

MINUTES OF THE LINCOLN SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, December 2, 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, Peter Sugar, Gary Taylor.

School Building Advisory Committee Absent: Hathaway Russell.

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

School Committee Absent: Al Schmertzler, 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

Dr. McFall, Co-Chair of the SBAC, called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

Tonight, they will dig deeper into the options presented to get feedback and input on how to refine and narrow the building options that will be developed. On January 13, 2015, Dore & Whittier will present their final report at the last public forum.

II. Agenda

Document: Educational Value Added by Facilities Upgrades and Enhancements, undated

Mr. Richardson reviewed the evening's agenda, which is below.

- A. Review of the November 15 State of the Town Meeting
- B. Key Issues and Variables
- C. Options
- D. Questions and Answers
- E. Feedback Activity
- F. Wrap Up and Next Steps

- A. Review of the November 15 State of the Town Meeting

Approved 2/10/15

Mr. Richardson said that Dore & Whittier has not presented one single option to become the Town's final school building project, and they expect tonight's additional feedback to result in changes to what they present this evening.

Mr. Richardson summarized the State of the Town Meeting that was held on November 15. Dore & Whittier has grouped the options of needs and building projects into three groups: 1) Facility Options 1A and 1B are facility repairs only; 2) Options 2A through 2F include the facility repairs and have additional a la carte educational enhancements; and 3) Options 3A through 3D are the most comprehensive; 3D is a brand new building. The options start from the least expensive to the most, and steadily adding on more renovation or new building as the number of the option increases. He said that there was the most support for the third set of options at the State of the Town Meeting, and the group supported energy efficiency, educational vision, and the possibility of including the Community Center.

Mr. Boone said that the assumption was that there would be no monetary support from the Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA], and the third set of options—the more comprehensive options—received the most support. The results of the feedback from the State of the Town Meeting are:

Option 1, Facility Repairs only: 3.7%

Option 2, A la Carte Enhancements and Facility Repairs: 20.0%

Option 3, Comprehensive Project: 76.3%

Mr. Boone noted that the two key issues are 1) whether there will be participation by the MSBA and 2) whether a Community Center Project will be included. If the Town wants to be invited into the MSBA process and is then accepted into the MSBA funding pipeline process, the likely reimbursement rate for acceptable costs would be 40%, and the project would need to address facility and educational needs. There is uncertainty as to whether the MSBA would invite the Town into the funding pipeline for a project, and if the MSBA invites the Town into the process, there will be a timing delay estimated to be at least 18 months, and the Town has to comply with the regulations and process of the MSBA, which would require another feasibility study. One other consideration is that the MSBA funds only school buildings; therefore, the Community Center Project would be a separate issue and project in terms of funding. Mr. Boone said that with any delay, they have estimated a 4 to 5% increase in costs per year. Mr. Boone showed one of the building options with the estimated costs in money and time to the Town if the MSBA funded the project and if it did not.

As the Community Center Study was discussed at the State of the Town Meeting, they are merely reflecting the discussion. Mr. Boone noted that the concerns for the Community Center Study project are the simultaneous funding for the schools and the center, site selection and parking issues, whether the community center would be attached to the schools or be free standing, and whether there could be shared spaces. Mr. Boone said Dore & Whittier has not explored any options that include the Community Center, but noted that the Hartwell Campus could be a potential site for the Community Center, as none of the options for the school that Dore & Whittier have put forth have included the Hartwell Campus. Mr. Richardson included that Dore & Whittier has not integrated

designs or work, and much design work needs to be accomplished for the schools and the potential Community Center.

B. Key Issues and Variables

Mr. Richardson said that the key variables, which need to be prioritized because the school project cannot have all of them, are: Cost, Educational Requirements, Energy Efficiency and meeting the Town's 2030 bylaw, Extent of preservation of the existing school buildings, Project timing, and Joint use of the schools and community. Under the cost variable, there will be construction costs, phasing and escalation costs, the question of MSBA participation and reimbursement for eligible costs, a 25-month construction period for options 2C through to 3C, and they would take one third of the school buildings offline for construction. Mr. Boone said the costs are estimates, and they do include the soft costs, construction costs, phasing, and escalation. Tonight they have some additional information on costs to present.

Dr. McFall reviewed the pink sheet, Educational Value Added by Facility Upgrades and Enhancements, and asked, if the audience members had to prioritize these items, how would they choose what should be on the top of the list? She noted that anything they do to the buildings will be an educational improvement, and how does one compare the impact of a cafeteria to air quality? She said that mechanical systems increase student focus, and students do better in school. The acoustics of a building can help or hinder students if they cannot hear the teacher or what is going on in the classroom, and she said having sound systems in the classrooms increases student engagement in class. The flexible multi-use spaces have many uses; the Brooks cafeteria/commons space not only gets students fed and through the lunch period more efficiently, but the space accommodates physical education when not in use, and the community could use it too. The accessibility for all in the school buildings' existing spaces is important, and she noted that the grade 2 wing, the oldest part of the buildings, is in the greatest need of renovation.

