

**School Building Committee – DRAFT Minutes
February 27, 2019
Kingsbury Room, Wellesley Police Station**

Present: Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Matt Kelley, David Lussier, Ellen Quirk, Heather Sawitsky, Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Dick Elliot, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Alex Pitkin of SMMA; Kristen Olsen of SMMA, Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management.
Absent: Joubin Hassanein, Ryan Hutchins, Matt King, Blythe Robinson, Cynthia Mahr, Charlene Cook, Jeffery Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being aired live by Wellesley Media and is being recorded for later viewing.

Citizen Speak

No one came forward for Citizen speak.

SBC Business

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Kelley moved that the School Building Committee approve the minutes of 1/17/2019. Mr. Gagosian seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Member Reports

Ms. Gray announced that given Executive Director Blythe Robinson’s departure, a position is open on the SBC. Her position will need to be filled by the School Committee and the Board of Selectmen in accordance with MSBA rules. Ms. Gray said that the SBC has appreciated Ms. Robinson’s contributions and wishes her well.

Ms. Gray reported that the School Committee began a discussion of redistricting that will be required as part of the MSBA project process. SC tentatively plans to lay the groundwork this spring to gear up for the process in the fall. The groundwork will include determining a process, including checking in with the MSBA to further understand their requirements.

Ms. Gray distributed her written responses to recent emails to the SBC and invited members of the committee to share any feedback with her. She noted that that Mr. Ulfelder assists with responses to SBC correspondence.

Ms. Ferko reported that at the last meeting of the Subcommittee on Communication and Outreach the members reviewed Ms. Gray’s draft SBC report to Annual Town Meeting. She said a Sprague parent attended Citizen Speak to encourage the SBC to communicate more widely with the school community when issues for discussion affect schools other than the HHU schools.

Hardy/Upham Project

MSBA Update

Mr. Elliot distributed a *Designer Selection Timeline for the Hardy/Upham Project* and a draft *Request for Designer Services (RFS)*.

Mr. Elliot said that a draft RFS will be shared with the MSBA and the MSBA's comments will be shared with the SBC at its March 21 meeting. Mr. D'Amico suggested that SBC member comments regarding the RFS be sent to Mr. Elliot within one week so that a draft may be delivered to the MSBA in time to receive timely feedback. Mr. Kelley suggested that any feedback from the MSBA be shared with the SBC prior to the March 21 meeting. Ms. Gray clarified that edits to the RFS may be made by the SBC at the March 21 meeting and submitted to the MSBA for its final approval.

Mr. Elliot further reviewed the Designer Selection Timeline. Mr. Elliot noted that the timeline presumes a May 21, 2019 MSBA Designer Selection Panel (DSP) Meeting date with interviews conducted by that panel, if necessary, at its June 4, 2019 meeting.

Mr. D'Amico said that the OPM will provide more detail on the designer selection process at the next SBC meeting. He noted that the MSBA's DSP will rank designer proposals and if the rankings are close it may schedule interviews. If there is a clear winner based on rankings the DSP may not conduct designer interviews. Ms. Gray clarified that the SBC will need to decide at its next meeting which SBC members will serve on the DSP and asked what further process the SBC should engage in to provide input on the designer selection. Mr. D'Amico said that the OPM will further advise on that process. Mr. Gagosian noted that he believes that a representative of the Town's Chief Executive Officer (Board of Selectmen in this case) is one of the prescribed SBC representatives to the DSP. Mr. Ulfelder said that the BOS is aware and would address this requirement in a timely manner.

Ms. Gray said that she, Mr. Gagosian and Mr. Elliot will attend the MSBA OPM Panel Selection meeting on Monday March 4.

Ms. Gray reported that, in response to questions at the last meeting concerning the terms of the OPM contract, supporting information was provided to the SBC by FMD. Mr. Gagosian reported that members of the PBC have copies of the contract for review. When the contract is finalized, the Board of Selectmen will authorize its chair to sign on behalf of the Town.

