

TOWN OF WELLESLEY



REPORT TO THE SPECIAL TOWN MEETING

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2018
7:00 P.M.**

**at the
MIDDLE SCHOOL AUDITORIUM
WELLESLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL**

**by the
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Please read this Report and bring it with you to Town Meeting.

For more information and updates, please visit www.WellesleyMA.gov.

This page intentionally left blank

TOWN OF WELLESLEY



ADVISORY COMMITTEE LETTER
Special Town Meeting — Tuesday, October 2, 2018, 7:00 pm
Wellesley Middle School Auditorium

TERM ENDS 2019
Jane Andrews
Rose Mary Donahue
Dave Murphy
Tom Skelly, Chair
Andrea Ward, Secretary

TERM ENDS 2020
Todd Cook, Vice Chair
Mary Gard
Paul Merry
Lina Musayev
Betsy Roberti, Vice Chair

TERM ENDS 2021
Julie Bryan
Bob Furlong
Jeff Levitan
Bill Maynard
Mary Scanlon

To the Town Meeting Members of the Town of Wellesley: September 14, 2018

A Special Town Meeting (STM) will convene on Tuesday, October 2, 2018, at 7:00 pm in the Wellesley Middle School Auditorium. All residents are welcome to attend. The proceedings may be followed on Wellesley Media Corporation’s Government Channel (Comcast Channel 8, Verizon Channel 40). The STM will also be live streamed at www.wellesleymedia.org/live-streaming.

I am writing on behalf of the Advisory Committee to provide you with an overview of the matters that this STM will address. The *Advisory Report* following this letter discusses, in detail, Advisory’s considerations and recommendations on the articles and related motions coming before this meeting.

This STM is to convene for the purpose of authorizing up to \$2.5 million in funding to conduct in partnership with the MSBA—the state entity that helps cities and towns fund school projects—a feasibility study of possible solutions to address the physical and educational deficiencies of the Ernest F. Upham School at 35 Wynnewood Road, followed by schematic design of the preferred solution. The preferred solution to address the needs of the Upham School—the school invited by the MSBA into its process—may be the renovation or rebuilding of the Upham School, the renovation or rebuilding of the John D. Hardy School at 293 Weston Road, or construction of a new school at another site. Following completion of the feasibility study and schematic design of the preferred solution, the Town will seek Town Meeting approval to fund detailed design and construction for the project. The construction costs, very roughly estimated at \$58 million, may be eligible for MSBA reimbursement of approximately 31% (or approximately \$18 million) and would require a Town-wide debt exclusion vote.

The Town has embarked on major upgrades to its schools over the last two decades. Sprague was rebuilt and Bates was extensively renovated in 2002 and 2004, respectively. The Middle School underwent a series of upgrades between 2006 and

2008, and last year's Annual Town Meeting approved design funding for steam pipe replacement and feasibility funding for projects that, when completed, will leave the Town with a "25-year middle school." The new High School was completed in 2012, and Fiske and Schofield were extensively renovated in 2015 and 2016. This leaves the Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham (HHU) elementary schools as the remaining schools in need of extensive repairs, renovations and/or replacement.

Problems at the three schools include:

- Heating systems, plumbing systems (including bathrooms), electrical systems, life safety/fire alarm systems, and windows beyond their useful life, resulting in frequent repairs, uneven heating and the constant threat of failure;
- Exterior envelopes (facades) in need of significant repairs;
- No sprinkler systems and combustible roof framing;
- Lack of compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA);
- Modular classrooms being used well beyond their service life;
- Undersized classrooms not conducive to learning, with outdated finishes, cabinetry, lighting, doors and acoustical treatments;
- Lack of specialized spaces for delivery of services;
- Need to use hallways for storage and for one-on-one teaching space; and
- One space used for gym, cafeteria and auditorium, which reduces time available for physical education classes and results in significant inefficiencies due to setup and changeover of the shared space.

The School Committee (SC) has been looking into the HHU issue for some time. A complicating factor is that the school system is in a cycle of declining enrollment that supports the consolidation of elementary schools from seven to six. The enrollment issue has been studied extensively over the past six years by the School Department, external consultants and Town study committees, including the HHU Master Planning Committee (HHU MPC). The currently observed declines in enrollment (K-5 enrollment is down more than 11% over the past decade) and the consistency of the projections of future declines led the SC to adopt the position last year to replace Hunnewell—the only school that serves the southwest quadrant of the Town—and to replace either Upham or Hardy pending further study. The HHU MPC recommended, and the SC agreed, that a third school would be rebuilt only if and when current enrollment trends were to reverse.

In keeping with the decision to replace two of the three HHU schools, the STM last June approved \$1 million to fund a feasibility study for options to replace the Hunnewell School. The Hunnewell feasibility study is already underway and will provide the Town with critical information, including the buildable options at the site and possibilities for timing of the construction. The Hunnewell project will be funded entirely by the Town and will follow the standard Town process for major capital projects, with further Town Meeting approval required for both design funding and construction funding and a Town-wide vote required for debt exclusion. Rough cost estimates for the Hunnewell project range from \$55 million to \$61.5 million, depending on the timing.