The Town's 2030 bylaw requires a 65% improvement of energy use for 2015, and the school buildings are the largest Town-owned buildings and the biggest consumers of energy. To reach the 2030 bylaw, the building enclosure—walls, roofs, and windows—need to be upgraded. They would also include advanced HVAC technology and go geothermal. The school buildings could also produce power with solar or wind. Mr. Boone noted that it is tough to save the existing structure and achieve the goals of the 2030 bylaw at the same time, and there is a cost premium to achieve the energy efficiency goal.

Under Preservation, the 1948 wing of the Smith Building is an historic structure. Construction standards were much different when it was built, and there is no insulation or energy management in the building. There is a sentimental aspect of the buildings, and there is also a relationship to the current educational vision. Under timing, there would be three phases of construction to be done over a period of 25 months. If the Town were invited into the MSBA process, there would be an additional 18 months.

Under Community Use, they noted that the degree of sharing was to be considered, and they wanted efficient use of public money, the schools would need public

and private areas, and what kinds of areas of the building can be shared by the community?

C. Options

Mr. Boone presented the options with detail and drawings, noting that they have explored only options that stayed within the buildings' current footprint and do not expand into the playing fields. They designed projects to house 600 students and to last for 30 years. Options 1A and 1B address facility needs only, with 1A addressing only the immediate needs at an estimated cost of \$12.2 million, and 1B addressing the immediate needs of option 1A and near term items at an estimated cost of \$29.2 million. He said the deferrable needs for site improvements such as parking areas and paving are estimated at \$7.7 million. These options are not long-term options.

Options 2A through 2F have a la carte educational enhancements. Option 2A would include Option 1B and improvements on the acoustics at an estimated cost of \$29.5 million. Option 2B would include 2A and add small group rooms at an estimated cost of \$29.8 million. Option 2C would have some new construction for the 2nd grade wing only and include Option 2B at an estimated cost of \$32 million. Option 2D would have some new construction and include kitchens and cafeterias at an estimated cost of \$36.6 million. Option 2E would be 10% new construction and include acoustical improvements and new kitchens and cafeterias at an estimated cost of \$36.9 million. Option 2F would be 15% new construction and include the 2nd grade wing, acoustical improvements, new kitchens and cafeterias, and the deferrable needs at an estimated cost of \$47.6 million.

Options 3A through 3D are the comprehensive educational enhancements. Option 3A would be 12% new construction at an estimated cost of \$54.7 million. Option 3B would be 23% new construction and is the plan (called the L-shaped plan) that the SBAC developed in 2013. Option 3C would be 48% new construction and have a partial second floor at a cost of \$58.8 million, and Option 3D would be only new construction and is included only for comparison purposes at an estimated cost of \$66.3 million.

Mr. Boone noted that of the three sets of options presented, it was unclear in which options the MSBA might be a financial participant, and the Town would again need to submit a Statement of Interest that the MSBA would have to accept. He said while it is tough to speculate, he thought that options 1A through 2E would likely not be accepted by the MSBA. Mr. Boone said that all of the options presented, with the exception of the new construction school building, now fall short of meeting the energy 2030 bylaw, and they have designed the options to meet the current energy code.

D. Questions and Answers

One person noted that the MSBA asks for projects that are designed to last 50 years, and how long were these projects designed to last? Sara Mattes said that educational philosophy changes and was concerned that the interior spaces be flexible. Mr. Boone said that the 3rd set of options is the most flexible and they have pursued a plan with a variety of spaces. Gary Taylor asked if Option 1A was a long-term solution, and Mr. Boone said it is just the new equipment that the district would purchase and is

not a long-term solution. Someone else asked about the deferrable needs in Options 2E, 2F, and the Option 3s. Another person asked whether the options have included the maintenance costs and fees included, and those prices are not included. The options include the project costs, but no operational costs after they are built. Mr. Richardson said they may be able to address the post-renovation post-construction operational costs in their final report, but those operational costs depend on many specifics, which they may not know. One other person was concerned about the fiduciary responsibility and wanted a long-term analysis on the operational costs, debt spending, and taxation to residents of the different options. Adam Greenberg was interested in Option 2F and said it had all but the small group rooms and if they dropped the deferrable needs that cost \$7.7, Option 2F could cost \$40 million and be a good option if the Town did not get MSBA funding.

E. Feedback Activity

The audience was asked to choose and to prioritize their key variables on big sheets of paper. The red sticker was the highest priority, and the green sticker was the second highest priority. Each option was presented on one table, and people were asked to identify pros and cons for each option and to build consensus. Each person was then asked to place a yellow sticker on the option that they wanted most if there was MSBA funding, and a blue sticker on the option that they wanted most if there was no MSBA funding.

F. Wrap Up and Next Steps

After the discussions and placement of stickers, Mr. Boone reviewed the results. There were no stickers placed on options 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C, or 3D. Option 3C with MSBA funding had the most stickers, and Option 3B without MSBA funding had the most stickers. Mr. Boone said Dore & Whittier will go to the SBAC to refine options 3B, 3C, 2F, and 2D/E. The SBAC will review the feedback and information and will develop a list. Dore & Whittier will present their final report at the next and final public forum on Tuesday, January 13 at 7:00 pm in the Reed Gym.

G. 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 forum adjourned at 9:05 pm. The next School Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 4 at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah G. Marcotte
Recording Secretary