have disabled children have to spend thousands of dollars to get evidenced based instruction. As Dr Marsden stated there is "boutique" education all around Medfield. Medfield school distict and responsibility to public education should not expect that all parents have the means, time and resources to outsource what is meant for public education. The education all of our tax dollars pays for. The idea that student with disabilities means low MCAS scores is ridiculous and is a baseless thought process. Quality programs focusing on education in a different way allow most of these children to achieve the same or greater MCAS scores. The subtle message here is if your child has a disability in Medfield you are going to spend much more than your taxes to get your child the education they are lawfully entitled to. Make room for the students, all students. Plan to have rooms for uptick and disability, esl needs. The 3Million dollars spent annually from our town in out of distict placements could be cut down as could the leagal expenses. The funds spent here could be used to make high quality programs that our tax paying residents expect and apply the programs and services equitably based on the needs of the students and not based on hatred of a family or applying more services to favorites. Not all students with equitable disabilities test scores in our town receive the same or equitable services. Gender, family income, as well as if your family has influence of school resources grant or funds are major reasons for disproportionate resources. We can not hang on to cultural oppression of disabilities and bias of esl class space when planning the future building, planning insufficient classroom space for students with disabilities is not appropriate or leagal. This building our school distinct should be for every child in Medfield. Stop the farming out programs and Make room for all neuro diverse children without creating adversarial and high financial costs to families for what should be free education. The culture of outcasting and bias of disabled children will not change with the current administration. Don't allow this bias to shape the future or our new school. The building belongs to our town, our citizens, our tax payers and your constituents. Embracing diversity of all kinds is the future the building needs to have room for all. This is your responsibility. Thank you. Judy Brasier
	I am not sure how an MSBA application should be written or what it should focus on but since we, the Town of Medfield residents, did vote against the prior plan for the expansion at the Elm Street location for many reasons (location in water resource area, expansion into open space (not environmentally friendly), and cost of project), I would think that these reasons would come into consideration for this next application. I also felt that the Town voted to see greater consideration for the re-use/renovation of the Dale Street campus, as using an existing space/school building is much more climate friendly, and this location is also not near a water resource. Renovations of existing building should be less costly as well.
	A new elementary school is long overdue. It feels like it's been 10 months with no real progress. Let's move forward! Maybe my 1 year old twins can attend the new school?

