

School Building Committee – DRAFT Minutes
March 21, 2019
Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall

Present: Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Joubin Hassanein, Meghan Jop, Matt Kelley, Matt King, 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: Ryan Hutchins

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

Member Reports

Ms. Gray welcomed Executive Director Meghan Jop back to the SBC, noting that the Board of Selectmen and the School Committee had both voted to approve her as a member of the SBC.

Ms. Gray circulated for committee member signatures the final *Report of the SBC to Annual Town Meeting*.

Mr. Ulfelder reported that project team members recently made a presentation concerning parking and the Cameron Street lot to the Board of Selectmen (BOS). He noted that the BOS has control of the Cameron Street lot but has agreed to include it for consideration as part of the Hunnewell project. Mr. Ulfelder said the BOS posed questions on space projections and other matters that will need to be addressed, but had a positive response to the presentation. Ms. Gray asked if a Cameron Street lot project would be a separate project from the Hunnewell School project. Mr. Ulfelder said the BOS was evaluating options for bringing a project forward.

Hunnewell Project

Review Preliminary Full Project Schedules

Mr. D’Amico distributed a detailed *Hunnewell Hardy Upham Schedule Comparison (Draft)* and displayed a slide showing project timelines.

Mr. D’Amico said that if design funding is approved for the Hunnewell project in Fall 2019, the project schedule could be:

Winter 2019-Summer 2021 - Design, permitting and bidding
Summer 2021-Summer 2023 - Construction
Fall 2023 – School Open

Mr. D’Amico said that if design funding is approved for a Cameron lot project in Fall 2019, the project schedule would be shorter with design/bidding in 2020 and construction in 2021.

In response to a question by Mr. Kelley, Mr. D'Amico said that the Hunnewell and Cameron construction schedules should not overlap too much but some overlap, for several months as shown on the slide, could be accommodated.

Mr. D'Amico said that the schedule for the Hardy/Upham Project could be:

2020-2022 - Design, permitting and bidding
Summer 2022 - Summer 2024 - Construction
Fall 2024 – School Open

Mr. D'Amico said that if there is a “Late Hunnewell” project that utilizes as swing space the building available after the completion of the Hardy/Upham project, the schedule could be:

2022-2024 – Design, permitting/bidding
Summer 2024 - Summer 2026 – Construction
Fall 2026 – School Open

Review Swing Space Concept Progress

Ms. Gray noted that swing space is a major challenge for school projects that typically take about two years to construct. She reviewed a list of frequently asked questions about swing space, including:

- What is swing space?
- Why not build a new school behind Hunnewell?
- Why not place modulars on the Hunnewell site?
- Why doesn't the town rent the old St. Paul's School?
- Why not wait until the Hardy/Upham project is complete?
- With declining enrollment, why not consolidate now and use the closed school as swing space?

Ms. Gray then reviewed School Committee Guidance to the SBC (August 2017), which included:

- Limit disruption to students to the extent possible
- Keep cohorts of students together. Ideally:
 - Keep entire Hunnewell population together, or
 - Break up into two groups of students, but keep grade cohorts together
- Redistricting: Each child should face no more than one school community transition, if at all feasible
- Elementary school classrooms are currently fully utilized
 - “Scattering” Hunnewell students across the District not supported by SC
 - TLC program requires careful consideration
- School Committee to revisit swing space guidance in early 2019
- School Committee must review and approve any swing space option

Mr. D'Amico reviewed the swing space concepts that have been considered by the SBC and former committees, all of which have been reviewed and re-evaluated by the project team in this phase of the project.

The swing space options considered but found to be not viable include:

- Building School Behind Hunnewell or Placing Modular Classrooms on Hunnewell site; Mr. D'Amico Said that previous presentations by SMMA have shown that the size of the lot, the 200-foot riverfront setback and 100-year flood plain limit buildable space behind the school or space to accommodate modular classrooms and construction laydown requirements on site during construction.