A second, separate project to replace either Hardy or Upham is proceeding concurrently with the Hunnewell project. In December 2017, the MSBA invited the Town into its so-called Eligibility Process to help address the deficiencies at the Upham School. The Town is fortunate to have received an invitation; only 15 of the 83 elementary school projects for which communities submitted statements of interest were selected. The

Town has successfully partnered with the MSBA in the past—the High School was funded and built using the MSBA process—and a number of key Town employees and volunteers possess significant experience working with the MSBA. Town staff and board members involved are working to obtain as much MSBA funding as possible.

Article 2, the only substantive article before this STM, seeks funding for the Hardy/Upham feasibility study, followed by schematic design of the preferred solution. As prescribed by the MSBA, the process is slightly different than the ordinary Town capital process being used for the Hunnewell project. Instead of three decision points for Town Meeting approval—feasibility, design and construction—the design phase is subdivided, so that there are two phases and approval points: (1) feasibility and schematic design, and (2) detailed design and construction. The feasibility study will examine the possibility of renovating or rebuilding either the Upham or Hardy Schools, as well as the possibility of constructing a new school at another site, should such a site be identified. The feasibility study will gather information on factors such as educational needs, total cost, traffic, swing space, topography, and geotechnical and environmental issues so that the buildable options at each site can be identified, evaluated and compared. At the end of the feasibility study, using all the information obtained and including a robust process for public participation, the three Town boards—the School Building Committee (SBC), SC and Board of Selectmen (BOS)—will agree on a preferred solution, which will then be put through a more detailed assessment, or schematic design. The goal of schematic design is to produce a project of sufficient clarity in scope, schedule and budget that the Town can vote to approve detailed design and construction funding.

As discussed in the *STM Advisory Report*, there is unanimous support by the Advisory Committee for moving forward with funding the feasibility study and schematic design for the Hardy/Upham MSBA project. The need for a new elementary school to replace either Upham or Hardy is clear, but the Town must now gather critical information to identify the best solution to serve the children and teaching professionals of those schools. The feasibility study and subsequent schematic design will allow the Town to do just that. The involvement of the MSBA offers the potential for substantial state funding assistance during a period when the taxpayers of the Town will be facing the costs of other major capital projects, including the Hunnewell project.

I am thankful to my colleagues on the Advisory Committee, especially Jane Andrews, for their work on this *STM Advisory Report*. I am also appreciative of the citizens who attended the Public Hearing for this STM and voiced concerns and asked questions, as these were very helpful to the Advisory Committee. Finally, we should all be grateful to the members of the SC, School Administration, Facilities Management Department, HHU MPC, SBC and BOS for their tireless dedication and work to provide the Town with the proper school facilities required to offer the highest quality education to the children of Wellesley.

Sincerely,

Tom Skelly, Chair
Advisory Committee

ARTICLE 1
Board of Selectmen
Town Reports

To see if the Town will vote to choose a Moderator to preside over said meeting and to receive reports of Town officers, boards and committees, including the Report of the Advisory Committee; or take any other action in relation thereto.

Advisory expects no motion under this Article.

ARTICLE 2
Board of Selectmen and School Committee
Ernest F. Upham School Feasibility Study & Schematic Design

To see if the Town will vote to appropriate, borrow or transfer from available funds, the sum of \$2,500,000 (TWO MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS), or any other sum, to be expended under the direction of the School Building Committee and the Permanent Building Committee for a feasibility study to determine the preferred solution to address the physical and educational deficiencies of the Ernest F. Upham School located at 35 Wynnewood Road, Wellesley, MA, which solution may include, but not be limited to, renovation or rebuilding of the Ernest F. Upham School or the John D. Hardy School, or construction of a new school at another site, and schematic design of the selected solution, for which the Town may be eligible for a grant from the Massachusetts School Building Authority. The MSBA's grant program is a non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need, as determined by the MSBA, and any costs the Town incurs in connection with the feasibility study in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the Town and, for the purpose of meeting such appropriation, to authorize the Town Treasurer, with the approval of the Board of Selectmen, to borrow said sum in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 7(1) of the Massachusetts General Laws, or any other enabling authority and to issue bonds or notes of the Town therefor, and that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of the issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the Massachusetts General Laws, thereby reducing the amount to be borrowed to pay such cost by a like amount; or to take any other action in relation thereto.

Introduction

Through this Article, the School Committee (SC) and the Board of Selectmen (BOS) seek Town Meeting approval to borrow up to \$2.5 million to fund the Feasibility Study and Schematic Design modules of a project, in partnership with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA), to address the needs of the Upham School. Half of the \$2.5 million (\$1.25 million) will fund a feasibility study that will help determine the preferred solution to address the physical and educational deficiencies of the Upham

School. Under the terms of the Article, the preferred solution may include renovation or rebuilding of the Upham School, renovation or rebuilding of the Hardy School, or construction of a new school at another site. The other half of the requested funds (\$1.25 million) will be used to undertake a schematic design of the preferred solution identified at the end of the feasibility study. Certain costs for feasibility study and schematic design phase work are considered to be eligible for MSBA reimbursement.

Given Town Meeting's approval last June of \$1 million in funding for a Town-funded feasibility study to address the needs of the Hunnewell School, approval of this Article will mean that, after many years of discussion and study, projects will be underway to fully address the needs of the Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham (HHU) elementary schools.

