

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012

Present: Ald. Salvucci (Chairman), Lennon, Albright, Crossley, Danberg, Laredo, and Lappin

Absent: Ald. Gentile

Also present: Ald. Linsky, Merrill, Hess-Mahan, Rice, Blazar, and Fischman

City staff present: Robert Rooney (Chief Operating Officer) Stephanie Gilman (Commissioner of Public Buildings), Sandra Guryan (Deputy Superintendent/Chief Administrative Officer; School Department), Alex Valcarce (Project Manager; Public Buildings), Michael Cronin (Director of Operations; School Department) and Joshua Morse (Facilities and Operations Supervisor; Public Buildings Department), Diana Fisher Gomberg (School Committee Member), Steven Siegel (School Committee Member), Angela Pitter-Wright (School Committee Member), and Jonathan Yeo (School Committee Member)

REFERRED TO PROG & SERV, PUB FACIL AND FINANCE COMMITTEES

#40-12 HIS HONOR THE MAYOR requesting the vote of the Board of Aldermen to complement by RESOLUTION the vote of the School Committee to transfer the sum of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$750,000) from health insurance savings to the Angier School Building Fund to fund the costs of a feasibility study of the Angier Elementary School. [01/30/12 @ 4:30 PM]

PROG & SERV APPROVED SUBJECT TO SECOND CALL 6-0 on 02/8/12

ACTION: APPROVED SUBJECT TO SECOND CALL 7-0

NOTE: The committee met jointly with the Programs & Services Committee to discuss the item. **The following is a transcription of the discussion:**

Guryan: I am the Deputy Superintendent for the Newton Public School, for all administrative, operational, and financial matters. I am pretty excited to be at the point where we are introducing and beginning the next project for the Newton Public Schools, the potential renovation or replacement of the Angier Elementary School. We gave a similar presentation at the special School Committee meeting two nights ago.

In essence, as many of you know the Newton Public Schools and all city facilities have been evaluated. The school facilities were evaluated in 2007 and a complete report was prepared by consultants, who evaluated the buildings on their condition, on the capacity to handle the enrollment and on their programmatic ability to handle the current program in the Newton Public Schools as compared to the time in which most of the buildings were built.

At that time, and then in every subsequent evaluation, the Angier School has reached the top of the list in every possible way of evaluating, whether it is age (it is the oldest school), condition, the building systems, the educational spaces. It is the top priority and those filings

with the Massachusetts Building Authority (MSBA) have been filed for many years. Newton has between 15 and 17 schools right now with statements of interests filed with the MSBA. The MSBA required that the city designate the top priority and that was, and continues to be, the Angier School.

The good news is that the Executive Office reached out to the MSBA several months ago. There were a couple of preliminary meetings, one here in Newton and one in Boston with the MSBA and a small group of people in the beginning of January, which included the Mayor, Chair of the School Committee, other elected officials, Public Building Commissioner Stephanie Gilman, Project Manager Alex Valcarce and some staff people. The kind of exciting thing that happened was Newton received a call that we were invited to come before the MSBA at that January Board meeting. We would not have thought that was even possible. The MSBA only meets every other month and we were thinking that the first time we might even be remotely on their radar could be the end of March. We got the call and a group went into their Board meeting, which was led by Steve Grossman, and at that time, the Mayor spoke on behalf of Newton and the Angier project. They were very receptive and then to my surprise, they voted Newton to be one of eight schools invited to enter the process. I think it is a shared goal among many of us that the Angier project be a project that is shared with the MSBA, so that Newton would receive all the funding for which it would be eligible.

The MSBA has created a completely new system on how these projects are managed. There is a very specific and elaborate amount of requirements and schedule but the key thing is Newton has been voted and received the invitation to participate. The vote causes the clock to start ticking and there is a time period where we must submit certain documentation. We are totally able to do that. Some of it is about enrollment projections, and Alex will tell you more about that, maintenance plans and strategies. The MSBA has already visited the school and they know the condition and are willing to have it in their process. What we are trying to do is get to the entrance to the next stage, which again requires the MSBA Board to vote to allow us to enter the feasibility study phase. It is through the feasibility study that all of our questions are going to be answered, such as the cost, whether the school could be renovated or whether it should or must be replaced, whether the site is appropriate for a new school or a renovated school. There are issues around the age of the building, which means it has to have a historic review. These questions are going to be answered through a full robust feasibility study and early design.

The key point is although we technically have nine months to submit this material, we don't want to use the nine months because we've established a goal of having the presumably new school, which we will only know after the feasibility study, the new or renovated school to be opened for students to enter in September 2016. For that to happen, construction would need to begin in July or August 2014. For that to happen, the most important thing we can do is enter the feasibility study phase, so that we know whether this is a manageable project for us. We will ultimately find out how much state grant money we would be entitled. The reason that we are before you now is that one of the items that is required to allow Newton to enter the feasibility study stage is the city needs to show evidence that it has approved the funding for the feasibility study prior to doing the study or even being allowed to go out to bid to get the designer or the consultant to do the study. So, that approval of funding has to be done in a particular way.

Ouida Young of the Law Department is on the working group that has been established already. She has been working with the MSBA legal staff. We are making sure that the type of vote that is taken and the indication that the funding is approved will be exactly what is required. The approval needs to go in along with our enrollment and other documents that we will be preparing. The appointment of a formal building committee is part of it.

Are goal has now been set that if possible we would really want to have Newton be on the MSBA Board agenda for the end of March. To do that we need to use this month of February to do all that work required and to submit evidence that the feasibility study can be funded. I am not going to go into all the details of that funding, as the others will provide the details.

