

## **HHU Master Plan Committee Minutes: May 19, 2016**

### **Great Hall, Town Hall**

**Present:** Hans Larsen, Ellen Gibbs, Jack Morgan, David Lussier, Stephan Gauldie, David Stern, Seong-Il Ahn, Maura Sullivan, Sara Jane Shanahan, Nancy Calderwood, Chad Harris, Jose Soliva, Matt Kelley, Sharon Gray, Lara Pfadt, Allan Port, Tom Ahern, and Ed Cloaninger. **Absent:** Brent Warner, Todd Ofenloch.

**Meeting Documents:** May 19, 2016 Meeting Agenda; HHU Master Plan Committee Meeting Dates; Quote Request Memo from Judith Belliveau, dated May 12, 2016; Proposal Response from Decision Insite; Proposal Response from FutureThink; Proposal Response from McKibben Demographic Research; Proposal Response from New England School Development Council; HHU Master Plan Committee PowerPoint Presentation, dated May 19, 2016; Email from Sara Shanahan to HHU Master Plan Committee, dated May 19, 2016

**Mr. Larsen opened the meeting at 7:08 pm.**

#### **Minutes**

Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee consider approving the minutes of the May 5, 2016 meeting. Ms. Shanahan asked for clarification in the minutes regarding the process by which the Enrollment RFP was to be considered. Mr. Larsen, Mr. Kelley, Dr. Lussier, and Ms. Calderwood responded to these comments. Ms. Calderwood made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Morgan seconded the motion. The Committee voted in favor of the motion, with the exception of Ms. Shanahan voting in opposition of the motion.

#### **Enrollment Studies**

Dr. Lussier suggested that the Committee review the memo and RFP. The Committee reviewed the memo and RFP for a few minutes. Dr. Lussier provided the Committee with an overview. Mr. Kelley and Dr. Lussier discussed distribution of the RFP and responses from the four (4) firms.

Ms. Sullivan asked whether the Committee was required to select the proposal with the lowest cost. Mr. Larsen discussed procurement requirements, indicating that variables other than cost could be considered. Ms. Shanahan asked about the cost. Mr. Morgan and Mr. Larsen clarified the procurement requirements. Ms. Shanahan asked about follow up requirements. Mr. Stern asked questions regarding the materials submitted by the firms.

Mr. Morgan discussed the process and timeline for considering proposals. Mr. Port stated that the Committee will need to consider how the proposals are responsive to the Committee's questions, such as what makes Wellesley unique, what is the effect of building a new school versus renovating a school.

Dr. Gauldie stated that he does not believe the Committee will be in a position to make a decision on the proposals next week. Tentatively selected firms should come in and present, to let Committee members ask questions.

Mr. Kelley asked whether the Committee believes that they will bring in one or more of these vendors to interview, stating that he does not know if we can expect the consultants to be available, especially those out of state. Mr. Larsen asked Dr. Lussier whether any of the consultants were located out of state; Dr. Lussier confirmed that some of the consultants were located out of state.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Committee was the customer, and as the vendor, it would be important to have them come in to discuss and review their methodology. Ms. Gibbs agreed, indicating that it would be a good experience for the Committee to engage and have some back and forth, noting that Skype or other video could always be used.

Mr. Cloaninger asked whether there have been any discussions with nearby communities to see who they have used. Dr. Lussier indicated that some nearby communities have used the consultants that had responded. Ms. Shanahan asked Dr. Lussier to confirm which ones had been used. Dr. Lussier responded that McKibben and NESDEC had been used by nearby communities.

Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee wait and see what they receive next week, and decide how to proceed then. Dr. Lussier asked whether they should forward the responses to the Committee as they are received. Ms. Shanahan asked whether the Committee has the ability to ask proposers who they would have working on the project. Mr. Larsen confirmed that the Committee does have this ability. Mr. Larsen asked whether there was any merit to further discussion on the documents. Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee should send comments to Ms. Belliveau.

Mr. Cloaninger noted that the proposal from NESDEC looks to be slightly different than the others. Dr. Lussier responded that NESDEC is a membership group and that their services are discounted for members. Mr. Ahern asked whether the responses are actually statements of interest, and whether the memo from Ms. Belliveau is considered the official RFP. Mr. Ahern asked whether the Committee expects official proposals to be submitted, and then have respondents come in to present, noting that this is the process that he is used to. Mr. Ahern stated that the Committee needs to interview the respondents, that it might be one of the most important things that the Committee does.