Background

The *Advisory Report* for the June 5, 2018 STM contains more detailed background on the Town's efforts to address the needs of the HHU schools. That report can be accessed on the Town website at:

http://wellesleyma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10649/2018-June-STM-Report_FINAL_and_Appendices. Town Meeting members are encouraged to refer to that report for specific information on topics such as:

- Building deficiencies of the HHU schools (pp. 5-6)
- Declining elementary school enrollment and disparate school sizes (pp. 6-7)
- Key steps in the development of the HHU projects before April 2017 (pp. 7-9)
- School Committee actions from spring 2017 to May 2018 (pp. 9-10)
- Recommendations and Report to the School Committee by the Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham Master Planning Committee (March 2017) (Appendix A)
- School Committee's Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham Facilities Project Position Statement (May 8, 2018) (Appendix B)

In addition, the School Building Committee (SBC) page on the Town of Wellesley website has extensive background and current information on both the Hardy/Upham MSBA project (the subject of this Article) and the Hunnewell project (feasibility study approved at June 2018 STM and currently underway). See <http://wellesleyma.gov/774/School-Building-Committee---HHU>. Interested citizens can subscribe to receive emailed updates from the SBC on both projects.

Of particular relevance to the present Article are the following pieces of background information:

1. The School Committee Position Statement on the HHU Facilities Project

In Position Statements issued in May 2017 and revised in May 2018, the School Committee has made clear certain fundamental tenets of its approach to the HHU facilities projects. The May 2018 Position Statement is reprinted as Appendix B to the *Advisory Report* for the June 2018 STM, and reflects the following:

- commitment to the neighborhood school model;
- agreement with the HHU Master Planning Committee (HHU MPC) to rebuild schools with 19 grade-level classrooms;
- agreement with the HHU MPC to rebuild two schools now with an enrollment "trigger" (when enrollment exceeds 2,350 students on a trending basis) for construction of the third school;

- agreement to build at Hunnewell and at either Hardy or Upham, in an order to be determined after further study; and
- commitment to retain control of the building and land of any closed school for eventual future reuse as a K-5 school.

The BOS has consistently supported these positions, as reflected in the original and revised charges to the SBC voted by the BOS, as well as in statements made to Town Meeting and during several BOS meetings.

2. The MSBA Invitation

Since 2013, the SC had hoped that the MSBA would partner with the Town in the construction or renovation of one or more of the three HHU elementary schools. As discussed in more detail below, the Town expects that the MSBA will provide a 31% base reimbursement rate on eligible costs for the Wellesley school project. The SC and BOS submitted Statements of Interest (SOIs) annually to the MSBA for each of the HHU schools between 2014 and 2017. Each time the Town submitted multiple SOIs, it was required by MSBA regulations to designate one SOI as the “priority.” In its spring 2017 SOI submissions, the SC and BOS, after extensive discussion, designated Upham as the “priority.” Before 2017, the MSBA did not invite any of the three schools into its grants program.

In August 2017, the MSBA contacted the Town and requested a Senior Study site visit. The site visit, which included all three HHU schools, took place on August 23, 2017. During the site visit and throughout its interactions with the MSBA, the SC has indicated its intention to build a new school at Hunnewell, and to evaluate both the Hardy site and the Upham site as the location for the second new or reconstructed school. In December 2017, the MSBA invited the Town into the “Eligibility Period,” the first step (“module”) in its grant program after SOI submission, for the Upham School.

The MSBA invitation has led the SC and BOS to divide the HHU projects into two separate tracks. The first track addresses the steps required to move forward, in partnership with the MSBA, on a new school, likely at either the Hardy site or the Upham site. The Article under consideration by this STM will provide the initial funding steps required by this Hardy/Upham, MSBA partnership track. The second track addresses the steps required for the Town, working independently of the MSBA, to construct a new Hunnewell School. The June 2018 STM approved \$1 million to fund a feasibility study for this second track, and work is currently underway.

Changes in the Warrant Language and Clarifications Since Spring 2018

An earlier version of this Article—to fund the first steps in the Hardy/Upham MSBA partnership track project—was initially included in the warrant for the June STM. However, some questions and concerns in the weeks leading up to that STM about the details and requirements of the MSBA process led the SC and BOS to postpone consideration of this Article until the present STM in order to engage in additional communications with the MSBA and the community. Several developments have taken place over the intervening months:

- The current version of Article 2 differs from what was originally proposed in May insofar as it includes language specifically stating that the preferred solution to

address the deficiencies at the Upham School may include renovation or rebuilding of the *Hardy School*. This new language, developed by the SC and BOS and approved by the MSBA, responds to community questions voiced last spring about whether the prior warrant language would have allowed renovating or rebuilding Hardy as a solution to the needs of Upham. In addition to specifically citing the renovation or rebuilding of either Upham or Hardy as possible solutions, the revised Article also mentions the additional possibility of “construction of a new school at another site.” While the HHU MPC considered in 2016-17 but ultimately ruled out the use of other Town sites (such as the North 40) as a solution to the HHU deficiencies, the MSBA process requires the Town to remain open during the feasibility study to a fresh review of alternative sites.

- SC and BOS representatives met with the MSBA over the summer and clarified the Town’s plan to consolidate and redistrict the current seven school elementary population into six schools (unless and until enrollment exceeds 2,350 elementary students on a trending basis, at which time a seventh school would be built). The MSBA understands the Town’s consolidation plan and the fact that the Upham student body may be redistributed to other schools in Town.
- SC and BOS representatives further clarified the MSBA’s position on allowable future uses of the Upham School and site should the preferred solution from the feasibility study call for renovating or rebuilding the sixth school at Hardy. Should renovating or rebuilding Hardy be chosen as the preferred solution to address the needs of the Upham School, the MSBA’s only objection would be to the use of the *existing* Upham School building as a *permanent* elementary school in the future. The MSBA would not object to the use of the existing Upham School building for *another purpose*, such as temporary swing space for the Hunnewell project. Nor would the MSBA object to the future construction of a *new* school on the Upham School *site* should elementary enrollment trends exceed the tipping point for construction of a seventh school.