	Without having a plan for strategically analyzing PreK-12 school facility use, scheduling, and other factors over the long term, this application falls severely short. Parents move to Medfield for the private school feel in a public school setting -- and that just doesn't mean small class sizes, but it also means small schools where children get to know each other and their teachers, and they don't get lost in the shuffle. And, teacher morale doesn't suffer as it does in a mega school. If you truly care about easing transitions, you'd put more focus on how an overly large elementary school (500+ students) causes anxiety and transition issues EACH and EVERY DAY as the mass of kids shuffle off their buses and to classrooms, and does the reverse in the afternoon. Moving from classrooms to lunch and recess will be a daily stressor, and going to gym and other specials will also require navigating a sea of kids multiple times a week. Why in the world would Medfield even think about this option when we have the perfect-sized elementary schools right now? And, with a grade 4-5 in the downtown area, which is fantastic for that particular development age and will help with the middle school transition. Sure, if we drop down to 200 at Memorial, Wheelock and Dale, consolidation makes sense, but the projections don't show that to be the case. A claim of financial savings is a false narrative because we'll end up paying in other ways, and worse, the students will end up paying. There was not one parent during the last strategic planning focus groups that I attended (3 in total) or on superintendent advisory councils, site councils or on the elementary school day committee, who said they wanted their young child in a large elementary school, or that environment was good for kids. NOT ONE. This viewpoint has been consistent for decades. This desire for a campus model with oversized consolidated elementary schools is absolutely not educationally or social-emotionally sound, and there's an abundance of data to back it up. Medfield ratings aren't dropping because of school size or old facilities -- they're dropping because we have a school committee that has pushed its own agenda, and the agenda of the superintendent on the community without debate, dialogue, and most importantly, the data to back up decision-making. A shiny new building won't solve Medfield's district problems -- it'll only make them worse. Consolidation, of course, sure helps with control -- if I were a teacher, I'd be very, very concerned about that prospect.
	I won’t vote for a school at wheelock.
	Hopeful that the committee will look with an open mind at why voters did not approve the new building of Dale st school on Elm St. 10 years ago we thought Dale street school was well past the need to be remodeled, despite the knowledge that this indeed will be expensive (any place you put the school) it is necessary. However, we do not support moving the school and changing the landscape of elm street. Not only are you changing land use, neighborhoods, and traffic you are changing the small town charm and feeling of community - which is why we chose Medfield 16+ years ago. When our children started here it was evident that the town spent time and effort on teachers and education and not so much on infrastructure - so many years later most all of the top performing teachers left or retired and a system of behaviorism was adopted, special needs spending per pupil was much lower than sister towns and so was teacher pay. Fast forward - here we are. It would also be helpful for us to see you engage with the town committees like the folks working on future planning. Lastly, we felt that when the proposal was given (over zoom) and showed the ideas for Dale at Dale st plan vs. a new elm st plan - it was loud and clear poor directions were given to the architects. Even if it was not spoken out loud, any architect given more space and a blank/open space will of course make that site more appealing. It would have been great to see a proposal that the architect didn't have a "choice" and creatively met the town's needs. (followed by the request for a plan at Elm) there would have been a big difference in the outcome. we are not opposed to the demolition of Dale st. if the new school remains on Dale st.
	Thank you for giving people the time to share feedback. I am concerned that the preference to consolidate the elementary schools is a bit premature and would create a too large elementary school beyond a size that is educationally sound. Enrollment has not dropped below 200 per school and think we should hold off on making that recommendation until that drop happens. Also, I think we should recommend a third-party consultant to look at how space is currently used across the district. I think we need to see how space is currently used on a day-to-day basis before we make recommendations.
	Please, in the interests of traffic and water supply, build on the existing Dale site.
	I was wondering if any investigation or other work was put into determining the reason(s) for the prior failed vote. The application doesn't appear to address that issue and what steps, if any, may be taken to avoid another failed vote.
	Looking forward to hearing the positive, and forward, momentum to address significant needs for the kids and teachers/admin at Dale. I appreciate the information shared and hope that the “Dale at Dale” side can be true to their promise of working hard to offer another solution to the one they voted down. Deciding to move to Medfield was largely based on the school system for our three kids and my husband and I were very surprised to learn of how run down the campus at Dale is. We were even more surprised to see the results of the vote after spending hours at the Special Town meeting waiting to be able to cast it. Very curious to hear specific feedback on the new plans with concrete timelines included. Thanks!