Gilman: That was a great summary. A working group has been established by the Mayor with representation from Law, Planning, Public Buildings, School Committee, School Department, and Board of Aldermen. We have been diligently working to get ready for being invited into the eligibility period and Alex Valcarce and I have spent a lot of time learning the MSBA process because it is a very prescriptive process. We have only been invited into the eligibility period. So now, there are a number of things that we need to submit – documents including the vote on the feasibility before we can even sign an agreement, before they will even consider inviting us into the feasibility stage. It is set up in a series of modules – the first being eligibility, the second being the feasibility study and...

Valcarce: I work as the Project Manager in Public Buildings. The eligibility phase establishes the commitment of the community to move forward. It shows the enrollment needs, it shows our maintenance plan and it shows the community's support to move into working in the program. Once we provide that information, the MSBA Board would vote to invite us into the feasibility study process. Once we get that invitation, the first thing we have to do is assemble the project team. The MSBA requires that there be an owner's project manager (OPM), which is not really a person but a firm – that is the first person that we would hire. That person actually becomes our liaison to the MSBA. They help us get the designer hired. All of the submittals that we do to the MSBA go through that organization.

We have to line up those two pieces and get them under contract and those funds are part of the funds...All of that is in the feasibility study and what they refer to as a robust schematic design, which is the phase that comes after the feasibility study. We will put that aside for a second. It is important that we get those steps going. We have assembled a preliminary timeline. Their Board only meets six times a year and we have made submittals to them – typically, you have to put things in six weeks in advance. Before we can submit something to them for their approval, we have to approve it locally, which means we have to do our approval process before we can submit something there. All of you being so familiar with the approvals process, layering in the State approval process, you will understand that each one of these modules to go from one to the next has a built in time period that is pretty happy. Our plan right now is that if we can get the information submitted and show the support for the funding, we could get on their agenda for March.

The working group has a conference call coming up with the MSBA on Friday and will be able to clarify some things. Everything is done in a very...It is dosed out by them step-by-step. Point being and we are very efficient and can do all of these things... We wouldn't actually start the feasibility study work until the end of the summer, probably somewhere in August. Just to get through the invitation, the assembly of the team, negotiating the fees and getting everybody lined up, now you are into September. We do the feasibility study, which has an interim submittal, so you have to build in time for that and a final submittal.

The feasibility study will conclude with recommendations. What they refer to as the preferred solution, which will be either to renovate and expand the school or provide a new facility. The feasibility study has to present alternatives with costs and you have to look at alternative site possibilities. It is a feasibility study. It has consultants that go with it and we have to do typical kinds of things like surveys. Sitting here and thinking construction is out there, when you work your way back and build in the timeline, it becomes clear that if we would like to avail ourselves of the opportunity and meet the goal of having a new or renovated Angier School facility for the fall of 2016, we need to keep the process moving.

The feasibility study would put forth the preferred solution, which the MSBA and the community agree to and then a schematic design is developed of the preferred solution with a cost estimate. The outcome of that phase is what they refer to as a project program scope and budget and that then is put forth. At that point they will tell us what they are willing to give us for grant funding and then a project agreement is executed between the community and the MSBA. At that point, we are actually kind of left to be able to develop the design, do the construction documents, put it out to bid, etc... The advantages are that you have some expertise. You have to hire designers and an OPM that are in the system that understand it. We will be able to avail ourselves of building systems, products, finishes, specifications, and those things that are more tried and true and be able to then reap the benefit of obtaining some grant funding to build the school. That is kind of it in a nutshell, as to why we find ourselves here today, needing to see if the community is willing to fund the feasibility study, and keep the process moving.

Lappin: This time line... I understand that you want to be in by 2016. It is very tight. Do you have the timeline? I didn't see it in our packet.

Valcarce: It is a preliminary timeline that we are working through. Ultimately, the actual project schedule is developed through the owner's project manager. Based on our understanding, consultation, discussions with the MSBA, we did a site visit to a school in Dedham that is about to come on-line. They were very gracious to host us and show us the school. They had their designer, OPM, and construction manager and we were able to collaborate that at least our general thinking and timeline is within the right range. Again, it is going to get massaged but the sort of time blocks that we have assigned are reasonable, in terms of the amount of time.

Lappin: No, I'm looking for the draft timeline because I am sure at some point, as they are asking us now to submit to funding this, in the timeline where they are going to ask us to have

funding for the whole project, which would mean if we were going to look for a debt exclusion, we would need to know when that has to happen because it has to start earlier than when we need the approval.

Guryan: That is all being drafted into the timeline. The Angier working group that was appointed by the Mayor is meeting every Friday is working on that. It won't be long before the draft timeline will be released in one of the updates.

Lappin: It would be great to know. When I think of a project manager.... I don't know if we are going to do a construction manager at-risk like we did last time but I thought hiring Mr. Valcarce was the reason why we did not need to hire an additional project manager.

Valcarce: In the MSBA process... to manage that process, they, the selection... They have an OPM panel selection and you have to be certified to do the MSBA process. It is not one person. It is like when you say you hire an architect but you don't hire one person, you hire a firm. They do scheduling, they do cost estimating, they will collaborate an independent cost estimate with their cost estimate, they will help reconcile those things, they will perform the paperwork, and they know the process. We would not want to expend the learning curve time and this is just the MSBA process, as part of the school we have other approvals and things that we will need to get done and our hands will be full with that and dovetailing those pieces as well. You can't think of the OPM as one person because it is not the job of one individual.

Lappin: Is this funding coming from the health savings or is this coming from somewhere else.

Guryan: This is coming from the health saving subject to the School Committee voting to approve that. That will be under discussion again at their meeting on Monday night.

Lappin: So we don't know the funding.

Guryan: It is proposed to come from the health savings and...

Lappin: I was just wondering if that had changed, but that is where it is right now.

