

School Building Committee Minutes
April 25, 2019
Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall

Present: Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Joubin Hassanein, Ryan Hutchins, Meghan Jop, Matt Kelley, David Lussier, Ellen Quirk, Heather Sawitsky, Jose Soliva, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Alex Pitkin of SMMA; Kristen Olsen of SMMA, Martine Dion of SMMA, Jeff D'Amico of Compass Project Management. **Absent:** Matt King

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. She announced that the feasibility study is expected to be completed in approximately four weeks and the intent is for SBC to recommend next steps for a new or rebuilt Hunnewell School. She noted that the location of the May 9th Public Forum has been changed to the Wellesley Middle School Auditorium.

Citizen Speak

Emma Andler and Gabrielle Gormley, kindergarten students at Hunnewell School, spoke in favor of preserving the tree. They said they think of the tree as family.

Elizabeth Lange attended Hunnewell School and is a parent of a Hunnewell student. She said that the tree is a way for people at Hunnewell to connect with nature, which, she said, is important as the town considers improving support for mental health. She said that if the tree cannot be preserved it should be repurposed. She suggested that there be a picture of the tree, a plaque with details about the tree and maybe a bench made from the tree.

Ann-Mara Lanza, member of the Wellesley Free Library Board of Trustees said that the Trustees would like another meeting soon to discuss current plans. She asked about the proposed use and impact on library patrons of a driveway connecting the school site with the library lot that is shown in recent slides. She also commented on plans discussed at the last SBC meeting for the gymnasium, suggesting that due to parking challenges the other planned new school would be more appropriate for a large gymnasium. She expressed concern about the impact of spectator parking on library patron parking, which is already challenging. Ms. Lanza said that without solving the parking problem this project is not feasible. She believes that the redevelopment of the Cameron Street lot is beyond the scope of the SBC, and needs a broader process including all relevant constituents.

Josh Dorin spoke as the liaison to the project from the Wellesley Historical Commission (WHC). He said that the WHC has an issue the design direction for the addition/renovation options as depicted on February 27 and April 4. He said that the April 4th version corrected an issue raised by the SBC related to the gymnasium/caferteria connection on February 27 but also features the oak tree, while previous versions did not, and moves the classroom wing much further back on the site. He said these changes create a sprawling floor plan that extends into the play space and encroaches more into the 200-foot riverfront. He said that Mr. Pitkin said these changes were related to the aesthetics of the building addition. Mr. Dorin said that, given the site constraints and programmatic needs and the expressed interest in a compact design, the

optimal solution for the addition/renovation design should respect these conditions. He said he believes there are aesthetic issues with the new construction option facade. Mr. Dorin distributed a floorplan image labeled "Requested scenario configuration" for the addition/renovation option. He said this handout depicts what the WHC would view as the optimal architectural solution for the addition/renovation option and the WHC would not consider the feasibility study complete without an exploration of this option.

Phyllis Theermann spoke representing Sustainable Wellesley. She said she is grateful that the SBC continues to evaluate a net zero building. She cited issues with gas pressure and leaks and asked that SBC consider a transition away from fossil fuels.

Niki Brinkman-Ofenloch, a Hunnewell parent, spoke in support of the Internal Swing Space option. She notes that there are concerns about transportation but believes if bus times could be reduced to 30-40 minutes the Hunnewell community could get behind the plan. She also addressed the issue of the tree and said if all else were equal she would support saving the tree but we have a responsibility to prioritize building the most effective and efficient school for students. Keeping the tree does not allow us to reach that goal.

Janie Penn of Bemis Road urged an option be selected that gives the 89-year-old tree a chance to survive. She said if we cannot get everything we want in the building design, that result is okay for the community.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of March 21, 2019. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried. Mr. Hutchins abstained.

Review Schedule

Mr. D'Amico distributed and reviewed a *Feasibility Study Work Plan* with a schedule describing desired outcomes and agendas for the next five SBC meetings and the public forum.

SBC Meeting 4/25 - desired outcomes are to understand: the approach to sustainability/net zero and photovoltaics; the process to conclude the study; additional information needed to make an informed decision; relative costs and the internal swing space option.

SBC Meeting 5/2 - desired outcomes are to understand: parking to be resolved with Board of Selectmen and other town boards; School Department opinion on building solution and swing space. If comfortable, vote a tentative building solution.

Public Forum 5/9 -agenda to include presentation of schedule and process, review design options and parking site plans; swing space, next steps and questions and answers.