	The School Committee's recommendation of a unified setting of two elementary schools. ignores the fact that the previous plan, based upon such a configuration at Elm Street, was rejected by the Town's residents. Has the Committee made a thorough analysis of the reasons that the previous plan failed? If so, then what were the results and will they be shared with the Town? The current recommendation is another example of "old wine in a new bottle" and it doesn't seem to reflect any broad Town consensus or involvement.
	The cost of a new school was never a concern for me and had zero impact on my vote. I want the school to remain on Dale Street. I believe its current location benefits the town, the students, the neighborhood, and the community. I will not vote for any scenario that leaves the Dale Street building vacant or a to be determined future use. I like when towns keep the character of their past when looking to build. I would like to see Dale Street's facade receive a face-lift while keeping the architecture intact. The remainder of the building can be as modern as the people want. I think of how town centers like Concord & Lexington have done a nice job of maintaining the historic aesthetic while meeting current needs.
	The application for the construction of a new elementary school or the renovation of the Dale Street school will establish the vision and the overarching design goals for the new project. These design goals will undoubtedly inform the next steps of the process and should therefore be free of controversy, be broad, and be universally accepted, so that the community does not have to reverse course at a later point when it turns out that certain aspects of the vision do not hold up to close scrutiny. With this in mind, I have three concerns with the proposal in its current form that should be addressed before the Select Board signs the application. First, the 2nd bullet should be struck in its entirety. It seems to be intended to elevate a certain project outcome while eliminating others from consideration without due process. The argument of reduced transition times and enhanced staff collaboration is not new and was circulated in support of the Elm Street campus location before the 2021 vote. While this argument may have merit at the individual level in isolated cases, it is subjective, based on conjecture, and should not be allowed as one of our top 5 design goals that we codify through the application process. Second, while the 5th bullet establishes the vision of building a model sustainable school, the language in the application makes sustainability a goal of the building design only. I believe that a school built on the periphery of the community that most people can only reach by car cannot be a model of sustainability. Over time, a bad location will erase any energy savings achieved through the building design. I therefore urge the School Committee to expand the scope of sustainability to the project in its entirety and not limit it to the building. The language should be clear about this. Third, the new school will be built by the community, for the community. Community objectives must be part of the vision. I believe that preserving and enhancing Medfield's vibrant downtown area, keeping it an attractive location for businesses, supporting and improving Medfield's standing as a walkable and bikeable community, are all design aspects that are worthy of being among the top 5 priorities. Community goals should be added to the proposal to reflect the fact that a new school is not an internal project by the school administration but will be an important piece of the fabric that makes Medfield an attractive place to live for residents of all ages.
	I believe the location of the Dale Street school is ideal. It offers many students the opportunity to walk or ride a bike to and from school. The students can also access Medfield's downtown area, including the library. This location enables students to socialize outside of school, and gives them the opportunity to grow more independent. It is a healthy choice.
	Thank you for once again trying to get this much needed project back in action. I strongly believe it would benefit our kids, teachers and community to combine two of our elementary schools. Not only could we make better use of space, staff, resources, and new technologies, but having kids remain in one space for a longer period of time would be a huge benefit to their growth. Less changeover during these formative years, especially for those students requiring interventions and services, would be better for all (in most cases). Again, thank you for your efforts to give our town and kids a much-needed new school. I'm hopeful the majority sees the need and understands the urgency.
	It is clear the residents in the Elm St area do not want the school in that area. Enrollment is dropping and that should be considered. Redo the Dale St School. The children enjoy going uptown on half days. In today's economy, concern of cost important. For the school committee to regain respect they must be transparent and respect the wishes of the community that have stated no school at Elm.
	Thank you all for all the time you're investing in this project. It must be a full time job. My comments will be brief and based on my opinion, so take it for what it's worth. I think Dale needs to be kept downtown, for the simple fact that we need to enable Dale students to continue to learn critical independence, safety and planning skills by accessing our downtown area. If Dale moves up to Wheelock, the distance, while not insurmountable, will most certainly serve as a barrier for students to going downtown. That learning opportunity will be entirely gone. My only other thought is that I would love to see more of a concerted effort put into considering a reno of the current Dale property. I may have become aware of the project late in the game, but I never was able to dig up any actual plan or discussion of serious consideration of a reno project for the current site. I would much rather update what currently exists (if feasible) than build a brand new, oversized, sparkly new building. I am completely onboard with the plan to incorporate more community use of the building, as well as a focus on sustainability... and with all of the water-related discussion of the Wheelock site, I never got the sense that building up there was beneficial to the town's existing water issues, either. Thank you again for everything you are doing in this effort.
	I support
	The schools need a unified campus. Let's move ahead so that we can best serve our children. WE NEED A BRAND NEW, spacious school.