Guryan: I think that Maureen Lemieux will be present on Monday and perhaps provide you more information. We have been working together to make sure that the School Committee has all of the information they need, so that they will be able to take an informed vote about what the sources in savings is and how it would be funded. The critical thing is that originally the feasibility study was included in the Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal 13. While the actual consultants may not begin their work until technically Fiscal 13, the approval and the actual availability of the funds has to be certified now. We were trying to work out all the different aspects of making that happen.

Crossley: I too am very excited to see this moving forward. I understand that in a way, this is just protocol that you are asking to move money within the School Department essentially

but it is our opportunity to understand more about the project, which is great. There's been guesses that if it is a new building, at the outside this could be a \$30 million project. I am working backwards from that and on the back of a napkin, \$3 million design and engineering fees and 25% of that is for schematic. Is that how you got to this number or could you describe the process in the feasibility analysis that would be developing lots of different scenarios. There must be many steps within the feasibility study that require decision-making. On one hand it is the money, is it enough to get through that decision-making and other hand it is what have you identified or do you see yourself identifying the decision points along the way and who is involved in that.

Valcarce: Within the MSBA program, we are required to have a school building committee and they give a very prescriptive listing, the school superintendent, the CEO, COO, the school principal, and within that, there are requirements for individuals with architectural expertise. Our working group is trying to dovetail our Design Review Committee and that sort of design review with the MSBA's process to link those two pieces together so we put some of those individuals into the school building committee. The working group is trying to sort that out. The decision-making or approvals are pretty prescribed within the MSBA requirements. Within the feasibility study, there is a milestone where you provide the program and the scope and the space needs and all of that analysis and the MSBA basically has to approve it and say they agree, which allows you to continue working on the feasibility study. Within that, the school building committee would review those items. Our general timeline we have allocated for some....where we would find reviews and timing them up with their submittals.

Gilman: This is also going to be a point of discussion in our conversation with the MSBA on Friday because we have a number of questions about the process and the whole of the school building committee. We are actually working with Ouida Young from the Law Department on what the roles are and how the design review process and city process will work with the MSBA process.

Crossley: I am wondering how our decision making process will dovetail with this newer set of requirements from the MSBA.

Guryan: That is what this interesting timeline that is being drafted is trying to do. I wanted to get back to your question about how the \$750,000 was arrived at. The MSBA provides a great deal of cost data on other projects that have been done. Both on cost of feasibility studies, which actually range from less than this to more than this and a great deal of detail on different size schools, we tried to look for something comparable. I was in an informational meeting with several of the MSBA people, where they verbally confirmed that they thought \$750,000 would be an appropriate number and would give us room. As you can hear from what we've been saying, it doesn't just include the actual feasibility study; it includes a pretty good path towards a design.

Crossley: Understanding that by the end of it you are defining the scope of the project.

Guryan: Exactly

Crossley: We have this process called site plan review and so forth and you can't get to that point if you are only given one thing to look at. There have to be some intermediary steps so we can get there.

Guryan: Mr. Valcarce did some calculations to try to get to the number more than one way. We have a reasonable level of comfort.

Valcarce: In the packet, we provided some links. There are a number of cost data table on their website. I wish I could say it was a simple apple to apples comparison but of course, nothing is. We look at the most current construction costs for elementary schools and we look at the designer and OPM fees. All the costs are provided as a percentage of construction costs and you have the construction costs. Every project is slightly different. Some things have more site issues. We tried to look at comparable schools by size. We don't know the ins and outs of every project, so we couldn't get to that level of detail. I would say that when you look at, if you look at them, the costs – if you look at each elementary school – sometimes there is a cost of feasibility study, programming, and schematic design and sometimes it is all under the feasibility study. I suspect that it was reported on the way that the proposal was provided by that particular designer.

Looking, through our experience, at the kinds of things you would need to do a feasibility study, which would include survey work, some civil engineering work, and testing, in consideration of those items along with the designer's items, the OPM's items under those categories, it generally worked out. Again it is not exact, but within the realm of about 3% of the construction costs. So, the \$750,000 was derived from basically the calculation you did, more or less, approximating the total cost of the project at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 million and including then the designer's fees. As usual, we are kind of stuck in a chicken and egg place. We would like to get proposals and have harder costs and then know what they are, but the MSBA says we will not invite you until you show us. So, we try to do some homework. Can we say definitively that it is a \$750,000 study, no, but based on all the due diligence that we could do and at least inferring with their historical data and speaking with the MSBA, it was put forth that it is a reasonable cost estimate for the feasibility study.

Crossley: I just want to make a statement that this a particularly difficult animal to get your hands around because the possibilities are so different. If it is possible to renovate and add to the existing school, it is a very different project than if you were building a new school. I just wanted to suggest because we talked earlier about the 5-58 committee and I think that our process in this city could be a very expensive one if we don't streamline it a bit. I think that the work we are trying to do there, which has barely begun, it needs to be informed by all of the information that you have so far and continually informed by that. It adds a whole other layer or it helps us to make decisions on how to streamline our process. I am not sure, which it is at this point.

Albright: I am sort of continuing on Ald. Crossley's theme and also a continuation of the meeting we had earlier by the president. We have all those processes that you described and we

have to make them to work together. I have a feeling based on the way the conversation went in the first 5-58 meeting that the idea might be to hunker down, get the work done – maybe under the covers- and do it as fast as we can and darn is the Design Review Committee in our way or is the newspaper going to be there and if they get a hold of that cost what are they going to say. I think we do our best work when we do it in public and I hate to say that, but it is true. It takes a little bit of extra time but I think we had better plan that time in because people feel left out of it and then they complain and that takes you back five steps. I know that we have to move fast because there is so much on the table but I hope we do it in as public a fashion as possible, with lots of notice to everybody “come and join us, look over our shoulders” and not be afraid that the newspaper is going to blow something out of the water and we will all be dead. That is my advice on the matter because I’ve seen what has happened in the past and when people feel left out...