The MSBA Process and Partnership: A Deeper Dive

Overview

The MSBA was established by the state legislature in 2004 in order to fund capital improvement projects for public schools. Revenue comes from one penny of the 6.25% state sales tax. The Town is familiar with the MSBA model from its successful partnership with the MSBA in designing and constructing the new High School and in completing the Middle School Window Replacement Project (as an Accelerated Repair Project).

The MSBA has a highly structured, prescribed process for building projects in which it partners with school districts. Participation requires strict adherence to MSBA standards that have been developed and refined over the past 10+ years, and approval is required from the MSBA Board of Directors at certain project milestones.

There are eight defined steps or “modules” in the process, each of which requires documentation and sign-off by the MSBA before proceeding to the next step. Further description of the process can be found on the MSBA website at <http://www.massschoolbuildings.org>. The eight MSBA modules are:

- Module 1 – Eligibility Period (current status)
- Module 2 – Forming the Project Team
- Module 3 – Feasibility Study
- Module 4 – Schematic Design
- Module 5 -- Funding the Project
- Module 6 – Detailed Design
- Module 7 – Construction
- Module 8 – Completing the Project

Reimbursement

Certain expenses from the feasibility study, design and construction are eligible for MSBA reimbursement. Reimbursement rates vary from town to town. Currently the base percentage for reimbursement is 31%. Additional percentage points can include:

- An “ability to pay” percentage (for Wellesley this is 0%)
- Incentive percentage points for design and construction for
 - Superior maintenance practices (up to 2%, average 1.4%)
 - Energy efficient/sustainable design and construction (up to 2%)
 - Others

By way of example of what reimbursement rate Wellesley might ultimately obtain, the Needham Hillside School project—an MSBA elementary school project in a neighboring town—has an MSBA reimbursement rate of 34.7%. Actual reimbursement amounts can be less than the reimbursement rate implies and will be dependent upon a variety of factors. Assuming a 31% reimbursement rate for a \$58 million school building project, the MSBA would pay, at most, approximately \$18 million and the Town, at least, approximately \$40 million.

The Role and Membership of the School Building Committee

The MSBA requires the formation of a school building committee, which is responsible for the development of the project and which meets MSBA requirements.

The SC and BOS initially formed the 14-member SBC in June 2017 to work on the entire Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham Facilities Project. They expanded the SBC’s membership in April 2018 to 18 members. The SBC is now working on both the Hardy/Upham MSBA project as well as the Hunnewell project. The SC and BOS updated the Charge to the School Building Committee on July 24, 2018 to reflect the SBC’s role in the MSBA-supported project and to clarify the collaboration of the SBC with the SC and BOS. The revised charge is included as Appendix A to this *Advisory Report*.

Working under the guidance of the SC and BOS, the SBC is charged with overseeing the execution of both projects through feasibility study, schematic design, final design, bidding and construction. Starting at the schematic design phase of each project, the Town’s Permanent Building Committee (PBC), per Town Bylaw Article 14, will assume day-to-day responsibility for managing design and construction of both projects and will work jointly with the SBC, similar to the process used for the design and construction of the High School.

The current SBC membership follows the model required by the MSBA for school building committees and is composed of:

- Two members of the School Committee: Sharon Gray and Matt Kelley
- Superintendent of Schools: David Lussier
- Assistant Superintendent for Finance: Cynthia Mahr (non-voting)
- Principals of Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham Schools: Charlene Cook, Ellen Quirk and Jeffery Dees (non-voting)
- Two members of the Board of Selectmen: Marjorie Freiman and Thomas Ulfelder
- Executive Director or designee: Meghan Jop, Assistant Executive Director
- One member of the Permanent Building Committee: Matt King, Vice Chair, PBC
- Facilities Management Director or designee: Steve Gagosian, Design and Construction Manager
- One member of the Advisory Committee: Jane Andrews
- Three community members with experience in construction, architecture or engineering: Joubin Hassanein, Ryan Hutchins and Jose Arias Soliva
- Two community members with Town government experience: Virginia Ferko, former Advisory Committee Chair, and Heather Sawitsky, former Town Moderator and former Advisory Committee Chair

Current Project Status—Module 1: Eligibility Period

The Hardy/Upham project is currently in Module 1, the Eligibility Period, which began on April 2, 2018 and must be completed within 270 days (no later than December 28, 2018).