- Phased Hunnewell construction; Mr. D'Amico said that the shape of the current school does not lend itself to being broken down in sections that would allow for efficient phased construction that would not dramatically extend the duration and increase the cost of construction.

- Use of Warren Building; Mr. D'Amico said that this building could not accommodate the entire Hunnewell population, would require displacement of Town departments and zoning restrictions limit on-site parking.

- Use of Hillside School in Needham; Mr. D'Amico said Needham is using this school for swing space and is not amendable to making it available for this project.

- Borrowing space from nearby colleges and private schools; Mr. D'Amico reported that inquiries to colleges and private schools about use of buildings or land has not had a positive response.

- New School on Cameron Street Lot; Mr. D'Amico said that the narrow lot would require a long, linear school that is not in keeping with the desired educational layout and having streets on three sides of the school would create issues for access to fields and for pickup and drop off of students.

- Renovating St. Paul's School; Mr. D'Amico noted that ADA issues would require substantial renovation to a building the town does not own and a Chapter 30 lease would require a lengthy permitting process.

- Using classrooms at Village Church; Mr. D'Amico said that only one floor was available and would accommodate less than half of the students. Additionally, there are challenges with circulation, access and security.

- Modular school at North 40 or Morses Pond; Mr. D'Amico said that pending master planning on the North 40 makes that site unavailable and substantial upfront costs would be incurred for utilities at either of these sites to support a modular assembly. Additionally, Morses Pond's months of use overlaps with some school months.

- Modulares at Cameron Street Lot; Mr. D'Amico said that modulares could fit on the Cameron lot but that parent pick up and drop off and deliveries would result in difficult traffic issues

- Modulares at Fiske/Bates; Mr. D'Amico said that all elementary school sites were investigated as potential modular sites.

Space and circulation issues at Bates and Fiske made those sites not viable.

- “Scattering” students to fill spaces around District;

Mr. D’Amico said this option of placing students individually in other elementary schools during construction would result in a loss of Hunnewell school identity and is not favored by the school committee.

- Middle and High School classrooms;

Mr. D’Amico said there is not sufficient capacity at these schools.

Mr. D’Amico said that the swing space options currently under consideration are:

- Modular School/Classrooms at Sprague Site;

Mr. D’Amico said that there is room to place modulares on the current parking lot; parking could occur on the grass field.

- Modular half schools at Sprague & Schofield;

Mr. D’Amico said that there are logistical challenges related to traffic and parking involved in locating a half modular school at Schofield.

- Waiting until Hardy/Upham opens: Two Schools on one site;

Mr. D’Amico said that this option would use the vacated school on the site of the new Hardy or Upham for Hunnewell swing space. There would be logistical challenges to be worked out after the design of the new building is determined. Additionally, this option would result in a three year delay in the opening of a new Hunnewell, which would open in 2026, and result in escalation costs of approximately \$10M of which \$9M is based on an average school cost of \$55M escalated up by 5% on construction costs and a lesser multiplier on soft costs. The additional \$1M is the escalation cost associated with pausing the H/U MSBA project during the swing space use of the old building on site and resuming work after the new Hunnewell is complete (for demolition, abatement and remaining site work).

- Waiting until Hardy/Upham opens: Redistrict plus mods on closed Hardy or Upham site;

Mr. D’Amico said this option assumes redistricting would go forward when the H/U MSBA building opens and the mothballed school would be used for swing space. Approximately 6 rented modulares and associated site preparation and removal would be required at a total escalated cost of \$12M.

In response to questions by Mr. Kelley, Mr. D’Amico said these cost estimates do not include busing costs or other district operational costs. The MSBA typically likes to close projects rapidly and he does not know what their response would be to pausing completion of the H/U project to allow for use as swing space. It could potentially jeopardize funding for the abatement and demolition phase of the project.

Mr. Soliva asked if swing space modulares behind Hardy had been considered. Mr. D’Amico said this option would result in a delay of one year in the H/U project if Hardy is selected for the MSBA project due to an overlap in construction schedules. If modulares were placed on the site sooner it could impact options for designing a new building on the Hardy site and create an unreasonably congested site during construction there.