Danberg: My comment is a continuation of what Ald. Albright is saying. One of the comments I would like to get from you is what difference you see in how the Design Review Committee, Designer Selection Committee will work as compared to this building committee because I see some overlap. One of the comments we heard from several sources in regards to Newton North was that the Designer Selection and Design Review Committees weren’t fully utilized to the extent that they could. I think that was one of the things that Ald. Albright may have been referring to in that people thought that weren’t being informed. This is not a question that I need an answer to today but I want you to make sure that you understand and you’ve worked out the Design Review and the building committee and who does what and how that whole thing works together.

Gilman: That is what we are working on with the Law Department - to figure out how it needs to work together.

Valcarce: I would just say that again within the prescribed MSBA format, when we do these submittals, there are forms that have to be submitted like meeting minutes, when that Committee met, who was there, what the vote was. I don’t think it is geared to override because they want obviously to have the local approval and they want you to give them the information that you had that local approval. I think the goal is to figure out how to streamline the two pieces in a way that is satisfactory to everybody.

Danberg: I am thinking long after all of this initial stuff is ironed out to make sure this works out right. Another comment was I remember the other day when Maureen Lemieux was talking about the health insurance vacation I think it was going to be two. Does anyone remember whether the total amount is in excess of \$750,000? Do you remember what that number was?

Lennon: Ms. Lemieux gave a balance and said we are using x from this.

Danberg: So this will cover it, at least. How will the decision be made ultimately, or have you not gotten to think about this, as to once you have decided whether it is going to be

renovation or a tear down, whether we would go with a custom design with an architect or go with one of the model schools.

Gilman: We will be looking at that during the feasibility process. The model school process... There are a number of model schools and you have to actually hire that designer that did that model school and use that model school. We will be looking at that as we go through the feasibility study. We are also doing some research now to see what model schools there are nearby that we can go and visit to understand the process that was used for the model school. The issue is that the site is fairly constrained and at this point it looks like it may not work but we are certainly going to investigate it to the full extent because if there are benefits to be gained from it we would certainly want to work towards that goal.

Valcarce: I guess I would say is that we will obviously do the research and try to figure out if there are model schools out there but the current Angier School is about 50,000 square feet. The site is just under two acres. The new Angier facility, however it gets named, will be about 73,000 square feet. To find a three-story model school that would fit exactly on that site without touching it - to use a model school is like this is it you don't touch it. As soon as you have to start customizing it and changing it around, the MSBA won't consider it as a model so you won't get those point benefits. While we will certainly look, see, and try, I have been saying... I think people should probably understand that getting the exact one to fit on there is probably not likely. Every site is different. It is probably not perfectly flat. I think that the more important value comes from utilizing the systems and the finishes and getting the knowledge base from the designer, the OPMs, and the construction manager at risk... That's a discussion with MSBA. They provide more points and seem to be in favor of that. I think that it is more likely to give us the cost savings and value. It will be driven by cost. The preferred solution, one would imagine, will come down to what is the most cost effective way to meet the school's programmatic needs. I think I would gear emphasis on that as more of a likelihood than coming up with an out of the book, perfect model school that is just going to fit on the site.

Every model school is owned by its designer. You would have to find it in advance and then you would have to go through the selection process. You are going to get proposals. We need to understand exactly, with the OPM when we get that person on board, how those things get written, so that we can make some flexibility if we find the model school designer.

Danberg: Is there a central database that has model schools or can anyone that wants to submit a model school, submit one... Like is the new Newton North in the database now of model schools.

Lennon: No

Valcarce: We actually did ask the question if we could design a model school for an urban site and they said there would be no value yet because it hasn't been enough times so how would they know what the cost is. We did hear on our field trip from that designer that they thought the MSBA might be looking again to up the inventory of model schools but who knows where that lies.

Gilman: There is no plan book. There is a page on the MSBA website about model schools. There is a list of schools and some photographs that you can look at. In the spreadsheets that they have with all of the cost data, unfortunately, they do not specify - So you have to look in two places to coordinate the data to figure out which one you are looking at.

Valcarce: And then most likely go to that designer's website and see if you actually find their model school.

Guryan: If you go back to the first thing Mr. Valcarce said, and actually this is going to be the answer to many questions, the feasibility study is going to determine whether the Angier project is a good candidate for the model school program.

Danberg: We really don't need to get any further into this.

Laredo: I really appreciate the importance of getting MSBA funding here; it is very significant. My understanding is what we are looking at is maybe 30 to 40% of the project, is that the ballpark.

Guryan: It is the ballpark but that doesn't get determined until you do the full design and the full cost of the project is known.

Laredo: So we don't know that until way down the road

Gilman: There is sort of a base percentage and then there are factors for the...

Laredo: What is the base percentage?

Gilman: I think it is about 31%.

Laredo: And what is the top.

Gilman: I am not sure but we could look at the spreadsheet. There is the formula based on the community, demographics and then you can earn percentage points for using a construction manager at-risk, using a model school, building a green school, having a good maintenance program. There are all sorts of ways to earn additional percentage points. Through the feasibility and the schematic design, you essentially get to a point where they can figure out what that percentage is.

Laredo: I guess my observation here is I think we should do everything we can to secure the MSBA funds with a cautionary note. The MSBA may be pushing us in a certain direction that this committee and the Mayor may decide that the end result may not be where we want to go. I think an illustration is a model school. A model school sounds great and you get some points for it but if it doesn't fit on the site, if it doesn't look like anything else you would have in the Angier area, it seems to me at the end of the day we want a good result and we certainly want

to do it cost effectively but don't want to lose sight of getting a good result. I just want to echo something that Ald. Lappin said. I am overwhelmed by the dates here as you presented them and I understand you are very early on. It would be really helpful to have a working calendar on a good excel spreadsheet or something like that, understanding that it is a flexible document that is going to change. We all need to do that and that goes right to what Ald. Lennon was talking about earlier about communication. I would urge you to build in there the time you need when you need to come to this committee and Finance and whatever other places you need to go for approval so that we get plenty of time to judge what is going on. This is just my observation having now been on both sides. The School Committee, frankly, functions for a reason I think more efficiently than the Board does. The Board has many more committees and just needs more process, so I think that would be very helpful.