Key steps in the Eligibility Period include submission of the following to the MSBA:

- ✓ Initial Compliance Certification (up to 30 days)
- ✓ Formation of a School Building Committee (up to 60 days)
- ✓ Completion of Educational Profile (up to 90 days)
- ✓ Enrollment Projections (up to 90 days)
- Certification of a Design Enrollment (up to 180 days)
- Summary of the District's existing maintenance practices (up to 180 days)
- Confirmation of community authorization and funding for feasibility and schematic design (up to 270 days)
- Execution of the MSBA's standard Feasibility Study Agreement

The steps that are checked above have been completed as of the date this *Advisory Report* went to print. The Facilities Management Department (FMD) expects to submit the summary of existing maintenance practices prior to STM. The SC, BOS and School Department have been working with the MSBA over the summer to complete two of the key items, an extensive review of enrollment projections (completed) and agreement on a Design Enrollment for the new school (pending). During an August 2018 meeting, the MSBA indicated that its enrollment analysis was pointing toward a target enrollment (365 to 370 students) that was very close to the target enrollment proposed by the Town (375 students). The MSBA is expected to send a letter confirming the target enrollment. (It is important to note that this is the target enrollment, not total capacity for the building. MSBA staff has indicated a general agreement with the Town's intent to build a three-section school.)

Once this STM approves the community authorization and funding for feasibility and schematic design sought under Article 2, all the steps required by Module 1 will have been completed.

Next Steps and MSBA Modules

The MSBA Board of Directors must approve the Town's completion of Module 1: Eligibility Period before the Town can move on to Module 2. A meeting of the MSBA Board is scheduled for October 31, 2018, at which time the Town believes the Board would approve the Town's completion of Module 1. This would allow the Town to move onto Module 2 earlier than the December 28, 2018 deadline for the Eligibility Period, and is the reason for scheduling this STM in early October.

While the Town has every expectation of working in partnership with the MSBA to completion of the Hardy/Upham project, STM's approval of this \$2.5 million in funding for feasibility study and schematic design does not commit the Town in any way to work with the MSBA. If the Town and the MSBA were to have unresolvable differences of opinion at any point in the process, the Town could choose to proceed with the project on its own without MSBA funding, similar to the Hunnewell project.

Module 2: Forming the Project Team

Following this STM, if the MSBA Board approves the Town's completion of the Eligibility Period, the Town will proceed to Module 2: Forming the Project Team. Two critical teams will be selected during this phase: the designer, who will perform the feasibility study and schematic design, and the Owner's Project Manager (OPM), who will oversee all aspects of design and construction on the Town's behalf. The Town, through the SBC, will hire the OPM first, and that selection must be approved by the MSBA. Following the OPM selection process, the designer will be chosen from a pre-qualified pool by an MSBA selection committee, with Town participation.

Module 3: Feasibility Study

The feasibility study/schematic design process mandated by the MSBA is slightly different from the process the Town would undertake if working independently on a construction project (as the Town is doing with the Hunnewell project). Whereas the Town generally separates a project into three distinct phases—feasibility, design and construction—and returns to Town Meeting at the conclusion of each phase to secure funding for the next, the MSBA process splits the design phase in two, combining initial (or “schematic”) design with the feasibility process and “detailed” design with construction. The MSBA process envisions two, rather than three approval/funding points. The two funding points are: (1) the initial funding approval for the feasibility study and schematic design being sought at this STM, and then (2) the Town Meeting vote and Town-wide debt exclusion vote following schematic design which will fund the detailed design and construction for the project.

The feasibility study will generate and study potential solutions. It will evaluate multiple sites, including Hardy, Upham and possibly others if viable sites can be identified. It will also evaluate whether the project should be a renovation/addition or new construction. While the Town has already examined those questions through the HHU MPC process, the MSBA process requires a fresh review of these issues.

In order to move forward to Module 4: Schematic Design, the MSBA and the Town must reach agreement on a “preferred solution” for the building project at the end of the feasibility phase. To determine this, community engagement is required for both the success of the project and for MSBA approval. The MSBA Board will be looking to see whether and how the community has been engaged.

The SBC is charged with organizing advisory groups and implementing a process to engage these groups as well as the broader community. The constituencies will include but not be limited to: Wellesley Public Schools parent community (current and prospective); environmental and sustainability groups; neighborhood abutters; historical groups; recreation and playing fields groups; and Wellesley Town government boards and committees, among others. The updated Charge to the School Building Committee of July 24, 2018, reprinted as Appendix A to this *Advisory Report*, specifies this required outreach and involvement.

The feasibility study will analyze and document educational programming and conceptual building designs in addition to topography, geotechnical and environmental information, wetlands, hazardous materials, traffic and swing space considerations, and total project cost, among other factors, at Hardy, Upham and potentially a third site.

The study will also examine the need for swing space during the construction period. The possibility of building a new school adjacent to the old school may obviate the need for identifying and funding off-site swing space. It is hoped that the new school could be built behind or beside the old school so that off-site swing space would not be needed—this is how the vast majority of new MSBA schools have been built over the past 10 years.

The feasibility study of the Hardy School site will include consideration of the properties at 818, 822 and 826 Worcester Street, which STM voted to acquire on April 9, 2018. The addition of these properties potentially makes the site more receptive to a new school and brings new options and new thinking to the project.

At the end of the feasibility phase, the Town and MSBA staff will present the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA Board, documenting their recommended design option, along with a narrative of the process by which the recommendation was reached. The SBC, SC and BOS plan to actively work toward establishing community consensus through all the elements of the feasibility study. It is the Town’s intent to use site selection criteria similar to those created by the HHU MPC (including site size/shape, traffic, environmental, geotechnical, utilities, topography, and student attendance zones) to evaluate the site and building options. (See pages 4-5 of the Report of the HHU MPC, reprinted as Appendix A to the June 2018 STM *Advisory Report*, for a listing of that body’s criteria.) Project cost is also expected to be an important factor. A supportive vote for the Preferred Schematic Design will be required of all three committees—the SBC, SC and BOS—prior to any submission to the MSBA Board.