Mr. D'Amico displayed a slide detailing potential schedules, as described earlier in the meeting but also showing a potential Town Meeting and debt exclusion vote for "Early Hunnewell" in the Spring 2021 and Spring 2024 for "Late Hunnewell". If modular are selected as the swing space option for "Early Hunnewell", the design, permitting and bidding for them would occur Fall 2019-Sept 2021.

Dr. Lussier pointed out that "Early Hunnewell" would open more than four years from now and "Late Hunnewell" would open seven years from now. Not modeled in the estimates are the investments in the existing Hunnewell building that will be required until a new school opens. Mr. D'Amico noted that the "Late Hunnewell" option presents similar issues with maintaining the closed school needed for swing space.

Ms. Jop asked if the \$7-8M cost estimate for modulars as swing space at Sprague for two years included any adjustment for costs that could be recouped at the end of their use. Mr. D'Amico said that the costs he reported assumed a lease and that he had not done a cost/benefit analysis for purchasing modulars. He said that he was told the salvage value might be low unless there was a buyer with the same specific needs.

Mr. D'Amico presented a slide showing a potential layout of modulars to accommodate approximately 256 Hunnewell students on the existing Sprague School parking lot. He noted that finding a configuration of modulars to create a large open area to serve as a multipurpose room for use as a cafeteria, gymnasium and indoor recess area is challenging. Modulars have low ceilings so some activity would be restricted. He next presented a slide showing a potential siting of the modulars long with a circulation pattern and parking on the existing grass field which would be returned to a grass field at the end of the project. The field would not be available for sports for two years. Ms. Gray said that the Playing Fields Task Force will provide information about that impact as well as the impacts of temporarily losing the use of fields at Hardy or Upham if those sites are used in a swing space option.

Mr. D'Amico said that if either swing space option that involves operating two schools on one campus is chosen there should, ideally, be separation of parent pick-up and drop-off, either accessing different roads or different traffic loops on site. He displayed a slide showing the layout of co-located schools from another project SMMA was involved with.

Mr. D'Amico said that in a three school "Late Hunnewell" swing space option the new MSBA H/U school would be used to accommodate 280 students in 12 classrooms with an additional 2 classrooms for the TLC program, old Hardy would accommodate 240 students in 12 classrooms and Old Upham would accommodate 210 students in 12 classrooms. The cost of this would be approximately \$10M.

Mr. D'Amico said that a two school "Late Hunnewell" swing space option would require redistricting. The new MSBA H/U school would be fully utilized to accommodate 365 students in 18 classrooms and either the old Hardy or Old Upham would accommodate 365 students in 12 existing classrooms and 6 modular classrooms. The cost of this would be approximately \$12M. (\$9 million escalation and \$3 million for the modular classrooms and related site work).

Mr. D'Amico said that an additional option under consideration is exploring the use of existing spaces in all elementary schools to determine if there is capacity to house Hunnewell students in grade level cohorts and staff for two years.

Ms. Ferko asked if operational savings associated with the two-school “Late Hunnewell” option had been estimated. Mr. Hassanein said those cost savings would not be insignificant. Mr. Ulfelder suggested it would be useful to have a thoughtful response from FMD about any savings since there would still be costs associated with maintaining the mothballed school.

Mr. Soliva asked when a decision on the site of the H/U MSBA project would be made and if once, that decision was made, if the site not selected could be another option for locating swing space modulars. Ms. Gray said that the schedule assumes completion of the feasibility study in Spring 2020. Mr. D’Amico said at some time after that the MSBA needs to approve the preferred options to move forward to schematic design. Mr. Gagosian pointed out that waiting until Spring 2020 would result in a delay in the design and permitting for an early Hunnewell project.

