DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE LINCOLN SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, October 16, 2014
Reed Gym, Ballfield Road Campus, Lincoln, MA
OPEN SESSION

School Building Advisory Committee Present: Becky McFall (Co-Chair and Superintendent), Doug Adams (Co-Chair), Ken Bassett, Owen Beenhouwer, Vincent Cannistraro, Tim Christenfeld, Buck Creel (Administrator for Business and Finance), Steven Perlmutter, Maggy Pietropaolo, Gary Taylor.

School Building Advisory Committee Absent: Hathaway Russell, Peter Sugar.

School Committee Present: Jennifer Glass (Chair), Al Schmertzler, Tim Christenfeld, Jena Salon.

School Committee Absent: Peter Borden, Preditta Cedeno (METCO Representative).

Dore & Whittier Architects Present: Jon Richardson, Jason Boone, Emily Rae.

Dore & Whittier Architects Absent: Donald Walter.

PM & C Absent: Peter Bradley.

I. Greetings and Call to Order

Mr. Adams, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:18 pm. He thanked everyone for attending and introduced the SBAC members.

II. Review of the Process and Last Forum

Document: Lincoln School Facilities Study, Schedule of Meetings and Public Forums

Mr. Adams thanked all for coming to give their focused feedback. The agenda will be:

- an overview of the September 16 forum
- educational vision and theory in action and give insights on how education can be furthered by building enhancements
- the facility's mechanical, electrical, and plumbing issues, with costs and strategies
- preliminary concepts and clarifying the range of options
- small group break-out sessions to examine the options and concepts
- reporting out of the sessions

Dore & Whittier had a PowerPoint presentation that they will make available on the website, www.lincnet.org.

Mr. Richardson reviewed the September 16 public forum, at which they asked the group to discuss their answers to the following questions:
1) What details should Dore & Whittier pay attention to? A) educational, B) facilities, C) site, D) costs, E) other, such as examples of what they could consider. He noted that the priorities identified were the educational vision, site sensitivity, cost to the Town, and the facilities implications.
2) What are your priorities and why? The second question's answers were facilities and code compliance, education, cost to the Town, safety and security, and site sensitivity.
3) How do you define a successful study and project? What outcomes or results do you want? The priorities were to explore a range of options, find a solution the Town can support, have a project that considers the Community Center Study, and find a single long-term solution.

Mr. Richardson reviewed the timeline for the study and noted that the Town was now in phase three, where it was time to develop conceptual options to the facilities needs. The architects will present refined options at the Saturday, November 15 State of the Town meeting and will refine them further for a final report. He stressed that they will approach the project with different components and will not come up with one single plan but will work with the Town to build alternatives and will have clarified and thoroughly examined a set of options by the end of the process.

III. Educational Vision

Documents: 1) Lincoln Public Schools, 2013-2015 Strategic Plan; 2) PowerPoint presentation available at www.lincnet.org

Dr. McFall presented the district's educational vision to connect it to the building on meeting their objectives for students. She has had wonderful discussions with the townspeople, and there are two perspectives: 1) how will the building improve education for our students; and 2) is there an educational vision, and are you improving the education that is taking place in the building? She said that many look at the educational vision through different lenses and define it by educational outcomes, educational process and how do we teach, individual student experiences and how they are tailored to my child, the whole child in the academic, social, and emotional components, the whole school community and want to ensure that students are connected to their community.

Dr. McFall said their educational vision is based on the district strategic plan and how they meet the strategic objectives. The district has strategic priority maps that show how the district meets its objectives, which are aspirational goals. The maps are on the school website, www.lincnet.org under the superintendent's bulletin on the left hand side of the web page, and the maps will be reviewed at the next School Committee meeting on October 23.

Dr. McFall discussed the 5 Key Questions for Learning. 1) What evidence shows that students know the objective or learning target? 2) What is authentic learning? 3) What evidence is there of meaningful exchanges between students and teachers? 4) How are we assessing student understanding? 5) How are we differentiating instruction? They have focused on authentic learning, defined as learning that has a purpose that creates engagement, and with authentic learning, students make connections between learning and the wider world. An example of authentic learning was the warrant article for

bicycle racks that the 8th graders presented at the March 2014 Town Meeting. Authentic learning means that students have an audience that will not only view their work, but will also give them feedback and a partner. One example was the letter that students wrote to their parents at Curriculum Night. English Language Learners [ELL] created a blog and a voiceover for teachers and family members so that they could comment on their work. Another example is students perform science as scientists do science.

