

**School Building Committee – Minutes
September 5, 2019
Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall**

Present: Chair Sharon Gray; Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder; Virginia Ferko; Marjorie Freiman Mary Gard; Steve Gagosian; Joubin Hassanein; Meghan Jop; Matt King; David Lussier; Melissa Martin; Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Richard Elliott; Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management; Alex Pitkin and Kristen Olsen of SMMA; Charlene Cook and Jeffery Dees.
Absent: Ryan Hutchins; Cynthia Mahr and Ellen Quirk

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:35 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being broadcast live and recorded by Wellesley Media for later viewing.

Public Comment

No member of the public provided comment.

SBC Business

Ms. Gray announced that meetings conducted by the Superintendent and some members of the SBC and School Committee will be held at each elementary school during September beginning with Sprague this evening. The schedule is posted at WPS.org.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of the July 25, 2019 and August 1, 2019 SBC meetings.

Ms. Freiman seconded and the minutes were approved. Ms. Martin abstained.

Hardy/Upham Project

Project Review

Preliminary Design Program work plan

Mr. D’Amico provided a review of the MSBA process for the feasibility/schematic design phase of the project including the major milestones for submissions to the MSBA.

Preliminary Design Program (PDP) - anticipated submission to MSBA in December 2019

- Educational program
- Initial space summary
- Evaluation of existing conditions
- Site development requirements
- Preliminary evaluation of alternatives (long list)

Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) -anticipated submission to MSBA in May 2020

- Evaluation of existing conditions on site specific options
- Final evaluation of alternatives (minimum of three: code upgrade, addition/renovation and new construction)
- Preferred solution decision (before ATM begins in late March 2020)

Schematic Design Report (SDR) - anticipated submission to MSBA in December 2020

- Schematic design (30%) (PBC oversees)
- Traffic, environmental and other technical analysis
- Construction estimates
- Project budget and schedule

Mr. D'Amico reviewed an approach timeline for the project including timing of community forums as follows:

- Community kick-off and one additional forum before submission of PDP in December 2019;
- A forum before option decision is shared with Annual Town Meeting in late March 2020;
- A forum before submit PSR in May 2020;
- A forum before submit SDR in December 2020;
- Ballot vote in March 2021;
- Complete design in August 2021;
- Start construction May 2022

Mr. D'Amico then reviewed project challenges including:

- Resolve school configuration- six school or seven school (study two enrollments);
- Selecting best site (to include Upham and Hardy);
- Community buy-in, including new website;
- Schedule (MSBA schedule is rigid);
- Education Plan – much work has already occurred to build upon.

SBC role

Mr. D'Amico presented a work plan for the period from project kickoff through December 2019 submission of the PDP, including dates of the SBC meetings concerning this project. He also reviewed a slide detailing responsibilities among SBC, School Committee, PBC and the Board of Selectmen for approving various deliverables during the feasibility study phase. Selection of the final preferred option (PSR Report) requires a vote of SBC, School Committee and the Board of Selectmen and the SD Report requires a vote of all four bodies.

In response to a question by Mr. Gagosian about where the decision about a CM (a construction manager delivery option) fits into the process, Mr. D'Amico said that would be at the end of the schematic design phase.

Ms. Gray noted the timeline requires School Committee approval of the education plan early in the process.

Dr. Lussier said that during the Hunnewell process an elementary school vision for the district was established and then tailored to Hunnewell in some specifics. Similarly this project's visioning will build on that work and process, which included representation from the community and all the elementary schools. Faculty and staff from Hardy and Upham will meet to work on

specifics of the plan for each school's needs including the special programs housed at each school.

In response to a question from Ms. Gray, Mr. Pitkin said that the space template or summary will be developed from the education plan and in response to comment from the MSBA.

Mr. D'Amico described what a Community Kickoff event typically entails. He said it is an invitation to the community for a conversation that includes communication of the project timeline, preliminary discussion of existing conditions and information about ways to be involved and provide feedback. He anticipates announcement of the new website at this forum. The next forum will be near the end of November.

Ms. Martin asked about the process for development of the long list of options to study. Mr. D'Amico said that the MSBA will require at least six options. The long list should include options for both enrollment scenarios at the Upham School: a code upgrade only; a renovation; an addition/renovation and new construction. Addition renovation and new construction on the Hardy site would also be options on the long list. Following its review the MSBA may suggest additional options for study.