Ms. Andrews asked if splitting the Hunnewell population between modulars at Sprague and Schofield was still under consideration. Mr. Pitkin said that option increased the cost and it would be a question for SBC if it wanted to pursue it further. Ms. Andrews said that this option might reduce the traffic impact at any one site and asked if School Committee had thoughts on it. Ms. Gray asked Mr. Pitkin to include that option in the next presentation along with information on costs, including transportation. In response to a question by Ms. Sawitsky, Dr. Lussier said that this option would still not allow for use of the host school’s gym and/or cafeteria for Hunnewell students.

Mr. King suggested that costs of upgrading and extending utilities be included in cost estimates.

Ms. Gray noted that this discussion has been about viable concepts that are being developed and there are no full proposals yet. More information will be presented at the next few meetings.

Ms. Andrews suggested it was important to identify a date for a public forum. Ms. Gray said that the weeks after April school vacation were under consideration.

Review Updated Design Progress

Mr. Pitkin reviewed the design options under consideration.

Mr. Pitkin said that the Addition/Renovation options each have their unique challenges.

Option B, with the gymnasium on the Wellesley Free Library side of the building was not popular with school users, after-school users and Wellesley Free Library representatives, all preferring that the active gym zone as well as the cafeteria be closer to the play zones on the south and east side of the site.

Option A has the gym and cafeteria sited closer to outdoor opportunities but the challenge of how to build a large structure and attach it to the 1938 building remains.

Mr. Pitkin presented an updated version of Option A. This version pushes the new structure back on the site, which he believes in an improvement architecturally. This version shows retention of the oak tree but Mr. Pitkin said if the oak tree is not retained there would be the opportunity for outdoor learning space to be created in that space. Mr. Pitkin said that the retained 1938 structure would be the school main entrance and would be opened up to allow more open, transparent circulation through the building, including an open commons/dining area. This version pushes some of the academic learning areas back, but Mr. Pitkin believes

more work can be done to pull them back in a bit. In this option, the administration can be located more deeply into the building, close to the gymnasium and cafetorium. Art, music and STEAM are together close to the front door, more remote from the academic areas than is desired. On the second floor the library is in the center of the floor plan and the academic spaces are back toward the quiet side of the building. After- hours access to the gym could be made secure and the loading location is similar to where it is now.

Mr. Pitkin explained that this version of Option A moves the structure into the setback and that may be the compromise to retain the 1938 structure, with or without the tree. Lot coverage is approximately 25%.

Ms. Gray asked how we would alter this option if setback relief is not available. Mr. Pitkin replied that some of the massing could be moved forward, probably not enough to be entirely within setbacks but probably enough to meet disturbed area requirements.

Mr. Soliva noted that the fallback to this Addition/Renovation option, if relief is not granted in a compromise to save the 1938 structure or the oak tree, would be entirely new construction.

In response to a question by Mr. Soliva, Ms. Quirk said that the location of art, music and STEAM rooms in this option is not ideal because it does not minimize transition time. The outdoor space at the front of the building is also not ideal for security and safety.

Mr. Ulfelder pointed out that other issues identified by educators with this option include concern about classrooms facing the library lot, long distances between the administrative space and the academic areas and that this option pushes back into the back play area and creates green space in front of the building, which from an educational and safety perspective is not useful.

Mr. Pitkin next reviewed updates to New Construction Option C, which he said reflects work that has been done to eliminate dead-end corridors and to be more aware of solar orientation. The angle of the updated option results in more regularity to the shared spaces within the learning commons and more classrooms with exposure on two sides. The location of the warming kitchen and service area remain a challenge with some consideration being given to a second area for limited food service related delivery. The main service dock, utilities and maintenance would be on the north side, as Mr. Pitkin said, is appropriate. Mr. Pitkin said that this version also maintains after-hours security and introduces the concept of a learning stair as another gathering area. The media center, art, music and STEAM are on the second floor overlooking the front of the building and adjacent to academic areas in back. This option may allow mechanicals in a second floor penthouse, preserving roof space for photovoltaics.

Mr. Pitkin reported that lot coverage for this version of Option C is approximately 24%.

