

**DRAFT****MINUTES OF THE LINCOLN SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Reed Gym, Ballfield Road Campus, Lincoln, MA

**OPEN SESSION**

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

School Building Advisory Committee Absent: Doug Adams (Co-Chair), Gary Taylor.

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

School Committee Absent: Tom Sander (Vice Chair), Al Schmertzler, Preditta Cedeno (METCO Representative)

Dore & Whittier Architects Present: Jon Richardson, Donald Walter, Jason Boone.

PM & C Present: Peter Bradley.

**I. Greetings and Call to Order**

Ms. Pietropaolo called the meeting to order at 7:13 pm. She thanked everyone for attending and introduced the SBAC members.

**II. Review of the Process and Introductions**

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

Ms. Pietropaolo reviewed how the Town arrived at this point. In March 2014, Town Meeting approved up to \$250,000 in funding for consultants to develop possible options for a Lincoln School building project. After a careful selection process, the SBAC recommended Dore & Whittier Architects, and the School Committee awarded the contract to Dore & Whittier Architects at its July 23 meeting. The fee proposal they received from Dore & Whittier Architects was \$180,000 with an additional \$10,000 allowance for reimbursables. The contract with Dore & Whittier Architects includes time to incorporate the input into a final proposal and has the option to add tasks if needed; now it is proposed that their work will finish in mid-January 2015.

Ms. Pietropaolo noted that the SBAC's liaison to the Community Center Study is Gary Taylor. The SBAC and Dore & Whittier made a list of components that are involved in a school building project to estimate each component's cost. By January, they should have a good sense what the Town wants to do to fix these buildings, and they want the Town to take pride in the school for the students.

Mr. Cannistraro thanked everyone for attending, and reminded all that the SBAC needs participation in this process, even if residents do not agree with each other. He noted that two reasons why they selected Dore & Whittier were: 1) they have an

1 understanding between outreach and participation in the process, and 2) there is a value  
2 in getting knowledge from the community, and they are trying to make the process as  
3 open and collaborative as possible. The end goal is to have a project that the Town can  
4 support.

5 Mr. Walter introduced the Dore & Whittier team of Mr. Richardson, project  
6 manager; Mr. Boone, educational planner, and Mr. Bradley from P M & C is the cost  
7 estimator. Mr. Walter noted they want to listen to the community and will give the  
8 background on the project. He said the SBAC meets every other Tuesday and  
9 encouraged the group to attend, and this process is open and transparent.

10 This evening's agenda has progress and introductions, the process for the current  
11 study, educational possibilities, preliminary cost considerations, small group break-out  
12 sessions, and reporting out of the sessions. Dore & Whittier had a PowerPoint  
13 presentation that they will make available on the website, [www.lincnet.org](http://www.lincnet.org).

14 Mr. Walter said they have reviewed the numerous studies of the school buildings,  
15 and they will prioritize the educational and facilities needs. At the end of the study, they  
16 will present a final report. Mr. Walter said they would be available to continue the  
17 dialogue after January. Their plan is to engage residents in as many settings as possible  
18 to glean information from all of the stakeholders of the buildings.

### 19 20 III. Educational Possibilities

21 Document: PowerPoint presentation available at [www.lincnet.org](http://www.lincnet.org)

22  
23 Mr. Boone, a former high school math teacher, reviewed the educational  
24 possibilities of the 21st century. They are to: 1) provide a warm, dry, and safe  
25 environment; 2) support individual learning modalities and multiple intelligences; 3)  
26 embody the 4 Cs of critical thinking, collaboration, communication, and creativity; 4)  
27 possess ubiquitous technology; and 5) adapt to changes over time. Mr. Boone showed  
28 the space needs analysis, where they measure the building against the benchmark that is  
29 provided by the Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA]. The Lincoln school  
30 buildings have some spaces that are undersized, some that are within the standards, and  
31 some that are over the standards. He noted that the buildings will likely need more  
32 classrooms.

33 Mr. Boone said they will explore a range of interventions and showed  
34 photographs of different types of interventions they have completed for other schools,  
35 including Wilmington High School, Middletown, R. I.'s Forest Avenue Elementary  
36 School, and the Hanscom Primary School. Their company is in the schematic design  
37 phase for a middle school in Scituate. The needs for those districts included reconfigured  
38 classrooms, larger collaborative rooms, small group rooms. He stressed that they will  
39 approach the project by different components and will not come up with one single plan  
40 but will work with the Town to build alternatives.