While the SC and BOS recognize that no matter which site is selected, some community members will disagree, the two boards, in partnership with the SBC, are committed to working toward a clear consensus on this important decision for the Town. If there is not a clear consensus among the three bodies on which site to build, officials have stated

their intent to continue to engage with each other and with the community until a preferred solution can be brought forward.

Module 4: Schematic Design

Upon completion of the feasibility study and MSBA approval, the schematic design phase will begin. During schematic design, the Town will undertake a more detailed assessment of the selected option. Preliminary drawings, outline technical specifications and a project cost estimate are prepared as part of this phase. During this module, the PBC assumes primary responsibility for the completion of the full development of the schematic design, but continues to work closely with the SBC following the same process that was used for the High School project. While the feasibility study analyzes the options at a high level, the schematic design phase explores much greater details regarding design, construction, budget and schedule. Issues such as sustainable design will be fleshed out with further quantification of costs and alternatives. Additional focus groups and community presentations will be held during the process.

Potential Hardy/Upham MSBA Project Timeline (under expected conditions)

November 2018	Complete Eligibility Period
May 2019	Form project team
May 2020	Complete Feasibility Study
November 2020	Complete Schematic Design
Spring 2021	Town Meeting and Townwide debt exclusion votes
May 2022	Complete Detailed Design
May 2024	Complete construction
September 2024	Open new school

Estimated Hardy-Upham MSBA Project Costs

Feasibility Study Phase Cost:

Owner’s Project Manager (OPM)	\$200,000
Basic Architectural Services	\$350,000
Topographical Survey	\$90,000
Wetlands Flagging	\$20,000
Hydrant Flow Test	\$10,000
Hazardous Materials	\$40,000
Traffic Assessment	\$50,000
Geotechnical	\$40,000
Environmental Phase 1	\$40,000
Sustainability	\$20,000
Swing Space Study	\$50,000
Cost Estimating	\$40,000
Board Presentations	\$15,000
Community Presentations	\$15,000
Subtotal	\$980,000
<u>Feasibility Contingency (15%)</u>	<u>\$147,000</u>
Feasibility Total	\$1,127,000
<u>Project Contingency</u>	<u>\$123,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,250,000

Schematic Design Phase Cost:

Owner's Project Manager (OPM)	\$200,000
Architectural/Engineering	\$500,000
Final Traffic Assessment	\$40,000
Final Geotechnical	\$20,000
Final Environmental,Phase 1	\$20,000
Sustainability	\$40,000
Cost Estimating	\$20,000
Board Presentations	\$10,000
Community Presentations	\$20,000
Reimbursables	\$20,000
Technology	\$15,000
Focus Groups (Charettes)	\$20,000
FF&E Planning	\$15,000
OPM's Estimates	\$20,000
Printing/Submittal Exch/Other	\$13,000
Subtotal	\$973,000
Schematic Contingency (18%)	\$176,000
Schematic Total	\$1,149,000
Escalation	\$101,000
TOTAL	\$1,250,000

The Interplay of the Hardy/Upham MSBA Project and the Hunnewell Project

The two HHU elementary school projects—the Hardy/Upham MSBA project that is the subject of this Article, and the Hunnewell project for which STM approved feasibility funding last June—are distinct. The two projects will run separately, are on different time lines, and will be funded separately. Nonetheless, neither exists in a vacuum and there is interplay between them, such as common building committees (SBC and PBC) and SC and BOS involvement.

At the conclusion of the Hunnewell School feasibility study, which is expected to occur in May 2019, the Town will have a clearer sense as to whether an “Early Hunnewell” construction project can go forward, given considerations and concerns about swing space. As discussed at the June 2018 STM, an “Early Hunnewell” construction schedule could result in opening of the new school by September 2023.

If swing space cannot be found and it is necessary to use a closed school (Upham or Hardy) for swing space, a “Late Hunnewell” construction scenario would occur after the construction of the new Hardy/Upham MSBA project school, resulting in the likely opening of the new Hunnewell School in 2026.

Anticipated Taxpayer Impact for Both Projects

Preparing a reliable estimated project cost is a key task of feasibility studies. Until feasibility studies are completed for both the Hardy/Upham project and the Hunnewell project, the Town will not have dependable cost estimates that are based on a thorough analysis of specific scenarios. For the Town-wide Financial Plan and the analysis presented in this *Advisory Report*, the Finance Department has produced very rough

estimates using figures provided by the architectural firm Symmes, Maini, McKee and Associates and FMD during the HHU MPC process and adjusting them for additional cost escalation based on the project timelines.

For this *Advisory Report*, the Town is assuming a \$40 million net cost to the Town of the Hardy/Upham project in partnership with the MSBA, based on a 31% reimbursement rate for a \$58 million project.

For the Hunnewell project, the ultimate costs will be heavily impacted by whether a path can be found to construct the new school without having to wait for the new Hardy or new Upham to be built so that Hunnewell students can be educated in the “old Hardy” or “old Upham” during the reconstruction. If such a path cannot be found, then under the “Late Hunnewell Scenario,” although the Hunnewell feasibility study will be completed in May 2019, design work will not begin until approximately January 2023 and construction would not be completed until approximately April 2026. Assuming cost escalation of 3.5% annually,¹ total cost would be approximately \$61.5 million.