Ms. Gray asked the educators provide their response to the updates to this Option. Ms. Quirk replied that she likes the site lines from the administrative area. She noted that the orientation of the building toward the neighborhood is a positive and will allow an attractive entrance. She said traffic flow within the building will be much improved with this option and access in and out of the building will be easy. She is intrigued by location of the STEAM room next to the media center and the location of art and music on the second floor. Mr. Pitkin reminded that there are options and time to work on the location of these spaces.

Dr. Lussier said this orientation allows for inside/outside school community gatherings and easy access for after-hours activities. He observed that this option is efficient and compact.

Mr. Soliva returned to the Addition/Renovation option and asked what adjustments Mr. Pitkin anticipates making. Mr. Pitkin replied that he would continue to explore moving the building mass forward. He said open space exposed in front of the building could be defended by a wall or fence.

Review and Approve February Invoices for Compass Project Management and SMMA.

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from Compass Project Management for work in February 2019.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve invoice #CPM 69-08 in the amount of \$15,530. Dr. Lussier seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from SMMA for work from January 26, 2019- February 22, 2019. He said that he and Mr. D'Amico had reviewed and approved the invoice.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA invoice #5042430 in the amount of \$56,940. Mr. Soliva seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Compass Estimating Amendment

Mr. Kennedy distributed Amendment No. 02 to the contract with Compass Project Management to provide a second set of cost estimates and estimate reconciliation between SMMA and Compass estimators numbers.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the Owners Project Manager Proposal Amendment #02, total value of the amendment is \$14,520 for a revised total fee of \$212,418. Ms. Jop seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Hardy/Upham Project

Transfers to Other Town Accounts

Mr. Elliot distributed two Departmental Transfer Memos for review and approval. The first was a transfers to charge SBC \$92.49 for food for the OPM interview meeting. The second was to charge SBC \$58.39 for Federal Express charges to return OPM responses that were received late.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve transfers between town accounts, as described, in the amount of \$150.88. Mr. Hassanein seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Compass Project Management Contract

Committee members received a copy of the contract electronically. It has been accepted by the MSBA, reviewed by Town Counsel and the PBC. The Board of Selectmen's approval and signature of the BOS chair is required.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to recommend approval of the Compass Project Management contract for the Hardy/Upham project. Matt King seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Designer Request for Services (RFS) and Review Selection Schedule

Mr. D'Amico said that the MSBA requested a longer period of time for designers to respond to the RFS. An updated Designer Selection Timeline for the Upham/Hardy Elementary School Project was distributed reflecting a response deadline of May 1, 2019.

The MSBA Designer Selection Board meeting is scheduled for June 4. If a short-list of designers is selected at that meeting, interviews will be conducted on June 18.

Wellesley's three representatives for this meeting will be discussed further at a future meeting.

A draft of the Request for Designer Services (RFS) for Ernest F. Upham Elementary School has been provided to the MSBA for comment. MSBA will release its formal comments following receipt of the signed OPM Contract. One substantive MSBA comment was that insurance limits be no less than the MSBA requirement of \$2M per occurrence/\$2M aggregate.

Ms. Jop moved to accept the Request for Designer Services contingent on a change in the insurance language to provide limits of \$2M per occurrence/\$3M aggregate. Mr. Ulfelder seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

At approximately 7:50 p.m., upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and a second by Mr. King, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

Documents and Exhibits Used

- Final SBC Report to Annual Town Meeting
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 3/21/2019
- Wellesley Hunnewell Hardy Upham Schedule Comparison Scenarios- Draft for Review and Comment
- Compass Project Management Invoice # CPM 69-08 and related Invoice Review Memo from Kevin Kennedy
- SMMA Project Invoice: # 50424 (\$56,940) and related Invoice Review memo from Compass Project Management
- Owners Project Manager Proposal Amendment #02 and related correspondence
- Contract with Compass Project Management, Inc. for Project Management Services
- Designer Selection Timeline Upham/Hardy Elementary School Project (updated)
- Draft Request for Designer Services (RFS) for Ernest F. Upham Elementary School