I just have one other observation. I am noting that this process from feasibility study to building is going to be four plus years or so to get it done.

Valcarce: To the conclusion

Laredo: We've got 10 or 11 other elementary schools to do, presumably all with the same type of process in place – some to a lesser degree because the work isn't as great and I just put out there that if we are going to really get to these projects in the next 10 or 12 years, we need to get the feasibility studies going sequentially. I don't want to go astray but I put that observation out there.

Fischman: I think I heard you say that the \$750,000, you are going to kind of move that quickly. Does that mean you don't have bidding laws that you have to deal with?

Valcarce: For design services

Fischman: For getting the \$750,000 speced, for getting the feasibility, for selecting the owner's project manager, for whatever other costs are involved in \$750,000. Are these bid out or are these designers...

Valcarce: Yes, we have to put together requests for services. They have forms that you fill out and we will figure out what we want to add for those requirements and then go through the process of getting the OPM and then working through getting requests for services for the designers. The OPM takes the proposals and they get submitted to the MSBA about a month in advance of the designer selection panel meeting. Then you go to the designer selection panel and at that meeting, they will have analyzed and looked at all the proposals, discussed them and then ranked the designers and then you would begin the process of negotiating with the number one ranked designer.

Gilman: The selection process is similar to the selection process that we do.

Fischman: Ald. Lappin asked a question about what do you need an OPM. That is required by the MSBA. So you don't have a choice, you have to.

Valcarce: And it is not one individual. It sounds like one person.

Fischman: You said you would start to do the feasibility in August and I guess I understand that between now and August that's when you are going through the selection, etc...

Valcarce: Correct

Fischman: Again the question and we talked about that when we were talking about the 31% in terms of how much reimbursement. When do we actually know what the cost is?

Valcarce: When the first schematic design that comes out of the preferred solution from the feasibility study, then that preferred option is carried through schematic design.

Fischman: Are we talking about knowing about this in 2012.

Valcarce: We would know those numbers in 2013.

Fischman: So let's say in 2013 we know that we are going to have to come up with \$16,000,000, which is 61%. We are going to get 31% but we need 61% of \$25 million, so that is \$16 million. So, we know that in 2013 and the fact that we needed an override of some sort, we couldn't find money, we needed some choice, that would be early 2013 or would it be late 2013.

Gilman: The working group is actually figuring out.

Fischman: If you have an override, it seems to me you would want to tie it to something that we are actually doing in the municipal area.

Linsky: Ald. Laredo brought up the point I was going to make on the timing. It is a headlong rush and it is lot of stuff. A timeline would really help me understand this. I am hearing a tremendous amount of things. Thinking about our processes and the state's processes, I understand the project manager, dollar thresholds and it seems like if we don't do a designer selection process from that, etc...Ald. Fischman also hit on the point that if you understand the timeline before the financial part when we know that piece because may need a separate process on that. One last question I have though, is because of the major cut between new and renovated or some potential combination, one of those options may require swing space. As you proceed through this process, when do we have to...that Plan B when does that fit in because I would assume that would likely mean the Carr School. How much do we have to advance that discussion along with the Angier?

Gilman: That will be coming to you soon. We are simultaneously putting together the timeline for Carr and we will be bringing that forward as well, so we can start that process moving because that will need to happen in order to allow them to move.

Linsky: And that really is going to be totally separate from everything that we kind of discussed in that regard in terms of big monies, etc...that is something we are going to take on separately.

Gilman: That is a separate project. It is not tied into this.

Guryan: But if it fit into the Angier calendar that we spoke of broadly and yes, you will get something that lays it out, that would be needed to be ready for September of 2014, just to kind of plant that.

Blazar: Is there any consideration given to possibly looking at redistricting at that the same time. You can build a school that is bigger than what is there now. You can take people away from Zervas or other schools because that seems to me to be something that should be given some thought.

Guryan: We talked about that and it was part of our long-range plan with the consultant that looked at the whole range of all the schools and the needs and the capacities. We do currently have projections for Angier and we are aiming to make that school larger than for the exact number of children that are in the projections so that we can add some capacity.

Blazar: So that you may be shifting some of the students that go to another school. When you say the percentage of the cost is say a third, is that percentage fixing or is it a number because if the construction cost is \$30 million and you are going to need a third, \$10 million, but then they go up to \$35 or \$40 million, do you still get stuck at that number or does it come back up again.

Valcarce: It is a number that will be broken out specifically by site costs, foundation costs, super structure, and finishes. It will be very delineated and what the cost is and what is the funding that they are willing to give you. For example, they cap the site costs at 8% of the construction costs. So, if the site costs turn out to be 10%, well that 2% the City fully funds.

Gilman: It is formulaic. That is why you do this robust schematic design to arrive at a cost estimate that everybody agrees to and then they figure out what percentage of that they are going to fund and that is the agreement that you sign and if the City...If the project grows or something happens, then it is on the City. It really makes you manage to that level, very tightly.

Valcarce: If you decided that you wanted to add a swimming pool, it is probably not something that they are going to cover the cost. The construction cost estimate will include escalation based on when the construction start will be.

Crossley: Couple of quick questions and I know what we are really here for is to agree to move a resolution.

Salvucci: We discussed everything else.

Crossley: Actually, this is our opportunity to get to understand the project and the timeline.

Salvucci: Sure.

