

LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING held jointly with the Permanent Building Committee

Tuesday, December 22, 2015

Hadley Public Services Building, Cafeteria
201 Bedford Street

PRESENT: Superintendent Dr. Mary Czajkowski, , Vice Chair Bill Hurley, Alessandro Alessandrini, Margaret Coppe, Judy Crocker; PBC members: Jon Himmel Chairman, Peter Johnson, Dick Perry, Carl Oldenburg, Charles Favazzo

OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Goddard (Director of Facilities), Mark Barrett (Project Manager); Representatives from DiNisco Design Partnership, Hill Associates, Bond Brothers

The minutes were taken by Paula McDonough and Judy Crocker.

At **2:05pm**, Vice Chair Hurley called the School Committee meeting to order.

At **2:05pm**, Chair Jon Himmel called the Permanent Building Committee to order.

Agenda

1. DiNisco Designs Partnership Presentation on Update of Middle School Capital Project:

Ken DiNisco gave a summary update that included:

- Proposed project improvements
- Existing versus proposed site and floor plans
- Cost breakdowns
- Renovation areas content and construction costs (Clarke 9 areas and Diamond 8 areas)

The discussion included:

- To ensure that the cost of the scope of work is the assessed appropriately, cost elements were vetted by both Bond Brothers and DiNisco. Frank Murphy of Hill International also participated.
- Elements of the Clarke and Diamond proposed project improvements reviewed included team size; general educational classroom spaces; science classrooms; art, music, drama and engineering; special education space; traffic flow, and site and floor plans.
- Clarke site improvements involve realigning the drive, building some new parking spaces and possibly relocating the tennis courts.
- Renovated areas completed in multiple phases allowed for short-term classroom use after phase 1.
- Any peer review would be needed in January. This is an important feedback exercise.

LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING held jointly with the Permanent Building Committee on 12.22.15

- Square footage costs and benefits were compared for new versus renovated space. Explanations for the differences in costs were asked and not totally accepted.
- On Dec 22 the Notice of Intent (NOI) was delivered to Conservation Commission for Clarke and Diamond.
- Clarke newly proposed pedestrian plaza will contain underground water retention that will counterbalance the new wing's water runoff.
- The new art room at Clarke is needed based on current overbooked rooms and large classes.
- At Diamond, a new teacher planning area is needed for more efficient use of classroom utilization; this would make the teacher/room practice at Diamond similar to what is now the norm at Clarke.
- How many classrooms, including art and science rooms, are made available upon Diamond change to teacher planning area model? No specific number was given and explanation discussed hard versus soft classrooms.
- Based on capacity analysis by School Master Planning architectural firm SMMA, utilization of Diamond math classrooms is 65-85% occupancy.
- Clarke and Diamond are fairly equivalent when comparing net versus gross square footage. Diamond has smaller classrooms but has better building circulation.
- The Architect explained that the project includes the repaving of the road on school property leading toward Hathaway Road and a very short stretch of contiguous, deteriorated pavement on Sedge Road that is actually town property.
- Even with phased construction, there was concern of the scale of renovations proposed to take place during school hours and how it would affect cost, scheduling, and occupancy timelines.

The ILP program at Clarke with possible relocation to Diamond was discussed.

- It is not necessary to expand the program.
- The program uses both inclusionary instruction in general education classrooms and separate classroom programming space.
- The Superintendent does not want to move the program from Clarke to Diamond now because it is not needed at this time.
- Diamond would require more FTE's and space if the program were to be moved.
- School Committee will vote on January 5.

2. Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC) and Co2 Presentation:

The School Committee must answer:

- Whether to air condition or not school spaces, based on school and community use
- DiNisco needs to understand community building use especially gym, library, and cafeteria.
- Lexington Board of Health recommends that Lexington Public Schools follow Massachusetts Department of Public Health guidelines (The MDPH uses a guideline of 800 ppm for publicly occupied buildings. A guideline of 600 ppm or less is preferred in schools due to the fact that the majority of occupants are young and considered to be a more sensitive population) for CO₂ air content at 600ppm. Are these State wide school standards necessary to be met? If so, additional ventilation will be needed at additional costs.
- Must realize total costs involved in all growth at Diamond versus growth at both schools. This is mostly a cost exercise since the Superintendent has advised against this approach.

Four options were presented:

- 4 Pipe Induction: very quiet, used at Estabrook, no filters to change, most cost effective for full AC.
- 2 Pipe Induction: manual turnover from heating to AC in fall and spring needed, full AC
- Variable Refrigerant Flow (VRF): noisier, full AC
- Partial Cooling: is really dehumidification and may not provide comfort the full school year [the thinking is that there may be 5 days of discomfort during the normal school year], used at Bowman and Bridge. The spaces occupied year round would receive air conditioning.

The HVAC discussion included:

- Fiske and Harrington use a geothermal system.
- Life cycle costs given are for Clarke only in the new, 16,000 sf building addition and not for Diamond or any of the renovated spaces at either school.
- Air-to-air pumps of today are more efficient than the geothermal pumps at Fiske and Harrington.
- Difference between policy of sustainability and practice.

The CO₂ discussion included:

- Currently, there are 3 air exchanges and a fourth may be needed, to meet DPH recommendation of 600ppm.
- DiNisco is developing costs differences for better CO₂ air exchanges.
- Models of exchange included:
 - High volume of air exchanged at a low speed
 - Or increasing the speed which will also increase the noise level
 - Therefore a larger unit will be needed for this larger air capacity. This will require a higher roof load, unit cost, associated ductwork, and electrical load

3. Value Engineering (VE) Presentation:

The discussion included:

- The master list of proposed VE items was distributed indicating which items were recommended by the Design team with input from school administration and facilities.
- Bond was asked if there were any other cost savings items that they were aware of, through their review of the plans and estimates that had not been raised yet. Bond replied that they believed the process to be comprehensive to date and that if items were found as the plans were more developed they would identify them.
- After review of the estimates some believe that the all growth at Diamond cost delta is larger than presented.
- All growth at Diamond scenario produces 16 classrooms.

PBC Motion to vote in favor of the recommended VE options presented by the project team, but to defer passing judgement on the extent of Air Conditioning and ventilation increases to the elected boards. Vote 6-0 with motion made by Himmel and seconded by Perry.

4. Proposed Middle School, Elementary and Pre-K Peer Review Process:

The PBC stated that the “peer review” exercises of the past two weeks were perhaps uncomfortable for some but they felt the process was worthwhile and appreciated. Pelham is another variable in this multi-part capital project.

A solution is a peer review process. Suggestions included:

- That the Architect and OPM assemble materials before the Peer Review process
- That an independent entity i.e. someone who is not on the project be involved; this does not rule out others from the OPM being involved.

The overall goal is to achieve the projected enrollment, compression, redistricting, new Hastings, elementary schools, middle schools, fire and police, as well as operating overrides, so all Town Meeting votes will be successful.

LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING held jointly with the Permanent Building Committee on 12.22.15

5. Hastings Elementary School.
 - a. MSBA has supplied promising news and hope to learn more when MSBA makes its final decision on January 27.
 - b. Special Town Meeting still needed to obtain MSBA feasibility study funding for Hastings.

Crocker left at 4:40pm.

Voted by the School Committee January 23, 2016

Meeting adjourned 5:00 pm.

Materials:

DiNisco PowerPoint presentation dated 22 of December 2015

VE sheets for Clarke and Diamond dated 21 of December 2015