By contrast, if a path can be found to move directly from feasibility to design and construction for the Hunnewell project, then, under the “Early Hunnewell Scenario,” construction might be completed and the new school opened by September 2023 at an approximate cost of \$55 million.

Based on these assumptions, the combined cost to the Town of the Hardy/Upham MSBA project and the Early Hunnewell Scenario is \$95 million, with a peak impact on the median tax bill of \$619 in FY24.²

The combined cost to the Town of the Hardy/Upham MSBA project and the Late Hunnewell Scenario is \$101.5 million, with a peak impact on the median tax bill of \$644 in FY27.

Advisory Considerations

Advisory members expressed unanimous support for this Article.

Advisory members believe that the feasibility study is an opportunity to gather more information about the Hardy and Upham School sites, to answer the questions that many have about both sites and to develop the Town’s options further. Analysis of both sites, as well as any additional site that is potentially identified via the study, will provide the Town with information critical to choosing a preferred site for schematic design, including: the types of services that can be provided at each site; the best configuration for the new school from an educational or programmatic perspective; the impact on neighborhoods, traffic patterns and the environment; the buildability of each site from a

¹ Escalation rates vary from year to year depending on market conditions. The 3.5% rate used in these estimates represents the best thinking of the project team and Finance Department at this early stage. The feasibility process will further explore escalation rates and produce more detailed cost estimates.

² For context, the actual median tax bill (i.e., the tax bill for a home valued at \$1,051,000) is \$12,559 in FY18.

geotechnical point of view; and total project costs. The impact on the viability of the Hardy site of the three Worcester Street parcels acquired by the Town in April 2018 will be explored during this process. All of these data points, and many others, will help the Town assess the benefits and limitations of each site and identify a preferred solution that can be fleshed out in more detail before the Town is asked to commit to detailed design and construction funding.

Advisory members see the funding requested in this Article, together with the funding for the feasibility study for the Hunnewell School that was approved last spring, as another step in a journey toward rebuilding either two or three schools, depending on eventual enrollment. Many Advisory members expressed the view that the approximately \$18 million of potential funding from the MSBA to build this second school would be a great benefit to the Town and one that must be pursued. Advisory members noted the reality that elementary enrollment in Town has fallen from a peak of 2,481 students in 2008-09 to 2,209 in 2017-18, a decline of 272 students or 11%. (The unofficial enrollment as of 9/6/18 for 2018-19 is 2,174.) Enrollment will be watched closely over the coming years, and it is the Town's intent to honor the enrollment "trigger" of 2,350, which was developed by the HHU MPC and has been endorsed by the SC and BOS, for the building of a third school.

Advisory members are optimistic about the chance to work with, and receive funding from, the MSBA on this elementary school project. The Town's past experience in building the High School through the MSBA process was positive. While the MSBA process has strict guidelines, it also envisions a robust engagement with the community to determine a preferred solution for schematic design and moving forward. Advisory members believe that, due to the hard work of the SC and BOS and the productive conversations they had with the MSBA over the past few months, the present Article for this project is better and clearer than it was last spring. Notably, the Article clarifies and makes explicit that the Town may fully consider the Hardy site during the feasibility study. Advisory members emphasized that a "yes" vote on this Article will keep open the option of receiving as much as \$18 million in potential MSBA funding, while a "no" vote would forfeit that funding.

Advisory members recognize that the Town process with respect to rebuilding these schools has been slow and at times painful. One Advisory member noted, however, that earlier input from the community had taken the initial proposal from a 24-classroom school at Upham to a 19-classroom school at either Hardy or Upham—an example of the positive effect of citizen input. Advisory members believe that, contrary to the concerns expressed by some citizens at the public hearing, there will be sufficient public process and Town-wide input during the feasibility study and in choosing the preferred option for schematic design. Advisory members noted that Town Meeting approval and a Town-wide vote will be required before the Town can proceed with design and construction of the preferred solution (Modules 6 and 7 in the MSBA process).

Advisory members strongly encouraged citizens to continue to participate through the public meetings and forums that will be a central part of the feasibility process to evaluate the Hardy and Upham sites. That process offers ample opportunities to help

define the needs and culture of the Town regarding the preferred site for the rebuilding of the second school.

Passage requires a 2/3 vote.

Advisory recommends favorable action, 13 to 0.

Charge to the School Building Committee (Revised)

July 24, 2018

Introduction

As described in the School Committee's updated May 8, 2018 [position statement](#) on the Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham (HHU) Facilities Project, the Committee is committed to addressing the clear needs of the HHU schools. While school committees in Massachusetts have authority and responsibility under the General Laws for establishment and maintenance of school buildings ([M.G.L. c. 71 § 68](#)), the Committee recognizes that the scale of the HHU project requires a broad-based process, involving multiple Town boards as well as interested residents, in order to build consensus around the project. To this end, the School Committee (SC) and the Board of Selectmen (BOS) created the School Building Committee (SBC) in June 2017 and charged it with overseeing the design and building process for both the Hunnewell and Hardy/Upham projects.

On December 13, 2017, the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) invited the Ernest F. Upham Elementary School into its Core Program. This updated charge to the SBC is intended to address the changes in circumstances driven by this unexpected, but very welcome invitation. While some aspects of the HHU project have changed as a result of the invitation, the underlying intent has not: to move forward to address the needs of the HHU schools by building two new or renovated schools at this time, one at Upham or Hardy in partnership with the MSBA and one at Hunnewell under a separate Town-funded process. The SC and BOS charge the SBC with the execution of these processes.