Crossley: I was going to ask if possibly, this draft schedule, even though it is a draft, could be ready for the 5-58 group meeting next Thursday. It would be great or when can we see it.

Gilman: We will have to figure that out with the working group on Friday to determine if we are comfortable with it at this point.

Crossley: Regarding the program for the building, you came up with a 73,000 sq. ft. number. Is that written?

Guryan: It is because when we had the architectural firm do the complete evaluation of all the buildings in 2007 and then updated it in 2011 but included in the study, which you can see on –line, is a complete explanation of what the state standards are for elementary schools programmatically and space wise and then what Newton opted for, which are much the same.

Crossley: Okay. So I would have to go on-line for that, there is not a simple one-page sort of enumeration of spaces.

Guryan: There probably is a one page out of the executive summary.

Valcarce: Actually, there is a two-page chart that is contained in that study if you just look at Appendix B. Every school is in there and it is based on the guidelines so there are some steps between the number of students. It is not...

Crossley: I think it would be helpful to have that document pulled and associated with the materials we get for this project as we move forward. I do remember that the idea was to build capacity at the school. It was one of the reasons it was chosen. It would be interesting to see how that is being done and I will move approval.

Salvucci: You can do it now but there are other questions coming up.

Albright: In terms of other schools that are of interest to us, do we have to wait until we are asked to submit more schools. What is the process moving into the future?

Guryan: The other schools are already submitted. If we wanted to partner with MSBA... Let's say the next school for this scope of a project is likely to be either Cabot or Zervas; those are the next two in the rankings, in order to even get where we just got, which is the invitation to participate and document everything, the community has to indicate that it is prepared to fund the project and move forward. The community would have to be ready to do that before we could even signal to the MSBA that we wanted to go forward.

Albright: Well then that is exactly the right question because, and this is maybe for all of us and for the executive and later, I am concerned that when we go for a debt exclusion override for one school that people are going to say “you are not going to get to my school for x number of years” and the conversation that I would like to have is what is the best strategy. Does it make more sense to go for three schools, four schools and do them sequentially? Don’t do them all at once but at least everybody knows my school is in the queue.

Guryan: There are two things in play. First of all, there is Newton’s own plan for the sequence and timing of addressing what are very large needs at a dozen schools. It is pretty daunting, and I’m not the one to say how many will be done in a very short amount of time. If you look at the five-year CIP plan that was put forward and then you look at the financing schedule or the debt schedule by the CFO, you will see that the funds are in for Carr design and renovation, for Angier feasibility and then construction, and design funds for the next school coming in the five years. In addition to that, we are beginning to work on proposals on behalf of the school planning to add to the CIP, which is a living document, to combine the full-scale school renovation or replacement projects with some smaller projects. We have different needs. We have facilities that are in very, very difficult shape that have to be addressed but we also have enrollment growths, we have a capacity issue and then of course we have the issues of all the programmatic spaces we need. What we are in the mix of while trying to get a proposal ready is in addition to moving down the path, getting swing space, getting the Angier project underway, particularly with MSBA and being clear about what the next school, and getting its design underway – proposing a number of smaller projects that would be more along the line of the Day Middle School Project in which we might add an addition with four to six classrooms to an existing building that is in pretty good shape. These would actually be the buildings at the far end of our list of needs that could possibly be brought up to being larger and then fix the spaces such as the cafeteria or add special education smaller instructional spaces and add the sprinkler system. Do a project that is in a range between \$5 and \$8 million dollars. I can’t know exactly but that can be done sequenced in with the larger projects, so that we could be addressing capacity at the same time as doing the major projects.

Albright: So do you have a timeframe for bringing that forward.

Guryan: We are working on it right now with the School Committee members and the facilities group that we have in the School Department that includes Stephanie Gilman and her team.

Yeo: We are beginning to discuss this on the School Committee and with the team at Public Buildings. I think in March or April the CIP working group will reevaluate all of the projects again.

Albright: Just as long as it is on the same timeframe that the debt exclusion override thinking is. They need to be coordinated.

Guryan: I think we understand that it is part of the mix of this.

Laredo: I agree with Ald. Albright's concerns. I am going to reiterate a couple of things. One is the timing, we would need to go out for some debt exclusion override because it does not look like there is any other source of funding in the CIP other than going to the voters and asking them to approve it. I think we have to be blunt about that. We need sufficient time to do that. It has to be built into your timeline. Having been involved in those kinds of campaigns before, you are talking maybe a six month lead in to do that and then you have to factor when your vote is versus when you have to go out and put things out to bid and when you can actually start construction. I'm concerned about a timeline that doesn't have us having a vote until 2014 and then you are going to start construction three or four months later. I am not sure how that works. Maybe it doesn't. Second, I appreciate the need to go out and get MSBA funding but I don't think it is feasible for us to go out and continually ask voters year after year to fund a school project here and a school project there. I am going to share Ald. Albright's concern, I really hope we think bigger picture. I will just add that I appreciate the idea of knocking off some of the smaller projects and that is a good thing but I would hate to do that and really not address each of the schools in a comprehensive fashion. I sat through that planning process in 2007. We have significant needs and we shouldn't just do some patchwork at these schools so it feels good. I think we should be very comprehensive and not be afraid to go out there and tackle the whole thing.

Lennon: I just wanted to be clear, wrapping up some questions I received from people via e-mail. On the feasibility study, it is \$750,000. The feasibility study is sort of the umbrella and within that is the owner's project manager, designer and other professionals, just so we are all clear.

Gilman: Yes and it takes us through this robust schematic design but there will be additional design costs. This is to get us to the point where we can sign an agreement with the MSBA.