SBC/Board of Selectmen/School Committee Joint Meeting 5/16 - desired outcomes are: to understand community feedback, including the public forum and Board of Selectmen re: parking resolution strategy and School Committee re internal swing space option; to agree on design solution for the building and swing space option.

SBC Meeting 6/6 – desired agenda to include: review draft report; discuss and vote on funding request for fall Special Town Meeting and review schedule through Town Meeting.

Mr. Gagosian said that PBC needs to buy into any final funding request to Town Meeting and will need firm proposals from the consultants. Ms. Gray said the SBC should gain clarity on when the handoff to PBC occurs and wondered if an SBC recommendation rather than final funding request would be more appropriate.

Ms. Andrews said that the information she needs most prior to a decision is community feedback and said that there should be a large amount of time at the public forum dedicated to receiving feedback.

Ms. Sawitsky said that the matrix discussed at earlier meetings that lists and ranks the values and considerations used by the SBC to arrive at decisions would be helpful for us to complete. She said it would help us make decisions and explain them to the public. Mr. D'Amico said that he intends to distribute that matrix prior to the next meeting.

Review Cost Estimates

Mr. D'Amico distributed a document entitled *Hunnewell Building Solution Conceptual Project Budget Summary* reflecting an estimated \$56,000,000 for the addition/renovation option and \$56,400,000 for the new construction option, not including the feasibility study cost of \$1.0 Million. He said that these feasibility stage estimates are based not on actual design but on narratives from the design team and historical data. The numbers assume a 12% building construction contingency, a 5% change order contingency and 0.5% soft cost contingency, 2 1/2 years of escalation and use of a construction manager at risk. He noted that costs for photovoltaics include only the arrays on the school building site, not on adjacent sites, and is larger for the new construction option due to larger roof area to install them on.

Mr. D'Amico distributed a document entitled *Swing Space Options: Conceptual Project Budget Summary* comparing costs for Internal Swing Space (\$4 Million, which includes the potential for 2 modulars and some site and design work to accommodate extra buses), Modular Full School at Sprague (\$8 Million), Modular Half School at Sprague and Schofield (\$9 Million), Late Hunnewell with no redistricting (\$10 Million), Late Hunnewell with redistricting (\$11 Million). Each scenario includes operational and staff costs for busing. The two late options assume a 4.5% escalation of building costs, which in an effort to be conservative, has been reduced from the prior estimate of 5.0 percent.

Mr D'Amico noted that the Late Hunnewell/No Redistricting option assumes a \$1 Million cost associated with delayed demolition of the old structure on the new HU school site due to its use for swing space. Mr. Hassanein asked if the potential cost of an MSBA penalty on the HU project reimbursement, due to delay in closing out that project as a result of a swing space use on site, had been factored in. Mr. D'Amico said that any potential costs associated with that possibility have not been factored in and no conversations have been had with MSBA about that.

Ms. Gray asked Ms. Jop what permitting issues might arise from the operation of two schools on one site as would be the case with one of the Late Hunnewell options. Ms. Jop said that it is likely there would need to be a temporary stay of some zoning requirements contingent upon the demolition of the school used for swing space after new Hunnewell is open and the completion of the HU project site work. There would need to be accommodation of parking and

traffic circulation for both schools. Mr. D'Amico noted that busing of Hunnewell students is assumed for all the options but that some parents will drive and that needs to be accommodated.

In response to a question by Ms. Ferko, Mr. D'Amico said that if a late Hunnewell option is selected there would be no need now for SBC to recommend one of the two late swing space options.

Discussion: Internal Swing Space

Dr. Lussier introduced Deane McGoldrick, WPS Director of Transportation, Cindy Mahr, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Ellen Quirk, Hunnewell Principal to discuss the internal swing space option.

Dr. Lussier explained that students and staff need to be off site for two school years during Hunnewell construction. A "Late" Hunnewell that waited until the HU building is complete to begin construction would open in 7 years. An "Early" Hunnewell, if a viable swing space option is found, would open in 4 years. He said an early Hunnewell is important given the existing building deficiencies and the fact that three classes of students would not benefit from the new building under the "Late" Hunnewell scenarios. Dr. Lussier said that the Internal Swing Space option may cause some disruption, but it is educationally viable. He said staff at Hunnewell is ready to go with it and have identified many positives.