Purpose

The purpose of the SBC, which will work under the guidance of the SC and BOS, is to conduct the two building processes through their respective phases. The SBC shall be directly responsible for conducting feasibility study work on the projects. Per [Town Bylaw 14.5](#), the Permanent Building Committee shall be directly responsible for conducting design and construction work on the projects, with guidance from the SBC. All of this work will involve a significant commitment from SBC members, spanning multiple years.

Throughout all of its work, the foremost priority for the SBC shall be for facilities that best serve the elementary students of Wellesley by meeting their educational programming needs in the most fiscally responsible manner.

Charge

MSBA Project

With respect to the MSBA project, the SBC shall be responsible for all aspects of the project, as specified in the MSBA [enabling statutes](#) and [regulations](#) and described on the MSBA [website](#). In addition to its responsibilities under the MSBA process, the SBC shall support the SC and BOS in securing an appropriation for the activities under Module 3 – Feasibility Study and Module 4 – Schematic Design at an October 2018 Special Town Meeting.

The preferred solution, whether renovation or new construction on a selected site, will be determined during Module 3 – Feasibility Study and further developed during Module 4 – Schematic Design. A Town Meeting appropriation will be required to proceed to design and construction on the selected solution.

Hunnewell Project

With respect to the Hunnewell project, the SBC shall again be responsible for all aspects of the project, following the typical Town process for construction projects, including feasibility study, design, and construction phases.

For the Hunnewell feasibility study, the SBC has already:

- Outlined the scope of the feasibility study and developed a proposed plan and estimated budget for it.
- Developed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for an Owner's Project Manager for the study.
- Developed an RFQ for a designer to conduct the study.
- Gained approval for the proposed scope, estimated budget, and RFQs from the SC and BOS.
- Issued the OPM and Designer RFQs.
- Supported the SC and BOS in successfully securing an appropriation for the study at a June 2018 Special Town Meeting.

The SBC is further charged with completing the feasibility study, including:

- Selecting an OPM and designer and negotiating engagement contracts with each.
- Conducting the study with the support of the OPM and designer.
- Potentially conducting analysis of potential swing space options, independent of the formal feasibility study.
- Producing a final report documenting the results of the study and presenting it to the SC and BOS.

The plan and schedule for the design and construction phases of the Hunnewell project are contingent on the results of the feasibility study. This charge will be updated once the results are known and a path forward is determined by the SC and BOS.

Additional Responsibilities of the SBC, SC, and BOS

Throughout its work, the SBC shall provide periodic written reports to the SC, the BOS, and the community, which shall also be posted on the Town website. The SBC, SC, and BOS shall hold joint meetings roughly once per quarter to discuss the projects, exchange perspectives, and discuss proposed solutions or decisions. The SBC shall advise the SC and BOS on possible and/or recommended paths forward. Because the SC and BOS believe that the project will not be successful without consensus among the SBC and both boards, supportive votes shall be required from each of the SBC, SC, and BOS at certain points in each project. For the MSBA project, supportive votes from all three bodies shall be required prior to any submission to the MSBA Board of Directors. For the Hunnewell project, supportive votes from all three bodies shall be required prior to seeking any Town Meeting appropriation for any phase of the project.

Public Engagement

In order to provide a broad base of input and feedback from town residents during its work, the SBC is charged with organizing various advisory groups to represent different constituencies or interests, including but not limited to: environmental concerns (in consultation with the Sustainable Energy Committee), historical concerns (in consultation with the Historical Commission), neighborhood/abutter concerns, and playing fields and other recreation concerns (in consultation with the Playing Fields Task Force and others). The SBC shall design a process by which it will engage with these groups to solicit and respond to their input. For the Hunnewell project, the SBC shall also engage with the Wellesley Free Library Board of Trustees in considering potential impacts to Library property under any proposed solution. In addition to working with these organized interest groups, the SBC is also charged with conducting appropriate public outreach on topics of interest to the community, both to provide information about the status of the projects and to seek public input.

All meetings of the SBC, or any subcommittees of the SBC, shall be held in accordance with the Open Meeting Law ([M.G.L. c. 30A §§ 18-25](#)). The SBC shall, to the best of its ability, ensure that its meetings are recorded by [Wellesley Public Media](#) and broadcast live and/or made available for later viewing by the public.

Membership

Following the requirements of the MSBA for school building committees ([963 CMR 2.10\(3\)](#)), the members of the SBC shall be:

- Two members of the School Committee
- Superintendent of Schools
- Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations, MCPPO-certified (non-voting)
- Principals of the Hardy, Hunnewell, and Upham Schools (non-voting)
- Two members of the Board of Selectmen
- Executive Director or designee
- One member of the Permanent Building Committee
- Facilities Management Director or designee
- One member of the Advisory Committee
- Two or more community members with experience in construction, architecture, or engineering
- Two or more community members with experience in Town government

Each of the boards or committees having membership shall select which of their members will serve on the SBC. Having continuity of service on the SBC is a priority; however, given that the expected duration of the SBC will likely cross over members' terms of office on their board or committee, replacement of members over time is expected. All members shall be appointed by vote of the School Committee and Board of Selectmen.