Lennon: I expect all these numbers to change, unfortunately. In saying that, I truly appreciate my colleagues on the other side of the table saying that we should be looking bigger picture and try to get out and talk about three or four different schools. We don't even know how much this is going to cost us. I appreciate Ald. Laredo saying that he has been a part of these campaigns and that they are six to nine months. It is essentially going out to sell and if we don't have an amount to go out and sell, whether it is one school or five schools consider it dead in the water. So, that is my concern. We have had our own conversation about trying to put too much in the pot. We are talking water/sewer infrastructure and we are talking this and that and all these other things that we want to do. I am very hesitant to start going out to taxpayers and not only saying we want to do a school, but now we want to do four schools but we really don't know how much that is all going to cost.

Albright: No, you can't go out like that.

Lennon: I understand but what I'm trying to say is you wouldn't go out like that. What I am trying to say is that we need to be cognizant of that. We don't even know what this one

school is going to cost us. If we have that further discussion, that it is also part of the conversation.

The other thing I wanted to make clear is we are going back to the MSBA at the end of March.

Valcarce: Our goal would be to submit things most likely by the end of this month, beginning of March. We are going to have a conference call with the MSBA and be prepared to be on their agenda in March.

Lennon: Let's say we go with March and at that meeting we need to be able to say that we have the funding in place for the feasibility study.

Gilman: We actually have to submit the resolution before they even invite us to the board meeting.

Lennon: I guess the question that I am trying to answer is a question posed to me that it seems like this period is a pretty lengthy period. Why are we voting this piece right now and my response was I believe they are going back relatively soon and when you go back you want to be able to say you've got x in place; that is what we want to do.

Gilman: And that 270 days is really the allowable time. If you don't get all of your stuff filed within those 270 days, you have to start all over again. You kind of lose your place in line. That is really the MSBA's way of saying you need to get stuff in. We are trying to do it as quickly as we can to keep the process moving because there is all this time that we need to go through the process.

Lennon: The last suggestion I was going to make and I mentioned it in the chairmen's meeting was that seeing that the School Committee will be potentially will be taking a vote on this next Monday, if we were to approve this in any of our committees, we would do it subject to second call. I think we have done that fairly recently to ensure that we are complementing their approval vote. We could potentially take this up on the 21st and I would want to get something in writing from the School Committee stating that they took an affirmative vote and we are able to do the same thing by the 21st.

Hess-Mahan: I expect to vote for this but I did have one question that comes from me from some people in the Angier community, who know from the whole procedure that we went through with Newton North. There are things that the MSBA will pay for and reimburse us for and things that they won't. The question that came to me was things like the cafeteria, the gymnasium and some of the other program space. Sandy could you talk about what they are going to reimburse, what aren't they, are there things that we want in Angier that aren't reimbursable.

Guryan: The things that you are describing are required and having visited the school in Dedham. It was interesting because that school in Dedham is replacing a school older than Angier in very difficult condition. The students are still in the school because they built the new

one on a different site. They stayed under \$30 million in costs and have all of the spaces fully approved by the MSBA. They described a great partnership. I think the spaces that we would be asking for: art, music, cafeteria, library, technology, gymnasium, and access are pretty standard.

Hess-Mahan: There is a brand new school in Arlington, where my wife teaches, that has all of those things and more. I'm not sure that the MSBA actually paid for all of them.

Valcarce: You can look it up in the MSBA table and it will tell you line for line the cost and it will give you the differential.

Salvucci: You will all remember, I am sure, that when we were doing the high school, there was a lot of delay and a lot of discussion as to whether we should renovate or tear it down and build a new one. I think we lost an awful lot of time just on that – hybrid and all the other business. We all knew in our heart that the school was coming down. So, if I may make a suggestion, start with tearing the building down because there is no point in wasting time discussing whether or not we are going to renovate a 90 year old school. One of the things that we need to do because we got burned \$14 to \$18 million dollars for hazardous material on North, I don't know that there is anything up there like that but we have to make sure there isn't especially under the school.

Valcarce: In the feasibility study, hazardous material surveys and all those things would be done.

Salvucci: Make sure you have all your back up material.

Crossley: Motion to approve subject to second call

Lappin: With the expectation that we get the timeline as soon as you have it.

Rice: Motion to approve subject to second call in Programs and Services

#239-11 ALD. ALBRIGHT, CROSSLEY & LINSKY requesting a discussion with Public Buildings Department and School Committee regarding modular classrooms that includes the, the location, the age, the condition and the number of modular classrooms. [07-12-10 @ 3:19 PM]

ACTION: **NO ACTION NECESSARY 7-0**

NOTE: Facilities and Operations Supervisor Josh Morse and Director of Operations Michael Cronin provided the committee with the attached spreadsheet related to all of the School Department's modular classrooms. The spreadsheet includes the location, material, condition, age, energy issues, accessibility issues, life safety issues, other code issues, rating, and comments for each of the 25 modular classrooms. The scale for the rating is one through four: one being best and four being worst.

The modular units range from brand new to 24 years old at Countryside Elementary Schools. Modular units that were built more than five-years ago are “stick built” and were a cheap fix for space needs. These modular classrooms require a different level of maintenance to keep their building envelope tight and to keep them from becoming damaged. The Public Building Department has done three maintenance projects on the exterior of these modular classrooms to address damage caused by roof leaks because of gutter issues. The structure is reinsulated; structural materials are replaced, reskinned, and painted. The School Department’s custodial staff has been instructed to inspect modular classrooms on a regular basis to identify leaks. Mr. Cronin is also inspecting the modular classrooms on a regular basis. The cost of the repairs at Zervas Elementary School modular classroom was approximately \$24,000 as the scope of the repair included replacement windows and other structural issues. The Horace-Mann Elementary School modular classroom repair was incorporated as part of the new corridor space to access the additional modular classroom. The Cabot Elementary School modular classroom repair was approximately \$6,000, as the leak issue was identified early before the entire exterior structure needed to be replaced.

