

Abington School Building Committee

July 29, 2014

Community Room, Abington Police Headquarters
6:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Richard Testa, Mike Franey, Andy Burbine, George Whiting, David Drew, Michael Lyons, Shawn Reilly Kathy Bailey, Peter Schafer, Felicia Moschella, Peter Serino, Jim West, and Ron Blanchard

Committee Members Absent: Jason Linn, Roseanne Kurposka, Tricia McDonnell, Jessica Sullivan, Teresa Sullivan, Richard LaFond, Jannette Leary, Barbara Cristoforo, Kevin Atkinson, and Keri Maquire

Professional Staff: Troy Randall, Scott Dunlap, Roger Boddie, and Mary Mahoney

Guests: Leo Provost, Tracy Remillard, Mike Kurowski, and Cindy Whiting

Mr. Testa called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

A. Approve Minutes for June 3, 2014

Draft meeting minutes for the School Building Committee meeting on June 3, 2014 were considered.

VOTED: on motion of Mr. Drew, seconded by Ms. Bailey, the members of the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes for June 3, 2014.

B. Approve Minutes for July 8, 2014

Draft meeting minutes for the School Building Committee meeting on July 8, 2014 were considered.

VOTED: on motion of Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Drew, the members of the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes for July 8, 2014.

C. Schematic Design

Mr. Testa recognized and thanked members of the Board of Selectmen and School Committee for attending the School Building Committee meeting.

Mr. Dunlap reported the evening's design presentation is part of the process for finalizing documentation for Schematic Design, gaining local approval of the documents and securing approval to submit to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). Much of the design presentation will recap previous project presentations and exhibit design advancement based on input received during working session meetings, meetings with staff and administrators, meetings with the School Building Committee (ASBC), and collaboration with MSBA. The presentation will also include the results of independent cost estimates produced for the schematic design documents and a review of the total project budget. The project timeline moving forward includes a supplemental project presentation to a joint meeting of the Board of Selectmen, School Committee, and ASBC on August 4, 2014 to obtain approval and authorization to submit Schematic Design documentation to MSBA for its consideration, submission of the Schematic Design on or before August 7, 2014 to be eligible

for project consideration by MSBA's Board of Directors at their next meeting scheduled September 24, 2014. Between August 7 and September 24, MSBA staff will review the Schematic Design documents and collaborate on the final scope and budget for the project. MSBA's collaboration will include a Project Scope and Budget process including a conference to finalize the project scope, budget, schedule, and potential MSBA participation for the project. The Project Scope and Budget documentation will be the basis of MSBA's Board of Directors approval for the project. If the MSBA's Board of Directors approves the project then the Town will be required to executed a Project Scope and Budget Agreement and secure the required local funding authority within 120 days of MSBA's Board approval.

The proposed site plan was presented highlighting the new school building in relation to the existing high school building, vehicle access, parking, and circulation, school transportation and parent drop off areas for the High School, Middle School, and Pre-Kindergarten, building entries, building sections, and site development features such as playfields and tennis courts. Mr. Dunlap noted that the total project budget will be reviewed later in the presentation, however it is important to note at this juncture that MSBA requires that certain grant ineligible scope be specifically identified separate from the construction costs for the facility. The costs are independently tracked by assigning them as "Alternates". Based on these guidelines the synthetic playfield work although included in the overall budget for the project will be identified separately as 'Alternate No. 1'. Similarly the fields lights associated with the synthetic fields are also grant ineligible but are to be included in the base scope of the project and thus will be identified as "Alternate No. 2". The project budget will also include two other scope options that have been briefly discussed in previous meetings and will be included only if the construction bid received is under budget. These two other scope items will be identified as "Alternate No. 3 and Alternate No. 4" and shall include scope to add site lighting along Gliniewicz Way and construct a field concession/storage building.

Mr. Franey and Mr. Burbine depart the meeting at 6:20 P.M.