Mr. Larsen stated that they will seek more complete proposals, which will be reviewed by the full Committee, and the Committee will then make decisions on next steps. Ms. Shanahan asked whether the request can be amended to have respondents come to the meeting on June 2. Mr. Larsen stated that he does not know if the Committee would be ready to do that on June 2, that another week may be necessary. Dr. Lussier said that it is difficult to vet proposals on camera. Mr. Gauldie asked whether it is possible to have a subcommittee review the proposals. Mr. Morgan stated that he would not support a subcommittee reviewing the proposals. Mr. Zehner explained the process used by the Planning Board.

Dr. Gauldie indicated that he would not be available for the June 2 meeting and asked how he might go about sharing his comments with the Committee. Mr. Larsen suggested that he make his comments available to staff, who would share them with the Committee at the meeting.

### **Review Revised Work Plan**

Mr. Larsen provided a revised set of meeting dates for the Committee's work and reviewed the proposed dates for the Committee. Dr. Lussier discussed dates for the Committee's tours of elementary schools. Dr. Lussier indicated that on June 9 the Committee would tour Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham from 9am to 3pm, and that a bus would be provided for this purpose; Sprague and Schofield would be visited on May 31. The Committee agreed that members could park and meet at 900 Worcester Street on June 9.

Dr. Lussier reiterated that these tours would not be deliberative sessions of the Committee. Mr. Larsen confirmed that members may ask questions. Ms. Shanahan asked whether the Committee could have a meeting on June 9 after the tours to discuss the schools. Mr. Larsen stated that he was open to meeting. Ms. Shanahan indicated that she thought a meeting would be helpful. Mr. Larsen asked if members of the Committee would like to meet. Mr. Morgan stated that he thought it would be helpful to have a meeting. Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee could meet from 3pm to 4pm. Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee could discuss the visits further at the meeting on June 16.

Mr. Larsen reviewed the rest of the proposed dates for the Committee. Members of the Committee suggested that it would be helpful to discuss the financial implications of the 10 year school facilities master plan. Ms. Gray stated that she felt it would be helpful to review the Town-wide Financial Plan. Mr. Morgan agreed, indicating that it would put things into perspective.

Mr. Cloaninger noted that the Committee may want to consider whether there would be light attendance at the meeting on June 30 given the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday.

Mr. Stern stated that it makes really good sense for Alex Pitkin to discuss facilities options at the May 26 meeting. Mr. Larsen suggested that the Committee wait and see where they get with Mr. Pitkin next week and see if people are comfortable. Ms. Sullivan asked if it was determined that there was an interest to have more studies done, when might those be performed. Mr. Larsen responded that this would likely be discussed near July 14, when the Committee could consider the options to date, tours, gap analysis, ability to deliver the educational program, attendance zones, and the neighborhood school model. Mr. Larsen indicated that at that time the Committee can discuss additional options that need to be studied and determine what type of analysis needs to be done, or further analysis on past options.

Mr. Morgan indicated that he believes the Committee needs to accept the reality of being on television, as well as public procurement laws associated with considering other proposals. Mr. Morgan stated that he would advocate against the idea of putting out a blank request before deciding what the Committee wants to look at. Ms. Shanahan asked whether Mr. Morgan was envisioning that the Committee discuss what they are looking for in a more robust way before putting out a request. Mr. Morgan, in response, said "yes."

Mr. Larsen asked if there was any further discussion regarding the logistics of the Committee.

### **Educational Program**

Mr. Larsen asked Dr. Lussier to review the education program and the School's Strategic Plan. Dr. Lussier made a presentation to the Committee, discussing school programs, additional space needs for programs, and the need for smaller collaborative spaces. Ms. Shanahan asked Dr. Lussier to clarify what he meant by smaller collaborative space. Dr. Lussier described the spaces as room for 6 to 7 people (students and teachers) to meet, working outside of the classroom.

Dr. Lussier reviewed the desired attributes of schools: 3 to 4 section schools, approximately twenty-one K-5 classes, and preferred classroom square footage. Dr. Lussier noted that during the tours the Committee will see classrooms significantly smaller. Dr. Lussier continued, indicating that separate gym and cafeteria spaces are preferred. Mr. Kelley noted the standards for gym sizes, and indicated that all gyms are well under the standard.

Dr. Lussier discussed preferences for specialized spaces (dedicated for art and music), learning support spaces (special education, English language learners, and similar), handicap accessibility, and security features. Dr. Lussier discussed the value of storage/lockers, accommodating new services/curricula, elementary social worker, and world language programs. Dr. Lussier asked if there were any questions. Dr. Gauldie asked Dr. Lussier if there were an optimal number of rooms for things outside of the classroom. Dr. Lussier responded that it varies school by school, that it is difficult to standardize. Ms. Shanahan asked whether some of the newer schools, such as Bates and Sprague, have these facilities. Dr. Lussier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Soliva asked whether Dr. Lussier anticipated the availability of special programs at each school. Dr. Lussier responded that each of the schools currently have specialized programs, except Bates. Dr. Lussier discussed the example of PAWS, indicating that it has classroom space at other schools. Mr. Larsen stated that the need for these nontraditional spaces exceeds these formal programs, that there are other less formal programs, asking Dr. Lussier to confirm. Dr. Lussier responded in the affirmative, but indicated that space for such other services is similarly inadequate.