Mr. King suggested that in lieu of lengthy appendices, there be summaries of complex data collected as part of the study to make community review more meaningful. Mr. Ulfelder said that summaries are useful, but full reports should also be accessible. Ms. Gray said the full MSBA submissions are typically posted on websites for MSBA projects.

Mr. Ulfelder asked if there will be an opportunity for the community to ask questions and provide feedback on the education plan, particularly related to school size. Ms. Olsen said this would likely occur in the second forum, to inform decisions about the long list of options.

MSBA process- Reimbursement

Mr. D'Amico explained that the MSBA considers several types of building costs to be ineligible for reimbursement.

- Categorically ineligible costs:
 - Not core to educational program, such as items for community use
 - Not part of permanent building and grounds
 - Beyond the project scope, such as the incremental cost of a gymnasium that exceeds MSBA guidelines

Examples of specific costs that are categorically ineligible include: land acquisition; legal fees; off -site improvements; synthetic turf, stadiums, utility company charges, swing space, permits and local board costs, financing, site remediation, asbestos floor tiles (although abatement of hidden asbestos discovered during a project is eligible), auditorium (although stage in cafetorium or gymnasium would be eligible).

- Exceed MSBA Caps
 - Soft costs exceeding 20% of construction costs;

- OPM costs exceeding 3.5% of construction costs; architect costs exceeding 10% of construction costs;
- Building costs exceeding \$333/SF (periodically updated but significantly below actual cost of school construction);
- Site costs that exceed 8% of building costs (most projects exceed this percentage);
- Furnishing and technology that exceeds \$2400/student based on approved enrollment costs (most projects exceed this percentage);
- Change orders exceeding 1% of construction cost.
- Spaces that exceed guidelines and not approved by MSBA staff.

Mr. D'Amico said that Wellesley's reimbursement percentage is currently 31% of eligible costs, with potential to modestly increase that percentage with incentive points for energy efficiency, maintenance history, renovation percentage (if applicable) or overlay district.

In response to a question by Ms. Jop concerning the potential to obtain overlay district incentive points, Mr. D'Amico agreed to provide further information.

Mr. D'Amico said that cost estimates at the PDP stage are per square foot estimates based on historical data. In response to a question from Ms. Gray, he said that the short list of approximately four options, going from PDP to PSR, will be costed out in more detail.

Mr. D'Amico stressed that the reimbursement rate is applied only to eligible costs and consequently the effective rate of reimbursement will be less.

Mr. King asked how costs for various features of the design will be tracked so that decisions include cost information. Mr. D'Amico said that the MSBA requires two cost estimates at every major milestone.

Enrollment and redistricting consultants

Ms. Gray said that the School Committee has discussed the need to engage a consultant to assist with enrollment projections and the redistricting process that will begin this fall as required by the MSBA as part of the feasibility study. She said that one option is to hire Future Think to update the enrollment study it did in 2016 for the Master Planning Committee.

Dr. Lussier stressed the need for accurate enrollment projections, especially with concern in town about 40B projects and their impact on enrollment. He suggested external support to facilitate the redistricting process and to support the credibility of the process.

Ms. Gray said that redistricting is a school committee responsibility but is a project related cost and she suggested that the funds to hire a consultant come from project funds.

Dr. Lussier said that the estimate to have Future Think update its work is \$12-14,000. Based on conversations with the Town of Lexington he said that the cost of consultant services to assist with redistricting may be approximately \$35,000.

Ms. Gray asked if funds budgeted for a demographic study in the Hunnewell feasibility study project could be used and Mr. Gagosian said that is unlikely.

Ms. Freiman suggested that it might be better to use a firm other than Future Think to independently validate the methodology and improve public confidence in the enrollment numbers in light of concern about the 40B's and their potential impacts on enrollment.

Dr. Lussier said that the district has been comfortable with Future Think's approach and that a new process will take a long time. He said that Future Think would include the 40B information in their update.

Mr. Gagosian said it is important to be sure that procurement requirements are met and Dr. Lussier assured that they would be.

Mr. Gagosian said there are project contingency funds available but he will study the question further and report back.

Adjournment

At approximately 7:00 p.m. upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and seconded by Mr. King the School Building Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

Documents and Exhibits used

- Compass Project Management Power Point Presentation to SBC 09/05/2019
- Email from Ms. Gray to all SBC members dated 9/5/2019 attaching a draft swing space matrix