It was pointed out that the condition of some of the modular classrooms lends support to the argument to renovate and/or replace the elementary schools. The modular classrooms are never going to get any better. The City needs to get rid of these modular classrooms. Mr. Cronin stated that there has been discussion of adding permanent additions and removing the modular classrooms at a number of schools to address the capacity issues. The details regarding this possibility have not been worked out but are in process.

The Committee felt that the information requested in the docket item had been provided. However, the Committee would like to have a larger planning and policy discussion regarding considering a twenty-year plan for addressing school building needs including the modular classrooms. In addition, it would be helpful to have the ongoing maintenance requirements for the modular classrooms over the life of the modular classrooms. Mr. Morse added that in the short-term, the modular classrooms are not going to be eliminated and the City will need to invest some money into maintenance. He is not suggesting that a substantial amount of money be invested in modular classrooms but maintenance is required to ensure that the modular classroom is useable.

The Committee felt that a motion of no action necessary was appropriate. A new item will be docketed requesting a larger policy discussion on modular classroom. With that, a motion for no action necessary was entertained and voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony J. Salvucci, Chairman

| Newton Schools Study - Facility Assessment | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| MODULAR ASSESSMENT | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Material | Condition/Age | Energy Issues | Accessibility Issues | Life Safety Issues | Other Code Issues | Rating | Comments | |
| BOWEN | | | | | | | | | |
| Modular addition | 1 classroom plus connector; carpet, 2x4 ACT, red-stained vertical wood siding exterior | Good/ 2007; siding is peeling | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1 | | |
| BURR | | | | | | | | | |
| Modular addition | 1 classroom | New 2012 | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1 | | |
| CABOT | | | | | | | | | |
| "1991" Modulars (2 classrooms, 1 support space and toilet rooms) | Wood vertical siding; pre-fab metal walls, ACT and carpet | Poor/20 years old, siding is deteriorating (one elevation has been replaced in its entirety), physical connection is poor, roof leaks, no canopy or weatherstripping at doorway - rain comes right in; poor or non-existent ventilation at toilet rooms. | YES | YES | YES | YES | 4 | Due to modular location one room was reduced in size (the library) and a second room does not have windows. Dead end corridor. Poor indoor air quality and mold is a real concern. Exit door freezes shut. Modular spaces >20 years should be replaced. | |
| "2007" Modulars (2 classrooms) | Wood vertical siding; pre-fab metal walls, ACT and carpet | Good/ 4 years old; roof leaks; stained ceiling tiles; exterior door not weather tight | NO | NO | NO | NO | 2 | Due to modular location windows were eliminated in one teaching space and reduced in another. Repair roof leaks and provide weatherstripping at door. | |
| COUNTRYSIDE | | | | | | | | | |
| "1991" modular addition includes 2 classrooms | Wood vertical siding; carpet, VCT, 2x4 ACT | Fair/1991; damaged ceiling tiles from various roof leaks, damaged window screen, wood exterior steps need repairs, stained carpet; exterior has newer paint | YES | NO | NO | NO | 3 | Note: too close to wetlands. No nearby toilet facilities. Modular spaces >20 years in age should be replaced. | |
| "1998" modular addition includes 2 classrooms and 2 support spaces | Wood vertical siding; carpet, VCT, 2x4 ACT | Fair/1998; damaged ceiling tiles from various roof leaks, stained carpet; window/wall leak over a period of years triggered a mold problem, that is mostly repaired | YES | NO | NO | NO | 3 | Note: too close to wetlands. No nearby toilet facilities. The facility is past its ave. life cycle of 10 years; maintenance and upkeep efforts will continue to increase. | |

| | Material | Condition/Age | Energy Issues | Accessibility Issues | Life Safety Issues | Other Code Issues | Rating | Comments |
|--|---|---|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|---|
| HORACE MANN | | | | | | | | |
| "2002" Modularity (2 classrooms) | Wood vertical siding; carpet and 2x4 ACT | Poor/arrived in 2002, were previously at a middle school and Carr, ~10 years old, therefore ~20 years old. Poor physical connection to school--leaks. | YES | YES | NO | NO | 4 | Due to modular location the existing educational spaces are reduced in size and the windows look onto the modularity 4' away. No nearby toilet facilities. Modular spaces >20 years should be replaced. |
| "2007" Modular (1 space used as Library) | Wood vertical siding; carpet and 2x4 ACT | Good/ 2007 | NO | YES | NO | NO | 1 | Due to modular location the existing educational spaces are reduced in size and the windows look onto the modularity 4' away. No nearby toilet facilities. |
| Modular addition | 1 classroom | New 2012 | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1 | |
| PEIRCE | | | | | | | | |
| "2007" Modular Addition includes 2 classrooms | Wood vertical siding; pre-fab metal walls, ACT and carpet | Good/ 4 years; roof leaks, ripped window screen | NO | NO | NO | NO | 2 | Repair roof leaks and window screen. |
| ZERVAS | | | | | | | | |
| "1991" Modular Addition includes 1 space used as the Library | Wood vertical siding; pre-fab metal walls, ACT and carpet | Poor/ 20 years old; exterior wall and floor are rotted, with a portion of the room unusable; bad indoor air quality | YES | NO | NO | NO | 4 | Modular spaces >20 years should be replaced. |
| "2007" Modular Addition includes 2 classrooms | Wood vertical siding; pre-fab metal walls, ACT and carpet | Good/ 4 years old; roof leaks; stained ceiling tiles; exterior steps being replaced 2011 | NO | NO | NO | NO | 2 | Repair roof leaks and replaced ceiling tiles; maintenance and upkeep efforts will continue to increase. |
| Modular addition | 2 classrooms | New 2012 | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1 | |
| OAK HILL MIDDLE | | | | | | | | |
| Modular addition | Four classrooms plus corridor and connecting corridor. | Good/2010 | NO | NO | NO | NO | 1 | |