General discussions ensued regarding the proposed site plan including:

- *Mr. Testa reported that there have been several inquiries regarding existing drainage issues at the High School site and asked for an explanation of how these issues will be address in the new project.* – Mr. Dunlap reported that currently there is no drainage system under the playing fields behind Abington High School, and an old and limited capacity drainage system exists under some of the paved parking areas. When the present high school building was constructed over 50 years ago, the playing field area was actually excavated and lowered by the contractor to its present location -- some 6-10 feet below the base elevation of the land surrounding the existing building. Therefore, the elevation of the current playing fields is much lower and much closer to the water table. The existing fields were also left very flat, with no "crowning" of the fields to help shed water to the sides of the playing field areas, resulting in standing water or mud after some rain storms. When it rains, the fields do not drain well because (1) there is no drainage system to collect and store any large amounts of rainwater, (2) the fields are not crowned or pitched to allow water to flow off to the sides, and (3) there is not enough existing soil/gravel above the water table to allow rainwater to be absorbed back into the ground naturally. MA Department of Environmental Protection stormwater management regulations required state-of-the-art underground drainage systems which collect, store, clean and release rain water (storm water) in a much more efficient and more environmentally-friendly manner. The proposed school building plans will include the filling and raising of some of the land elevations around the new building which will provide more room underground to allow for natural rain absorption and the installation of underground stormwater drainage systems. Additionally, the entire roof of the newly proposed school building will include a rainwater collection system which utilizes rainwater for use in the building's plumbing system, in lieu of attempting to re-charge the water onto the site or into the soil.

- *Mr. Reilly requested a review of the traffic flow into and around the site.* – Mr. Dunlap reviewed the independent vehicle entries, parking and parent drop off queue designed for the High School and Middle School and separate bus drop off and queuing lane. Mr. Schafer noted that the facility will be operated with staggered start/release times to manage site flows and maintain separation of student populations.
- *Mr. Drew asked about toilet facility access for off hour field users and spectators.* – Mr. Dunlap identified a men's and women's toilet rooms at the northeast section of the building which are located to allow for off hour access without need to open the building to the public.
- General discussion ensued regarding the "Alternates" proposed for the project, MSBA requirements for separately tracking of design and construction costs associated with the work items, the inclusion of Alternate 1 – Multi-purpose Synthetic Turf Fields and Alternate 2 – Field Lights for Multi-purpose Synthetic Turf Fields in the total budget for the project, inclusion of Alternate 3 – Site Lighting along Gliniewicz Way and Alternate 4 – Field Concession/Storage Building only if the construction bid received is under budget, and the order of Alternates 3 and 4. There was a general consensus to include Alternates 3 and 4 but the order of the Alternates should be changed to Alternate 3 – Field Concession/Storage Building and Alternate 4 – Site Lighting along Gliniewicz Way.

The proposed first floor plan was presented highlighting the general layout of the building with a Middle School academic section separate from the High School section and shared core facilities with separate circulation patterns. The Middle School academic section is laid out to promote project based team learning with the first floor assigned to grade 5 and 6 and the second floor assigned to grade 7 and 8. The Pre-Kindergarten section was reviewed including general space layout and organization, access with controlled entry, parent parking, and school transportation queue lane. Separate student dining spaces are located at the front core of the building with direct connection to each school's circulation paths; one dining area for Middle School students and a separate dining area for High School students.

The proposed second floor was presented highlighting the Middle School academic section, High School academic section, circulation paths for each, access to back of Auditorium seating, and shared Library/Media Center. The Library/Media Center although a shared space has been designed to maintain a physical separation of student populations while maintaining an open feel to the space enabling adult supervision of the space and student activities.

General discussions ensued regarding circulation throughout the building, including location of elevators, and creation of zones within the building to allow for off hour use of community space without full access to the building.

A "Bird's Eye Perspective" was presented with a general overview of the building layout, identification of site and building access points, parking facility locations, traffic patterns, and identification of site improvement features.

General discussions ensued including:

- *Proposed roof appears flat in the perspective, how will it drain and not result in leaks.* – Mr. Dunlap stated that roof areas must be designed with a slope of anywhere from ¼" per foot to ½" per foot to provide positive drainage to the building drainage system. Additionally, the Massachusetts structural code has increase the live and dead load requirements for the roof structure to account for snow accumulation loading.
- *Will solar panels that generate power be included in the project?* – Mr. Dunlap reported that the building will include infrastructure to support a future photovoltaic array (solar panels).
- *Will the building be designed to meet Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Codes?* – Mr. Dunlap reported that the project will be designed to achieve MSBA High Efficiency School

Program so as to achieve grant incentive points for the project and as such will meet USGBC LEED Silver guidelines and state energy efficiency codes.

Building views were presented with a general overview of the architectural design style featuring traditional New England materials and style to blend with other Town buildings adjacent to the school campus, including Town Hall and Library.

General discussions ensued including:

- Windows and glazing systems proposed for the building exterior with Mr. Dunlap discussing the need to be thoughtful in the layout of windows to minimize the size of framed windows and avoid added structural components associated with large openings. The building design groups small windows together to provide the benefit of large glass feature while compartmentalizing the assemblies to avoid added structural supports for the openings.
- Emergency Electric/Power Systems proposed for the project with Mr. Dunlap reporting that the project design includes a 750kW emergency generator. The emergency electric services will partially power the building including life safety systems, emergency lighting, power to the heating plant, certain food service equipment, telephones, building security systems and building IT network.