Ms. Pfadt asked whether SMMA did a space program based on needs. Dr. Lussier responded that SMMA's work focused primarily on the adequacy of the facilities. Ms. Pfadt asked whether the SMMA analysis was planned with growth and space needs taken into account. Dr. Lussier responded that he thought it was a great question for Mr. Pitkin to address at the May 26 meeting. Mr. Larsen recalled that the SMMA work was an analysis of the facilities space only.

Mr. Kelley noted the MSBA's recommendations for school size per student. Mr. Gauldie asked whether that accounted for the special spaces discussed by Dr. Lussier. Mr. Soliva responded that he believes that area is included in the MSBA's recommendations.

Dr. Lussier stated that another desired attribute is air conditioning, indicating that Sprague is the only elementary that has air conditioning. Dr. Lussier stated that it is not a must have, but it is nice to have,

also noting that better windows would also do a good job of moderating temperatures. Dr. Gauldie asked whether site features, such as playing fields, had been taken into account. Ms. Gray indicated that site constraints do come up later with SMMA's analysis.

Dr. Lussier reviewed the key limitations of the Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham schools as indicated by administrators: Hardy - lack of specialized spaces for music, art, world language; lack of specialized space for student support; gym not available during 90-minute lunch blocks; stage is used for storage, lack of access/site lines of entrance to main office; undersized and outdated modulars. Hunnewell - undersized classrooms, poor building circulation, lack of specialized spaces, gym not available during 90-minute lunch, stage is used for storage, access/site lines of entrance to main office, outdated classrooms doors/some do not lock, 2 undersized/outdated modulars. Upham - Single K class this year, sharing specialists with other schools, handicap accessibility – no elevator, lack of specialized spaces for student support, gym not available during 90-minute lunch, lack of storage, 2 undersized and outdated modulars.

Ms. Shanahan asked Dr. Lussier whether additional classrooms could be opened if there were more students. Dr. Lussier responded in the affirmative. Ms. Calderwood asked Dr. Lussier what he was predicting in terms of kindergarten sections at Upham for the next school year. Dr. Lussier stated that they were predicting two classrooms. Dr. Lussier stated that Upham draws more kids because of a special autism program. Dr. Lussier explained the open enrollment policy.

Mr. Stern asked Dr. Lussier whether there are models that he has studied that he thinks are phenomenal. Dr. Lussier referenced the new field school in Weston, indicating that it does a lot of things really well and is the type of school that we would want to take a look at if designing new schools. Dr. Gauldie asked whether there are resources that the Committee can look at offline. Dr. Lussier responded that none come to mind, but that he will look into that. Mr. Larsen asked whether the MSBA has identified an elementary model. Dr. Lussier responded that it was something they can look into as well.

Dr. Lussier asked the Committee if there were any questions, concerns, or feedback. Dr. Lussier stated that despite impediments, he is proud of the School's team, that they don't just make the best of it, they thrive.

Responding to an earlier comment, Ms. Gray stated that the MSBA does list models for elementary schools, including in Dover.

Mr. Port asked whether the Committee could be provided with existing numbers of classrooms and total number of rooms, also stating that he assumes there are empty classrooms. Dr. Lussier responded that at present there are no empty classrooms. Mr. Ahn asked that the Committee be provided with a data sheet for each building prior to the school tours. Dr. Lussier responded that this was a good idea and that they would provide that information.

Discussing the School's Strategic Plan, Dr. Lussier discussed changes and evolution of school spaces, the long term vision in terms of programming, and explained how the evolution in program should drive

how spaces will be designed. Dr. Lussier noted that programming needs change, and that it is important to think about doing things differently. Mr. Morgan stated that flexibility was of paramount importance.

Dr. Gauldie, speaking to the Committee's architects, asked whether using modular building was feasible, whether it could be scaled. Mr. Soliva responded that modular was still a fixed dimension, but that if you keep adding, certain things can be manipulated. Mr. Soliva continued that you could plan for larger classrooms, or spaces that can be subdivided. Mr. Gauldie asked, in terms of prefab housing, whether that extends into schools that can be added over time. Ms. Pfadt responded that this deals with phasing, but that modularity is, in a sense, temporary. Ms. Pfadt stated that even phasing may cause disruption. Ms. Pfadt noted that modular building is a great concept, but that the underlying units need to be driven down the road.