	My family and I agree that the importance of flexibility within the space for grades is of highest importance. One of our children went from 25 children in a classroom due to space constraints in Memorial School, to 22-23 children at Wheelock School, only to then have 25 again at Dale St. Each teacher who had classes with children over 22 children have voiced concern to me as a parent about not being able to reach those that slide under the radar. I have a child who is exactly the product of that - so it does happen more than anyone would like to think. I would guess the best way to do this is create a campus environment, allowing for more flexibility of classroom need. Although I am open to other ideas as long as this challenge is addressed. I cannot imagine anyone who has a child in the system has not felt anxiety every 2 years as their child jumps across the town. Not to mention the average sibling is 1-3 yrs in between the next, so as a parent we are running across town in the middle of pickup - cursing why the school system was built this way. The entire setup has always been mind boggling to me. I understand it happened, Medfield has piecemealed it all together as the town grew. I know there seems to be a very big feeling of rejecting change throughout this town. It is felt in many organizations. But this is the time for us to correct one the issues that plague this town. It is simple - how do we best share resources, keep costs down because of our low tax support, all while preparing for an unknown future of class sizes - build a campus. Or reconfigure the current schools and create a campus in the middle of town with large buildings that the poor neighborhood of Adams St gets to look at for life. Either way - a campus is the way to build our future. Medfield residents and their young families deserve more than the old system “was just fine” for the prior students, they turned out okay. Education is different now, this town complains about lower school rankings in one breathe. The next breathe is voicing how they do not support any change in structure of the Medfield education system, even though EVERY expert says it is the best way to educate children of today. I hope this town can unite and build for our future children, my kids will not benefit, but I know what they would have benefited from. I hope the young families in the 10 homes that sold this summer in our little neighborhood alone will receive that education.
	I fully support this and anything we can do to get better learning spaces for as many kids as possible. Great idea to have flexibility in grade configurations and non-grade specific learning spaces!
	I don't have any concerns with the application. I appreciate all of the hard work and dedication. My concern is that there still seems to be a group of people in the community who are unhappy with the process. Please (continue) to go above and beyond to ensure input is received, open meeting rules are followed (I'm not insinuating they haven't been, it just seems to be the perspective of some in the community), and the committee understands the concerns of the dale at dale group. I care more that there is a school than I do about the location. THANK YOU for your work on behalf of the kids in Medfield. We appreciate you.
	I am very happy to see the school committee fight for the best interest of our students, community, and teachers. The aspect highlighted in the application are all valid and cannot be ignored. We have the opportunity to improve Medfield‘s already amazing school system. We had the opportunity to identify our weaknesses and improve upon them by building a fantastic school to benefit all students.
	It would be very beneficial, if someone could prepare a long term capital expenditure plan for the schools. This would include information as to the age of the buildings and expected long term maintenence. It may assist in a scenario where we are able to consolidate the elementary schools into 2 buildings. It will also provide information to the general public about the cost to upkeep vs. building a new school sooner and not wasting money. I think the transition to 3 schools is a lot for these young kids. Simply creating a "campus" like structure, does not eliminate the transition to a new school. If we were able to simply have 2 schools there is only 1 transition in the elementary years and we would reduce overhead.

It seems that this proposal is just digging in of heels and trying to once again build on Elm St.
The top 2 (40%) of the goals are about this.
The concept of a "Campus Setting" has just had its words changed to a "Unifying Setting."

Even before presenting the goals, the proposal has a section extolling the previous proposal about how much work was done with the SBC and MSBA, and with [only] a 4% margin of loss at TM. This seems to also indicate a desire to defend and rehash the old defeated proposal.

The proposal says that they reevaluated the plan and there are "new factors raised since" now showing a need for a "unified setting". But this is not new to this proposal. The previous proposal called for the same thing - it was just called by a different name, a "campus setting".
Additionally, there has never been any real open community discussion/input, fact finding, or community goal setting. What are the new factors and where did they come from? They are not stated nor referenced here so I have to ask, do they even exist?

The proposal indicates the SC believes there will be a change in the school population due to building projects in town. Compared to the previous proposal this indicates "fluctuations" in enrollment whereas the previous said 'increases'. Does the SC truly believe there will be small fluctuations, as there always are, or have they hedged the wording and do they still plan on an oversized building because they still believe there will be a substantial increase?
I previously did a 25 year study with spreadsheets. raw data available, and analysis showing there is no correlation between population increase and school enrollments. This was presented to the Warrant Committee in an email and to the town on Facebook. There was no need to present it to the SC at the time since they had already finalized their plan. The study, data, and spreadsheet is available on request.

Additionally, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council has reached and published he same conclusions. There is no correlation between housing production and enrollment.
https://www.mapc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/MAPC_HousingEnrollment_Final.pdf
https://www.mapc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/01Jan-HousingProduction-1.pdf

There were at the time of last fall's Special Town Meeting 3 additional years of enrollment data to show that the projected increase of the last proposal was wrong. That data was never presented by the SC to the town. Now - there is yet another year of data and none of the data was presented to the Select Board to support any of the enrollment predictions made in this proposal.

The proposal looks for flexibility in grade level configurations. During the previous work, the SC looked at keeping the current grade configurations of small schools versus changing to two larger schools with more grades. It was determined that the current configuration was best and to stay with it. Has the SC changed their minds? If so why? Where is the data and discussion?
It is well known that smaller schools, especially for younger grades is more desirable. Many studies have shown that. And, the town has a history of making this a priority.