Hunnewell Project

Project Invoices

Mr. Kennedy distributed an invoice from SMMA for work in January 2019 which he reported has been reviewed by Mr. D'Amico and an invoice from Compass Project Management for work in January 2019, which Mr. Kennedy has reviewed.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve invoice #50285 payable to SMMA in the amount of \$20,640. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve invoice #CPM 69-07 payable to Compass Project Management in the amount of \$15,530. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

SMMA Contract Amendment

Mr. Kennedy distributed proposed Amendment No. 2 to the SMMA contract in the amount of \$3,200 for arboriculture services to assess the large white oak tree on the Hunnewell site. Ms. Gray suggested that it would be helpful to have the results of this assessment prior to the next SBC meeting.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the Additional Services Amendment # 2 in the amount of \$3200 for a total revised SMMA contract fee of \$553,200. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Updated Design Progress with Site Plans

Mr. Pitkin said that SMMA has been working to advance four design options. They have been relabeled with letters for clarity: Addition/Renovation Options A/A1 and B and New Construction Options C and D.

Mr. Pitkin briefly reviewed the recent meetings that SMMA representatives have conducted, including a meeting with the Sustainable Energy Committee (SEC), a meeting with representatives of the Facilities Management Department (FMD), a meeting with SMMA's cost estimators and a meeting with the project's architecture task force.

Ms. Olsen reviewed some of the slides from the meetings with FMD and SEC. She said the focus of the meeting with FMD was on system types the FMD recommends that SMMA move forward with as it develops its energy model.

Ms. Olsen noted that although the SBC is not pursuing LEED certification for this project, SMMA is tracking the LEED scoresheet as the feasibility study progresses. Four certifications were reviewed at the meetings with SEC and FMD and Ms. Olsen said she expects the project will incorporate aspects of each given that sustainability is a priority.

Ms. Olsen said that SMMA has begun preliminary energy modeling on the four design concept options. She reviewed a slide outlining some of the preliminary assumptions that will be used in that modeling including window to wall ratios, plug loads, site lighting, light power density and preferred HVAC systems.

Ms. Olsen noted that the RFS for this project included a EUI goal of 30. She presented a EUI breakdown for a Renovation/Addition model with a predicted EUI of 26-30 and one for a New Construction model with a predicted EUI of 23-27. She noted that for both models 32% of the predicted EUI is for miscellaneous equipment which is plug load. She said that this involves how the building is actually used and may be managed in a variety of active and passive ways.

Ms. Olsen presented a slide displaying what she described as first pass preliminary numbers on the KW of PV needed to offset the project. The slide showed that an estimated facility energy use @EUI 28-30 would require 800-860 KW of PV/80,000-86,000 SF of PV. Preliminary estimates include a 20% contingency. Potential PV options on site (school roof, Cameron St. lot, Library roof) amount to an estimated 75,000 SF. She said that next steps in the analysis would be a detailed look at the roof areas to determine how much is actually viable for photovoltaic panels. That analysis will occur during schematic design.

In response to a question by Mr. Gagosian about options if enough rooftop square footage is not available for PV, Ms. Olsen said that SMMA will model geothermal gain in the next energy model. She noted that the most effective use of geothermal energy is in its application to year round energy use and it is not clear at this point how much year round use the Hunnewell building will have. Dr. Lussier noted that the schools near fields are now the ones used most in the summer and that deep cleaning of the buildings is required in the summer. He said there might be some summer rental use of Hunnewell. Ms. Olsen said that a Project Owners Requirements Document is being produced that will clarify projected building use.

In response to a question by Ms. Andrews, Mr. Pitkin explained that the difference in estimated EUI for the Addition/Renovation model and the New Construction model is due to increased square footage needed for the Addition/Renovation model and to the fact that there is a limited amount of insulation that could be added to existing walls in the renovated space, which will increase energy use somewhat there as a result.

Mr. Pitkin presented slides showing progress on the Addition/Renovation Options A & A1 and B. He said that he is working to address the question often asked: When will we know if we can use the original portions of the 1938 building in front of the larger modern aspect of the new portion of the building in a cohesive architectural plan? He has employed the strategy of trying to give the modern portion of the building a slightly different site reference than the existing 1938 structure. He said that he is convinced that the building entrance would need to be in the 1938 portion of the building if that is retained. He believes this would allow for a welcoming entrance and for pushing the administration space further into the building as has been requested.