Dr. Lussier described Internal Swing Space as an option that leverages space at the other 6 elementary schools to host Hunnewell students for two years while the new Hunnewell is being built. The key considerations in evaluating this option are:

- Maintain a Hunnewell identity
- Limit student transitions
- Support the TLC program
- Offer no-cost transportation, four scenarios and costs for each to be presented
- Impact of additional classes at host schools

Dr. Lussier said that the Internal Swing Space concept begins with the notion that there may be spaces available at other schools. He presented WPS internal enrollment projections that show declining enrollment at all elementary schools except Schofield, for a projected elementary enrollment decline of 164 students in SY21-22 and a total decline of 255 students by SY 22-23, for a total elementary population of 1920. Dr. Lussier noted that 10 years ago the elementary school population was 2,500.

Dr. Lussier said at Hunnewell there are projected to be about 240 students in SY 21-22 and SY 22-23. He said that an estimated 33-44 students or two classrooms per grade level to be placed at each host school. He said that by SY 22-23 the decline at each school is projected as follows: Bates -51; Fiske - 48; Hardy -19; Hunnewell -16; Schofield +2; Sprague -78 and Upham -45. Based on this there appears to be space for the Hunnewell students. He said it is possible there would be an opportunity to put four Hunnewell classrooms at one school and none at Schofield given that school's enrollment numbers.

Dr. Lussier explained how the Internal Swing Space option would work:

- Each of the six elementary schools would host one Hunnewell grade level (2 classes each unless one school was able to double up)

- Students would remain as distinct Hunnewell sections at these schools (not placed within the host school's existing sections)
- At the end of each year, the students remain and the Hunnewell teachers move across schools, limiting student transitions
- A smaller version of the TLC program would be created at each of the elementary schools
- All available classroom and specialized spaces would be evaluated

He said that all elementary school principals are on board with this option to allow a new school to come online earlier.

Discussion: Add/Reno Option

Mr. Pitkin presented a timeline detailing how the current addition/renovation option was developed.

November 2018- five variations were presented

December 2018 – Options were narrowed to three with the following shortlisting characteristics identified:

- Save most valued (front) portion of 1938 building and evaluate two-story and three-story options and an attempt to save the oak tree
- Variations on classroom neighborhood configuration
- Core educational environment on quiet side of the site
- Community use and access options
- Main entrance identity
- Service entrance location

Early January 2019 – the three-story option was still under consideration but there came clear direction that a two-story option was educationally preferred. There was also much discussion of the need to have the gymnasium and cafetorium on the west side of the site adjacent to active outdoor areas. The second shortlisting included:

- Consolidation of Options 4a and 5
- Preference for a two-story option
- Study removal of 1950's music wing
- Study without the oak tree (noting the existing stress to the tree and questions about survivability)

Late January 2019 – Option 4a/5 was presented but concerns were expressed about the location of the gymnasium and cafetorium and the configuration of the common spaces in the learning neighborhoods was not favorably received.

February 2019 – options were evaluated that encroached less on the setback and continued attempts were made to configure the entrance and to locate the cafeteria with access to active outdoor zones.

March 2019 -

- Options re-named to A & B
- Option A disapproved of the entry into cafeteria space and separation of gym and cafeteria
- Option B disapproved of gym and cafeteria on northwest side of building/site

- Option B disapproved of the geometry and location of the third neighborhood common
- Introduced hybrid to resolve the above factors
- Studied option with and without the oak tree

In February 2019 - Option A was refined to:

- respond to expressed interest by educators to tighten the floorplan
- respond to the concern that the massing of the addition was crowding the sculptural qualities of the 1938 building
- respond to the request for a larger gymnasium
- allow with or without the oak tree, limited impact on footprint if the massing premise approved

April 2019 –

Option A was reviewed again with educators and if this option is selected by SBC there will need to be more work to tightened up the floorplan and to find the right distance for the addition behind the 1938 building if the tree is preserved in the plan. The fire department has required an access road around the circumference of the building.

Ms. Andrews asked why the February version of Option A/A1 was altered since it seemed more compact. Mr. Soliva replied that the entrance with circulation that bifurcated the gym and cafeteria in that plan needed to be resolved, and the desire of the educators to move the gym and cafeteria to the brook side both triggered the modification of the plan.

Sustainability Presentation and Recommendation

Martine Dion of SMMA presented an update on sustainability. She reviewed some key considerations related to sustainability and mechanical systems for school design that differentiate it from design for other building types including:

- Ventilation requirements;
- Northeast climate, requiring heating dominant energy use and a cooling season;
- Study, design and construction duration of about 4 years. The energy code will change in that time frame narrowing the gap between the energy stretch code and net zero ready;
- User variability for a building with a life expectancy of 50 years
- Public bidding procedures;
- Complex zoning requirements; and
- More technology impacting electrical usage.