Mr. Dunlap reported on the cost estimates provided by independent firms. Following completion of the independent estimates, a reconciliation was conducted to confirm project scope and unit cost information. Based on the reconcile estimates the construction costs inclusive of the synthetic turf field and associate site lighting (Alternate No. 1 and No. 2) were in budget with the Preferred Schematic Study cost estimate. Subsequently and based in part on the study phase budget and reconciled cost estimates, KBA developed a total project budget utilizing MSBA budget formulation template titled Form 3011.

A total project budget created with MSBA's Form 3011 was presented and Ms. Mahoney reviewed the document. The Form 3011 is composed of budget categories including: Feasibility Study Agreement, Administration including owner's project manager, legal and permitting fees, Architecture and Engineering fees, Construction Costs, Alternates, Miscellaneous Costs such as utility connection and construction testing costs, furniture, equipment and technology costs, and owner and construction contingency reserves. MSBA's process provides that the Schematic Design submission includes a draft total project budget based on the reconciled designer's cost estimate and projections of project soft costs and that the budget also identify projected costs which may be considered ineligible for grant reimbursed based on MSBA regulations and policy. The draft projection of ineligible costs are listed in the column labelled "Scope Items Excluded from the Basis of Estimated Total Facilities Grant ..." with most of the values automatically calculated basis on data entered for the estimated budget, the size of the building, the MSBA approved project enrollment total, and costs associated with project Alternates. Based on the reconciled designer estimate and estimated budget for all other project related costs the total budget for the project \$96,400,000.00 which is slightly below the Preferred Schematic Study project budget produced in December 2013.

General discussion ensued regarding inclusion of owner contingency and construction contingency funding and MSBA's policy change that reduced grant eligibility for construction contingency reimbursement to one percent of the construction costs. The total project budget as proposed includes a construction contingency of 4% which is a conservative approach to project cost forecasting. Discussion continued regarding the costs for future furniture and technology equipment needed to complete the new building. Ms. Mahoney reported that furniture, equipment, and technology equipment is included in the budget at the MSBA recommended cost allotment based on the school enrollment with a value of \$2,676,000 available for such purchases.

Audience members inquired about MSBA's school grant program and certainty of its commitment to fund the project grant and whether the local taxpayer impact forecasts will change based on the

further refined Schematic Design total project budget. Mr. Dunlap responded that since its creation on 2004 the MSBA has made significant progress in implementing major management and financial reforms to the state reimbursement and funding process for school construction and that the MSBA has a dedicated revenue stream of one penny of the state's 6.25-percent sales tax to ensure its commitment to assist municipalities in invest in their schools. Mr. Testa noted that in its history MSBA has made more than \$10.7 billion in reimbursements to cities, towns, and regional school districts for school construction projects. Ms. Moschella reported that based on MSBA's reimbursement process that instead of waiting years for reimbursement, districts now receive payments from the MSBA as costs are incurred, usually within 15 days of submitting a request through the MSBA's online system. Mr. Testa further commented that the forecasted taxpayer impact for the project has not changed based on the refinement of the total project budget through Schematic Design.

D. General Business and Items not reasonable anticipated 48 hours in advance

Mr. Testa encouraged Committee members to continue to solicit inquiry from and provide information to the public regarding the project. Mr. Testa reported that Committee produced documents including "More Fact & Figures" document, map diagram of new school construction cities and towns, and benefits of technology document are posted to the ASBC web page. Mr. Testa further reported that prior to posting and in an abundance of caution both the informational handout and pamphlet were forwarded to the Office of Campaign Finance (OCPF) to review to ensure that neither would present a campaign finance issue. The OCPF reported that documents are fine for distribution and can be used going forward. The one point they stressed is that these documents are able to be made available on our website, as posters and in print for distribution by any member of the public requesting information, however Town funds cannot be used to mass produce these documents and or pay for postage for an unsolicited mass mailing.

Mr. Testa thanked members of the Board of Selectmen, School Committee, and community members for attending the ASBC meeting and for being part of the project development process.

E. Adjournment

VOTED: on motion of Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Whiting, the members of the committee unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 P.M.

Meeting Handouts:
Agenda for July 29, 2014 meeting
Ai3's Presentation to the Abington Building Committee July 29, 2014