The Addition/Renovation Option B retains the oak tree and a portion of the 1938 building and the 1950's wing. In this option the classroom neighborhoods work their way around the building and there is potential egress from the cafetorium to a play area in the back of the building or to the existing play area on the southeast side of the building. If the tree is not retained, that space on the western corner could be used as a sheltered play area. Ms. Gray asked and Mr. Pitkin clarified that the arborist retained to assess the tree would have a sketch of exactly where the building would be sited in relation to the tree.

Ms. Gray said that the front hallway in this option looks very narrow. Mr. Pitkin said there is a Palladian window in this area and options to make the front hall secure and larger and more welcoming.

Mr. Pitkin said that lot coverage calculations for all options are still a bit high but not in a concerning way at this preliminary stage. He said it is likely that approximately 15 parking spaces will be available on site.

Mr. Pitkin presented a slide depicting the massing of Option B and the parking area. Mr. Pitkin said that he thinks there will be a lot of free roof area for PV, even on with the addition/renovation options.

Mr. Pitkin presented a floor plan of Addition/Renovation Option A without the 1950 music room addition. Some additional new square footage is shown for the service area. He said that a problem with this option remains the entry that bifurcates the gymnasium and cafetorium, requiring entrance to the building between those two spaces.

Mr. Pitkin then presented a floor plan of Addition/Renovation Option A1 that disconnects the gymnasium and cafetorium, placing the cafetorium at the rear of the building. A problem with this option may be the placement of the classrooms that wrap around the library lot side of the building. Dr. Lussier said that a positive aspect of having the cafetorium as placed in this option is the sight lines from the cafetorium to the outdoor play spaces. Ms. Quirk said she liked the clear sight lines from the cafetorium to the play space and the gymnasium on the quiet side, but she was concerned about the visual distraction for the classrooms on the library lot side of the building. Mr. Kelley asked if Dr. Lussier or Ms. Quirk viewed the distance of the 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms from art or music rooms and the nurse to be an issue. Ms. Quirk suggested that this floor plan might create a dead end and bottleneck at that spot in the hallway that could

create a distraction for other learning spaces. Dr. Lussier wondered about the security of after-hours access to the cafetorium in this option. Mr. Pitkin said there could be a hallway lock down.

Mr. Gagosian pointed out that the separation of the cafetorium and gymnasium is a new design element here and it is important that the school department make clear whether than is programmatically acceptable.

Addition/Renovation Option A1 does not retain the tree but maintains outdoor space in that area to help maintain some visual separation between the 1938 building and the larger mass of new construction behind it, which Mr. Pitkin thinks will be necessary.

Mr. Pitkin presented a slide showing examples of new construction additions behind smaller older buildings, as would be the case if portions of the 1938 Hunnewell building were retained. He noted that the Sprague School is an example of a new construction addition to a smaller older building, but in that case the retained structure is on a higher elevation than the new construction and therefore both sections of the school visually stand alone.

Mr. Pitkin said that an urban design approach is often to save only the façade of an older building and to build behind it, but this building does not lend itself to that approach. Mr. Pitkin expressed some reservations about pushing new construction too snugly up against the old building here.

Mr. Pitkin then presented slides depicting the development of New Construction Options C and D.

New Construction Option C would remove the 1938 building and the oak tree. The building entrance and massing are oriented toward the neighborhood. As currently drawn this plan would require setback relief, but Mr. Pitkin said those issues might be resolved as the design is further developed and further calculations are made.

Mr. Kelley ask Dr. Lussier and Ms. Quirk if they prefer the cafetorium or the gymnasium to open directly to outdoor play areas and he asked Mr. Pitkin if the location of the gymnasium and cafetorium could be swapped in this option. Mr. Pitkin said it might be possible but that there would be an impact on the location of the media center on the second story which he has currently placed above the cafetorium. He said that nothing would be built over the gymnasium.