How do they prepare teachers to do this type of work, and how does the school building help them to reach these objectives, and what does that look like? The district needs different types of spaces that can be used in different ways for project learning or for individual instruction. They need varied spaces that allow different ways of teaching and for students to learn, and the spaces need to allow for collaboration between students and staff. The district needs a technology infrastructure for current and future needs. Could they use technology to teach differently to help students think deeper? The district teaches students that they are connected to the community and their environment. Dr. McFall noted that the 6th grade was having an overnight field trip to the Museum of Science this evening.

Dr. McFall said with the current layout of the school buildings, faculty and staff use hallways and closets for individual student learning. She asked what designs might improve student experiences. Other schools' learning spaces, such as the Hanscom Middle School and the Hanscom Primary School, have ways to adjust the inside spaces and tailor them to specific students' needs. The current Lincoln school buildings could be gutted to create the flexible spaces needed while maintaining the existing outside walls.

IV. Preliminary Cost Considerations: Mechanical, electrical, and plumbing issues, costs and strategies

Documents: None.

Mr. Richardson said that the educational vision is crucial to the design. He noted that the existing facility has comprehensive needs, which include mechanical, electrical, plumbing, roofing, insulation, and educational vision upgrades, accessibility compliance, kitchens and cafeterias, hazardous material abatement, fire suppression and fire alarm upgrades, and structural upgrades. When they do a partial upgrade, they have to complete them according to the current building code. The current building is 130,000-140,000 square feet, and buildings over 75,000 square feet have to have fire suppression systems. They will need to make the building to be able to withstand wind and earthquake damage too. The buildings need to be warm, dry, safe, and accessible.

Mr. Richardson said that the school project has to be completed in accordance with the procurement and public construction laws of Massachusetts and will be a design, bid, build project. He explained that when a public building needs to have renovation work within three years that totals 30 percent of its appraised value, the amount of money triggers a project to have to comply with current building code requirements, local bylaws, and other laws. The Lincoln school buildings would need to have roughly $6.5 million of work to have to comply with those requirements. While roofing, windows, and HVAC components can be exempt from those requirements, if a district does additional work such as replacing doors and other items, the dollar amounts paid for

roofing, windows, or HVAC components have to be counted toward the dollar amount if they are done within 36 months. The building also must comply with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and be accessible, and work could trigger necessary compliance with the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board, the State Building Code, the International Existing Building Code, and the Town's new energy efficiency bylaw.

Mr. Richardson said that any numbers on costs given this evening are in today's dollars, and he noted that prices escalate by 4-5% each year. Prices include construction and project costs. The architectural team wants guidance on the long-term goals for the buildings.

Mr. Richardson said the programmatic needs of the existing facilities are the Smith School 2nd grade wing, kitchens and cafeterias, small group rooms, hub spaces, classroom neighborhoods, spatial adjacencies, windowless classrooms, and specialist spaces.

Mr. Richardson reviewed their slides on costs for roof, window, and mechanical options. The roofing options are EPDM, PVC, or TPO membrane roofs. The current roofs will need to be replaced in the next 5-7 years. The estimated costs are: 1) $2.3 million for EPDM; 2) $2.5 million for PVC; and 3) $2.3 million for TPO, with additional project costs of $600,000 for each alternative. The window options are 1) triple-paned windows that meet the standards for energy 2030 with an R-value of 5 or above at a cost of $2.5 million; 2) single-paned windows that have much lower energy performance at a cost of $800,000. Mr. Richardson noted that the buildings do not have any insulation, and the Town's Energy 2030 bylaw requires that the buildings be 65% more efficient. There are four options for mechanical systems; options one and two that would also solve sound problems that currently exist in the buildings, but options three and four would not. Option one would have full air conditioning with an overhead delivery system that is equipment intensive at a cost of $8.1 million; option two would be full air conditioning with an energy efficient chilled water system at a cost of $8 million; option three has new unit ventilators at a cost of $7.4 million; and option four would be to install a split ductless system in the classrooms only. Option four would be the least energy efficient and the lowest cost of $2.3 million, but it would have more maintenance costs than the other three options. The slides with the different roofing, window, and mechanical options were not meant to add up to the general numbers of costs per square foot.

The accessibility needs included changing interior doors at a cost of $.05 million, changing exterior doors at a cost of $.09 million, installing new toilets and sinks for $1.13 million, redoing the auditorium and stages for $.41 million. The fire suppression system was estimated to cost $1.8 million with an additional $.44 million to fix impacted ceilings.