The proposal still talks about the false flags of "minimizing transitions for our students" and "increasing … corroboration."
Firstly, transitions are important for students and for most (it is acknowledged a few have greater difficulties with them) they are a needed learning experience. Children, even those who have greater difficulties, must learn to make transitions - it is a part of life that is inevitable - and there is no better time to learn this valuable life skill than in school and to start learning this early. In addition a "unified setting" will not truly ease any student transitions. The only thing that will ease is they might get off the bus in the same place. After that they will still go in a different direction, through a different door, different halls, to a different room, a different teacher and classmates, and navigate different bathrooms, music and art rooms, gym, and cafeteria from their old school.
Secondly, it will not increase corroboration. They only thing that will do that is more time in a teachers day and more inter-school and district wide meeting times in the schedule. Teachers currently barely have time in the day to go to the bathroom, let alone walk across a 'unified campus' to a different school.
These are two false flags used for marketing to gain support that will not truly make a difference to students.

The proposal indicates the schools serve as a "community resource" and yet no effort seems to have been made to gather community input nor to publicly coordinate with Parks and Rec who is also in dire need of increased and modern space, not to mention a safer building than the Pfaff Center with its sagging floor. The Pfaff Center and Parks and Rec are next door to the Dale Street school and a coordination seems to me to be highly desirable to gain increased land for a Dale Street school as well as coordinate and provide for a community resource.

The proposal indicates that an application (SOI) was sent to the MSBA in April with the Select Boards approval. Why? This might be premature when we still don't know what we are doing. Is it to save time in the process? Then to save time we should have been gathering substantial community input over the past year. And besides, the MSBA process is nothing but slow, adding years to a project that we critically need. The proposal indicates we will get a substantial reimbursement. But why? The MSBA process may give a 20-25% reimbursement, but the MSBA process also adds 20-25% to the cost of a project with its requirements. The MSBA process also adds substantial requirements and places barriers on what the town may be allowed to do.
The proposal also talks about how the SB approved the SOI, trying to make points by making all think the SB is on board with all of this.

This proposal finally acknowledges that they want to build a new school with the words "construction of a new elementary school, or the renovation/addition of the Dale Street School …".
The previous proposal went to the town to obtain funds for a feasibility study for the Dale Street School and was given funds by TM for that - the DALE STREET school. The Town only found out late in the process that what they were really doing was building a new school AND In A Different Location. The Town was mislead. I hope this does not happen again.
A substantial reason, amoung many, that the previous proposal failed was that the town was mislead from the beginning, not well informed along the way, and not given an opportunity for meaningful input.
So far, with the lack of movement in public for a year, only beginning this summer, with there no community meetings, surveys, or forums for a year to give input, with this proposal not being shown to, withheld from, the public before SC meetings, with there little opportunity for any public input on it, with only a week for review of this proposal and feedback, with it not being well publicized or available on the town web site, with the first widespread publication (on Facebook) not originally having clickable links until people asked for them, it seems that the

	I support the application and support a new school!
	I strongly urge the town to build or renovate the Dale Street School with out the State's interference. The town urgently needs an updated facility especially for the physical, medical and mental health needs of today's students. The best place for grades 4 & 5 is a downtown location. The present Dale Street School location has the most number of families living in nearby apartments. Many of the children in the apartments are transient; having the ability to walk or ride bikes to school gives them a feeling of safety and security in their own neighborhood. I saw this first hand when I worked at Dale Street. I do not agree that a new school would need to have special facility for town usage other than what we currently have.
	Instead of renovating Dale, take Memorial and Dale and make one large campus of both schools - less maintenance of buildings. Make it even bigger and incorporate the grades from Wheelock. Make the Wheelock area all fields for sports.
	I understand from the BOS meeting on 8/30/22 that the School Committee intends for the application to be "flexible" and "collaborative", but this application is worded vaguely enough for a small group of people to read into it implied permission to try to pursue the same failed Wheelock plan again. This is an opportunity to emerge from a very polarizing voting process with a more unified conversation and plan. Creating and maintaining a space to educate children should not be this divisive of a topic. The focus of this application should be on the successful approval and construction of a new facility at the current Dale site. As a resident who supported the original Wheelock plan, I know I am not alone in acknowledging that the ultimate goal here should be to create an appropriate educational facility for the elementary age kids in Medfield. It's critical that our kids are not the victims of a toxic small-town political battle this time around. Thank you.