Dr. Lussier said he likes this option but would still like to see direct access and site lines from the cafetorium to the outdoor play spaces.

Mr. Gagosian said there is a strong conceptual organizing geometry to this option's design. The vertical aspects tie into the civic buildings nearby and the soft bend of the building relates to the street and the neighborhood.

Ms. Andrews said that the strength of this option is the orientation facing the woods and the brook.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the orientation of this option is a strong foundation for the type of sustainability goals we are trying to achieve.

Dr. Lussier said that the car circulation plan as drawn is very close to the cafetorium egress.

Mr. Pitkin said those lines are preliminary and could be reworked to a gentler bend, similar to what is there now.

Mr. Gagosian asked if the curb cut could be moved further south and Mr. Pitkin replied that there are some mature trees there but it is possible to explore, noting the existing playground could move. He did not think there are grade issues there.

Ms. Quirk said she would prefer to avoid the deep circular drive.

Dr. Lussier asked if the gym could be moved forward in this option with the cafetorium behind it. Mr. Pitkin said that would create a U-shaped plan. He will look at that.

Mr. Pitkin presented slides depicting New Construction Option D and noted that this option features a lot of open space on the west side of the site, whether or not the oak tree may be retained there. He noted that this option does not provide the preferred visibility from the cafetorium.

Mr. D'Amico asked for guidance as to what the SBC would like from SMMA to further illustrate the massing of a new construction addition behind a renovated 1938 building in an Addition/Renovation option. Mr. Gagosian suggested, and the committee generally agreed, that it would be most helpful for Mr. Pitkin to further illustrate the massing for the A/A1 Option since that option presents the most challenge.

Mr. D'Amico said that at the next SBC meeting there will be an initial discussion of cost estimates. Currently the cost estimating is in the SMMA contract. Mr. D'Amico asked if the SBC would like Compass to pursue a proposal for a parallel set of estimates so that at the end of the feasibility study we have two sets of numbers to define the cost estimate before going to Town Meeting for design funds. He noted that for the Hardy/Upham project, the MSBA will require the second set of estimates. Mr. Gagosian said he thought it was worth it to authorize Compass to come back to SBC with an amendment for second cost estimates for the building. Mr. D'Amico asked if SBC would also like second estimates for the Cameron St. parking improvements and swing space. Mr. Ulfelder and Ms. Freiman said that both would be useful to have before Annual Town Meeting since questions may be asked about the numbers included in the Town-Wide Financial Plan. Mr. D'Amico said that given the general expression of agreement he would proceed at risk for now with the second estimates, understanding subsequent formal approval will be required, and will have estimates to present at the March 21 SBC meeting.

Review Parking Concept Progress

Mr. Pitkin reviewed the existing parking available for Hunnewell School use noting that there are 61 total available spaces (36 on the Hunnewell lot, 5 in the Library lot and 20 in the Cameron St. lot). He said that approximately 82 spaces will be needed in the future. Assuming approximately 15 spaces produced on the Hunnewell site and 5 in the Library lot, 62 spaces in the Cameron St. lot would be needed. This would be almost half of the existing 137 Cameron St. lot spaces.

Mr. Pitkin presented a Cameron St. lot parking deck option with 224 parking spaces on two levels. This option would include a buffer areas along Washington Street and be naturally ventilated. PV coverage could be on a simple roof with a system to capture rain water.

Mr. Ulfelder suggested, to avoid confusion, that spaces in the main library lot no longer be listed on graphics related to Hunnewell parking needs since those are not available for school use.

Ann-Mara Lanza, a member of the Board of Library Trustees, said that the library needs all of its available parking, and more, for its patrons.

Review Swing Space Concept Progress

Mr. Pitkin presented a single site modular school plan, including a multi-purpose space, and a diagram of a potential layout of the plan on the parking area of the Sprague School site. He noted that the stormwater retention system under that parking area would not preclude the placement of modulares there, but that the placement of the foundation would need to be thoroughly thought through. SMMA will carry the more expensive foundation option in the budget estimates, but will evaluate whether the less expensive option of steel plates might work.