### 41 42 IV. Preliminary Cost Considerations

43  
44 Mr. Richardson reviewed cost estimating and stressed that they do not yet have a  
45 final tally of the entire cost at this time; Dore & Whittier are currently reviewing two lists  
46 of over 100 detailed items. The major cost items for the health, safety, and welfare of all

1 who use the school facilities are: 1) safety and security; 2) fire suppression; 3) hazardous  
2 materials; 4) accessibility; 5) acoustics; 6) structural codes; 7) energy efficiency to meet  
3 the Town's bylaw; 8) thermal comfort. Mr. Richardson informed the audience that the  
4 school project has to be completed in accordance with the procurement laws of  
5 Massachusetts and will be a design, bid, build project that has to comply with the public  
6 construction laws, M.G.L. Ch. 149. When a public building needs to have renovation  
7 work within three years that totals a percentage of its appraised value, which is 30  
8 percent, the amount of money triggers a project to have to comply with current building  
9 code requirements, local bylaws, and other laws. The Lincoln school buildings would  
10 need to have roughly \$6.5 million of work to have to comply with those requirements.  
11 While roofing, windows, and HVAC components can be exempt from those  
12 requirements, if a district does additional work such as replacing doors and other items,  
13 the dollar amounts of the roofing, windows, or HVAC have to be counted toward the  
14 dollar amount if they are done within 36 months. They have to make the building  
15 compliant with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and make it accessible, and  
16 work could trigger necessary compliance with the Massachusetts Architectural Access  
17 Board, the State Building Code, the International Existing Building Code, and the  
18 Town's new energy efficiency bylaw.

19 Mr. Richardson said that any numbers on costs given this evening are in today's  
20 dollars, and he noted that prices escalate by 4-5% each year. Prices not only include  
21 construction costs but project costs. The existing facility's educational needs are: Smith  
22 School class size, classroom count, cafeterias, kitchens, break-out spaces, technology,  
23 and science. The architectural team wants guidance on the long-term goals for the  
24 buildings and will work with the Town to build alternatives. One question is how

25 Mr. Bradley reviewed their slides on costs for roof, window, and mechanical  
26 options. The roofing options are EPDM, PVC, or TPO membrane roofs. The current  
27 roofs will need to be replaced in the next 5-7 years. The estimated costs are: 1) \$2.3  
28 million for EPDM; 2) \$2.5 million for PVC; and 3) \$2.3 million for TPO, with \$600,000  
29 for project costs for each choice. The window options are 1) triple-paned windows that  
30 meet the standards for energy 2030 with an R-value of 5 or above at a cost of \$2.5  
31 million; 2) single-paned windows that have much lower energy performance at a cost of  
32 \$800,000. There are four options for mechanical systems; options one and two that  
33 would also solve sound problems that currently exist in the buildings, but options three  
34 and four would not. Option one would have full air conditioning with an overhead  
35 delivery system that is equipment intensive at a cost of \$8.1 million; option two would be  
36 full air conditioning with an energy efficient chilled water system at a cost of \$8 million;  
37 option three has new unit ventilators at a cost of \$7.4 million; and option four would be to  
38 install a split ductless system in the classrooms only. Option four would be the least  
39 energy efficient and the lowest cost of \$2.3 million, but it would have more maintenance  
40 costs than the other three options.

41 Mr. Richardson gave general numbers for costs per square foot, with ranges of  
42 plus or minus 10 percent. A light renovation would cost \$225 per square foot; a medium  
43 renovation would cost \$295 per square foot; a heavy or gut renovation would cost \$315  
44 per square foot; and new construction would cost \$325 per square foot. Mr. Bradley said  
45 that renovations are more difficult to price up front, and there is phasing and additional  
46 time needed to do a heavy renovation than there is for new construction. In addition to

1 construction costs, which are the amounts paid to a general contractor, a project includes  
2 engineering and design fees and soft costs which include furniture, fixtures and other  
3 equipment, and those are an additional 25 percent. In addition, site costs vary and are  
4 entailed in a project, but they have not been included in the construction costs. The slides  
5 with the different roofing, window, and mechanical options were not meant to add up to  
6 the general numbers of costs per square foot. Demolition costs were also not included  
7 and can range from \$6 to \$8 per square foot, and additional amounts need to be set aside  
8 in case they find and have to remove hazardous materials. Mr. Bradley also noted they  
9 are not sure what the square footage of a project will be.

10 Residents asked about costs, whether the roofs really needed to be replaced, and  
11 about the amount of money that would trigger compliance with more laws.

## 12 13 V. Small Group Break-Out Sessions

14  
15 The audience, seated at eight tables of eight participants, discussed and report out  
16 in their small groups, answers to the following three questions.

17 1) What details should Dore & Whittier pay attention to? A) educational, B) facilities, C)  
18 Site, D) Costs, E) Other, such as examples of what they could consider.