Mr. Richardson gave general numbers for costs per square foot, with ranges of plus or minus 10 percent. A light renovation would cost $225 per square foot; a medium renovation would cost $295 per square foot; a heavy or gut renovation would cost $315 per square foot; and new construction would cost $325 per square foot. Renovations are more difficult to price up front, and there is phasing and additional time needed to do a heavy renovation than there is for new construction. In addition to construction costs, which are the amounts paid to a general contractor, a project includes engineering and design fees and soft costs which include furniture, fixtures and other equipment, and those are an additional 25 percent. Site costs vary but have not been included in the

construction costs. Demolition costs were also not included and can range from $6 to $8 per square foot, and additional amounts need to be set aside in case they find and have to remove hazardous materials. They are not sure what the square footage of a project will be. The smaller scope items, such as walls, insulation, electric and lighting have not yet been priced for current market conditions and are works in progress.

V. Preliminary Options

Documents: None.

Mr. Boone presented four options that represent incremental steps and are works in progress for which they wanted feedback this evening. They designed projects to house 600 students and to last for 30 years. There are four families of options: 1) capital improvements only with three variations at a cost range of $38 to $47 million; 2) capital improvements with a la carte programmatic needs at a cost range of $41 to $48 million; 3) both items above with all educational requirements that depended on renovations and additions with four variations at a cost range of $48 to $64 million; and 4) new construction at a cost range of $55 to $68 million. Mr. Richardson noted when items fail and have to be fixed on an emergency basis, that is most expensive.

Mr. Richardson showed slides of each variation on the options. For option 2A, they would add new kitchens and cafeterias. For option 3A, they would renovate as much as they could and add cafeterias for a cost range of $48 to $58 million. For option 3B, they would demolish the Brooks school and rebuild it for a cost range of $50 to $60 million. For option 3C, the SBAC developed a minor renovation and major addition for a cost range of $52 to $64 million. Option 3D included a second story in small parts but was a major addition that would include demolishing the Smith School at a cost of $52 to $64 million. Option four is new construction of a 140,000 square foot building at a cost of $55 to $68 million.

VI. Small Group Break-Out Sessions

Documents: None.

The audience, seated at tables of eight participants, discussed and reviewed the options to answer the following questions. Did Dore and Whittier have the right range of options? What components excited you and why? Are there any other questions on how the educational vision impacts the design of the facility? What are your initial thoughts on the ranges of options presented? What about an option excited you and why? What other options or combination of options should the Design Team explore?

Mr. Boone asked them to write down their comments.

The Design Team was asked about possible MSBA support, and Mr. Boone noted that they have not yet reached out to them, but in the previous project, the MSBA had agreed to a certain number of students with a certain number of spaces. Mr. Richardson said that the MSBA would not accept the district into the repair program. Spaces for students to be schooled in during construction were included when appropriate.

VII. Reporting Out from the Sessions

Documents: The lists made by each table

Mr. Boone put up the lists that the groups compiled. The lists will be transcribed, and the commonalities will be tallied and discussed at the SBAC meeting, and the information will be included in their final report.

The group asked that options 2A and 2B be combined and options 2A and 2C be combined. While some were not crazy about the aesthetics of two-story buildings, they liked their energy efficiency. The group said that Dore & Whittier should pursue a two-story portion of the building. Mr. Boone asked whether Dore & Whittier should stay within the footprint of the existing buildings or pursue building outside that footprint, and the group said they should build group rooms outside the footprint.

Mr. Boone said that the Brooks School stays in some options and is demolished in others. He also said that even with the same square footage, one educational program might fit into an existing building differently than it might for new construction. Mr. Boone noted that of the four options presented, it was unclear which options the MSBA might be a financial participant in, and he said they do not know until they present designs to the MSBA. The Town would again need to submit a Statement of Interest that the MSBA would have to accept. He thought that option one would not be accepted by them, option two was a wild card, and options three and four would most likely fulfill the educational program of the district, and the MSBA would most likely participate. Mr. Boone said they will summarize the evening's comments and will revise the options to present them at the November 15 State of the Town meeting.

Mr. Christenfeld thanked everyone for coming and asked that they stay involved and get others involved; the SBAC meets every Tuesday evening.

The slides will be posted on the school website, www.lincnet.org on the right-hand side of the site under the SBAC.

VIII. Adjournment

Dr. McFall thanked the audience for their commitment, feedback, and time. She noted that the group will see it expressed at the next stage.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm. The next School Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 23 at 7:00 pm. The next public forum is scheduled for Tuesday, December 2 at 7:00 pm in the Reed Gym.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah G. Marcotte
Recording Secretary

Approved by SBAC 12/9/14