Ms. Dion then reviewed:

Hunnewell specific Net Zero Ready design strategies which include:

- Maximize envelope insulation and air tightness;
- Maximize mechanical system efficiency;
- Efficient lighting system;
- Limit or eliminate gas fuel systems for heating and cooking;
- Maximize space available for Solar PV on school rooftop; and
- Plug load reduction and management, which includes training users to optimize energy reduction.

Systems Approaches including:

- Heating/cooling sources, heating/cooling applications and ventilation sources and applications.
- The recommended base system for heating and cooling is a VRF air source heat pump.
- Analysis of an all-electric building will continue through the schematic design phase.

Ms. Dion presented a preliminary energy performance summary comparing a Net Zero Ready New Construction option and a Net Zero Ready Addition/Renovation option. She displayed results of preliminary energy model results that reflect a predicted energy use intensity (EUI) for the new construction, assuming a VRF HVAC system, of 26.4 for new construction and 28.4 for the addition/renovation option. She noted that there could be opportunity in schematic design to fine tune and reduce the EUI even further. She noted that the Request for Services for this project contained a goal EIU of 30. By way of comparison she said that ground source heat pumps would cost more and due to the energy required for pumping would result in a higher EIU, 30.5 for new and 31.0 for addition/renovation. A boiler chiller at stretch code level of performance for early Hunnewell would result in EUI of approximately 42. Ms. Dion noted that a late Hunnewell would need to meet a later stretch code.

Ms. Dion said that the EUI mentioned above for the new and add/renovation options could change for each as designs are refined. She noted that the range of predicted EUI for new construction is 23-27 and the range for add/renovation is 26-30.

Ms. Dion presented a preliminary assessment of solar photovoltaics comparing the solar PV offset required and the solar PV area required for both the new construction (73,484 SF) and the add/reno options (78,531SF); roof area available in the new construction (30,000 SF) and the add/reno options (25,000SF); additional roof area required for the new construction (48,484 SF) and the add/reno options (53,531SF); and preliminary cost estimates for school roof only array for the new construction option (\$1,185,000) and the \$987,500) and the addition/renovation option (\$978,500). She noted that the estimates are for school roof arrays and that further area may be identified for PV's on adjacent properties such as the Cameron Street lot.

Ms. Dion reported that the final study report will include:

- Owners Project Requirements, developed working with FMD
- LEEDv4 Recommendations
- Preliminary Energy Performance Goals
- Planning for Solar Photovoltaics

In response to a question from Ms. Andrews, Ms. Dion said there is a 2-point gap between the predicted EUI for the new construction versus the add/reno option mainly due to the building enclosure of the existing portion of the building. Ms. Andrews noted that Ms. Dion's presentation slides also showed an additional energy cost associated with the add/reno option. Mr. Soliva said he thinks that the EUI delta between add/reno and new construction is not substantial enough to differentiate the two options on this basis.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the work on the sustainability for this project has been remarkable and forward thinking especially in light of the changing energy codes that will apply. He thanked the Sustainable Energy Committee and Green Schools for their advocacy efforts at the beginning of this process.

Adjournment

At approximately 8:15 p.m., upon a motion by Dr. Lussier and a second by Ms. Andrews, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

Documents and Exhibits Used

- Handout (2 pages, dated April 25, 2019) provided by Josh Dorin, Historical Commission Liaison to SBC. The first depicting the Addition/Renovation options presented to SBC on Feb. 27th and April 4th, the New Construction option of April 4th and a December 20 depiction of various zones on the site (quiet, active, welcoming, civic and Library relationship). The second depicting a "Requested scenario configuration" for the Addition/Renovation option.
- *Hunnewell Elementary School Feasibility Study Work Plan* (Updated April 24, 2019)
- *Hunnewell Building Solutio : Conceptual Project Budget Summary* (Compass Project Management)
- Memo from Tim Bonfatti of Compass Project Management to SBC Re: Cost Impact of Waiting for MSBA Project (April 23, 2019)
- *Swing Space Options: Conceptual Project Budget Summary* (Compass Project Management)
- Wellesley Public Schools *Hunnewell Project Internal Swing Space Proposal* Power Point Presentation to SBC 4/25/2019
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 4/25/2019