In response to an SBC request for examples of other situations in which two schools were temporarily operated on one site, Mr. Pitkin showed the site plan of two Concord elementary schools operated on one site during a construction project completed approximately 15 years ago. He said in that situation a temporary special permit was obtained to access the site over wetlands, there were staggered start and stop times for the two schools and students were primarily bused.

Ms. Sawitsky asked if there are cost estimates for this swing space option and for the option of delaying this project. Mr. Pitkin said that information is being developed.

Mr. Ulfelder asked if stock sizes could be used for the multi-purpose room to reduce cost. Mr. D'Amico said they have shown SMMA's plan to a modular supplier and are in the process of determining which components fit within their stock sizes. They will then work with SMMA to see if adjustments to the floor plan may be made to deliver the educational program using more standardized components.

Mr. Pitkin confirmed that cost estimates would include all project costs including utility costs and permitting.

Ms. Ferko asked if the School Committee and the school administration had discussed and were comfortable with an assumption of mandatory busing as part of the logistical plan for swing space. Dr. Lussier said there will need to be flexibility for any plan, and he believes the logistics will work. He said it has been a working assumption that the entire Hunnewell community would be bused to swing space. Mr. Kelley said that busing will be a feature of all the swing space options.

Ms. Sawitsky asked for clarification as to whether the Sprague gym or cafeteria would be available for use by Hunnewell students in this Sprague site swing space option. Dr. Lussier said they would not as they are fully utilized by Sprague students.

Dr. Lussier asked if a separate working group on swing space is needed both for the practical decision making process and for communications. Ms. Gray said that there is a SBC Subcommittee on Swing Space and perhaps it is time to reinstate that subcommittee and schedule some meetings.

Ms. Gray said that in response to a request by an SBC member and some members of the community, the project team explored whether redistricting in advance of construction could create a swing space option. She said that this idea would require adding modulares to Hardy and Upham to make those 18-classroom buildings and the project team determined that site constraints and the limitations of those buildings make this unworkable. Mr. Pitkin said that it

would be complicated to add modulars to these sites as they are under consideration as sites for the MSBA project.

Mr. Kelley noted that the SMMA slide has a bullet point indicating that redistricting would take 8-9 months but he said the School Committee does not expect that it would take that long.

Report of the SBC to Annual Town Meeting

Ms. Gray said that the purpose of the report is to share with Town Meeting members what the SBC has been working on and where we are in the process. Given time constraints, Ms. Gray suggested that the Subcommittee on Outreach and Communications finalize a draft. Mr. Gagosian said that SBC members may send any comments to Mr. Kennedy. Ms. Gray noted that the draft she distributed includes some edits by Mr. McDonough and therefore varies slightly from the draft previously circulated. Ms. Sawitsky said it would be helpful to include a review of any out of town sites the SBC has explored as swing space.

Mr. Ulfelder moved that the SBC authorize the Subcommittee on Communications and Outreach to make the final review and edits to the SBC Report to Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

At approximately 7:20 p.m., upon a motion by Dr. Lussier and a second by Mr. Ulfelder, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

Documents and Exhibits Used

- Minutes of the 1/17/2019 SBC meeting
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Christine Youngren
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Mark Rigel
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Catherine Johnson
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Casey Bechtel
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Britt Estwanik
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Molly Bruni
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Niki Ofenloch
- Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Joanna Troy
- Draft Request for Designer Services (RFS) for Ernest F. Upham Elementary School (2/27/2019)
- Designer Selection Timeline Upham/Hardy Elementary School Project
- SMMA Project Invoice: # 50285 (\$20,640) and related Monthly Vendor Invoice memo from Compass Project Management
- Compass Project Management Invoice # CPM 69-07 and related Invoice Review Memo from Kevin Kennedy
- SMMA Additional Services Proposal Amendment #002 (2/27/2019) for Arboriculture Services and related correspondence to Sharon Gray from SMMA
- SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 2/27/2019
- Draft SBC Report to Annual Town Meeting 2/25/2019