19  
20 2) What are your priorities and why?

21  
22 3) How do you define a successful study and project? What outcomes or results do you  
23 want?

24  
25 The groups talked from 8:20 to 8:45 pm.

## 26 27 VI. Reporting Out from the Sessions

28  
29 Mr. Walter put up the lists that the groups compiled and reviewed each list for  
30 commonalities, noting that Lincoln has great handwriting. The lists will be transcribed,  
31 and the commonalities will be tallied and discussed at the SBAC meeting, and the  
32 information will also be included in their final report.

33 Some of the lists asked what the educational vision for the project was, and others  
34 wanted to spend the money on teachers. Good outcomes for students and teachers, in  
35 terms of the facilities and people. Class sizes were another concern, and out of the  
36 process the group wanted an understanding and a sharing of vision.

37 The educational climate has a range of options, and they wanted an interior  
38 climate that was conducive to learning versus gutting and rearranging the class. They  
39 noted the facilities were not great now, and some groups want to save the current building  
40 as much as possible. They said the shape and accessibility of the building leads to  
41 creativity, site preservation was important so that students could see outdoors. They also  
42 wanted to obtain the Town's approval and needed the latitude to explore solutions. The  
43 second-grade wing at the Smith School is in need of more than other parts of the  
44 buildings. They were also concerned about safe parking, and the safety of pedestrians,  
45 buses, and cars, and the walkways are not safe. They also did not want to spend any  
46 more money on studies.

1 One group wanted a clear strategy to move forward. The mechanical issues, air  
2 quality, conditioned dry (not humid) air, should be fixed as the climate changes. They  
3 were also concerned that the building be safe from the outside, and occupants should feel  
4 safe. This group wanted the scope of the study to be included with the community center  
5 study and for the Town to come to consensus. They wanted better playing fields; the  
6 center field is too wet and not level in the spring and needs better drainage. They also  
7 wanted an energy efficient building. They also wanted meetings to be timed before a  
8 major decision on the building was to be made and the information to be presented to the  
9 public before the decisions were made.

10 The next group wanted a facility that adapted to different educational styles and  
11 needs, that is warm, safe, and dry, a process where people feel they have been heard, but  
12 to minimize the number of decisions to be made by the Town to get to the outcome.  
13 They also did not want to spend \$5 million each year on repairs and want a building that  
14 can be sustained for a long-term future. They want to minimize the time that students  
15 and teachers have to learn in temporary trailers, and they also want the least disruptive  
16 process for the interim time. Mr. Boone stated that modular trailers are on wheels and are  
17 nice, but are expensive. They would like a space where pieces could be used for a Town  
18 Community Center. The group said a well-articulated educational vision is a successful  
19 study.

20 Another group listed parking, cafeteria, safety as number one, technology,  
21 education, building codes, accessibility, and adjacency as priorities. They included  
22 affordability and the cost tolerance by Town as concerns and wanted to have a budget  
23 before designing something and wanted to find a threshold, and they were concerned  
24 about the saleability of the plan and want teachers and parents on board with the design.

25 The next group wanted flexibility for educational requirements and raised the  
26 issue of how far into the future the buildings should be designed for; 50 years? They  
27 wanted to preserve the green and keep the buildings connected to the outdoors. They  
28 noted Town uses for the campus and were concerned about the budget and the Town's  
29 cost tolerance. They were also concerned about the timeline and to get a project that  
30 passes and they would like to give our children the best possible education.

31 Another group cited long-term flexibility in the design to adjust to changes over  
32 time and wanted to minimize specialized facilities. They were concerned about  
33 education, safety, to preserve the green. They were concerned about how far in the future  
34 should they design a project for. They wanted to integrate the Council on Aging and the  
35 Recreation Department on the campus. They want a project that fosters an environment  
36 with an educational vision and to have the faculty to support that vision. They wanted  
37 the building to be energy efficient.

38 Mr. Walter thanked everyone for coming and asked that they stay involved and  
39 get others involved. Dore & Whittier will consider a survey to include the opinions and  
40 suggestions of those who were not in attendance.

41 The slides will be posted on the school website, [www.lincnet.org](http://www.lincnet.org) on the right-  
42 hand side of the site under the SBAC.

43  
44  
45 VII. Adjournment

1           The meeting adjourned at 9:27 pm. The next School Committee meeting is  
2 scheduled for Tuesday, September 23 at 7:00 pm. The next public forum is scheduled for  
3 Thursday, October 16 at 7:00 pm in the Reed Gym.

4

5   Respectfully submitted,

6   Sarah G. Marcotte

7   Recording Secretary

8

9