Ms. Sullivan asked Dr. Gauldie if he was asking in terms of accelerated construction. Dr. Gauldie stated that he was asking in terms of feasibility, suggesting that modularity could expand if needed. Mr. Ahn stated that modular, if it is a temporary solution, is good, but traditional construction will have a 100-year lifespan. Mr. Soliva stated that you need to have a master plan, a site plan strategy. Mr. Larsen stated that he supports the concept of modular construction, but observed that the MSBA is not utilizing this. Mr. Kelley stated that there is one company called Project Frog that came up in School Facilities Committee meetings. Mr. Soliva stated that modular construction is used in Europe, but that it is very difficult to adjust modularity, and education is very malleable, it changes. Dr. Lussier referenced the construction of the High School, noting that the project was designed with the house model in mind, with hubs for students at each floor, and that the project was designed for this model.

Mr. Larsen asked Dr. Lussier if he would like to recap the Strategic Plan. Dr. Lussier indicated that the Plan is a 5-year plan, now 3 years into the Plan. The major themes were 1.) support for all students, 2.) support for people, invest in the development of educators, 3.) program changes, such as the curriculum, full day kindergarten, use of technology, etc..., and 4.) resources - management of resources, facilities, budgets. Dr. Lussier stated that they remain anxious about the budget not keeping pace with needs, and that a significant amount of cost has been transferred onto parents in the form of fees. Mr. Lussier views public education as a responsibility of the entire community, and the cost transfer has created equity gaps. Dr. Lussier stated that they are making progress on bringing more of these costs back into budget.

Mr. Larsen confirmed that the Strategic Plan would be posted to the HHU webpage.

Mr. Larsen stated that for the next meeting they would provide an information sheet for all of the buildings. Mr. Zehner asked whether the names of additional consultants for the enrollment study should be sent to Dr. Lussier and Ms. Belliveau. Mr. Larsen responded in the affirmative.

### **Citizen Speak**

Mr. Larsen asked for public comments. Amy McCarron from Lawrence Road asked to speak. Ms. McCarron stated that desired elementary school attributes were presented at the meeting, noting that she prefers kids to have separate gyms and cafeteria and that there be handicap accessibility. However,

Ms. McCarron stated that she questioned other attributes, such as the 3 to 4 section school. Ms. McCarron stated that this was not preferred by parents, kids, or teachers. Ms. McCarron stated that the solutions were less about buildings and more about great teachers. Ms. McCarron stated that when Sprague was built it was recommended to be a 4 section school, but that this was rejected by residents of the Town. Ms. McCarron stated that the buildings are for kids, not the convenience of adults.

Michelle Shaw of Bay View Road asked to speak. Ms. Shaw noted that her family just moved to Wellesley last week, that they have twin 3 year olds. Ms. Shaw stated that they moved to the Hardy District because it is a school with great diversity, and as a parent of minorities, it will be great to have diversity in schools. Ms. Shaw stated that she wants that experience for her children, and that they also like to walk to school. Ms. Shaw stated that she is new to Town, but that something that she is worried about is pulling more kids into fewer schools. Ms. Shaw stated that she spent several years in Washington DC as a statistician, and wondered whether the RFP had been posted on the website and whether it was an open and public process for soliciting responses. Mr. Larsen explained the procurement process. Ms. Shaw stated that she would be interested in seeing the RFP and information on the website, noting that she knows a lot of shops in Washington DC that would be interested in responding. Mr. Larsen and Dr. Lussier confirmed that they would verify that it was posted on the website.

Catherine Johnson asked to speak, stating that while she is a member of the Planning Board, she is speaking as a realtor. Ms. Johnson stated that she brings people to Wellesley and introduces them to the Town. Ms. Johnson thanked Ms. Shaw, noting that she had been in Town for one week and she was already in the Great Hall. Ms. Johnson stated that the elephant in the room that she encourages the Committee to study is enrollment, that it is really difficult to project right now given the lack of stability. Ms. Johnson referenced the numerous teardowns, that it is difficult to know who is moving in. Ms. Johnson encouraged the Committee to question the consultant and have them consider trends. Ms. Johnson also suggested that the consultant look at what is offline, the development opportunities that are not known. Ms. Johnson stated that she can see what is brand new, and that there are a lot of houses from 2014 that haven't been sold yet. Ms. Johnson state that she also believes the consultant will need to look at where houses are being built, noting that teardowns are not evenly distributed around Town.

Mr. Larsen asked for additional comments.

### **Adjourn**

Hearing no additional comments, Mr. Larsen asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Morgan moved to adjourn. Ms. Gray seconded the motion. The Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm.**