

Sutton School Building Committee
Regular Scheduled Meeting – Wednesday, October 21, 2009
Town Hall Meeting Room

Present: Glenn Coulter, Donna Davis, Cecilia DiBella, Tim Harrison, Mike Jerz,
Wendy Mead, Roger Raymond, Jim Smith, Ken Stuart, Dave Suhl, Ross
Weaver, Christine Watkins

Absent: Laura Stonebreaker

Guests: Vince Dube, Flansburgh
Jon Winikur, SBS

Meeting called to order at 7 pm.

DEP: Flansburgh updated the SSBC on discussions with the DEP. A meeting was held with Barbara Kickum, DEP Worcester. The design options were reviewed. The second floor to the core is feasible. The capacity of the wells is the main point. The capacity is an important number to help the DEP define the zone field. A combination of the distance and number of wells will determine a zone. DEP has 162' around each well. This may or may not be the final zone. Flansburgh presented Option D. Option D would be a definite "No" right away. Athletic fields are not allowed on a well-protection zone. Nothing is final at this point with the DEP.

If increased flow is needed, an option is to drill the existing wells deeper. This may allow for better permitting options. Ross Weaver commented that this would probably not be a viable option as the wells, at their current depths, already have traces of radon and uranium. Deeper drilling may increase these amounts. There are natural contaminants in the aquifer.

DEP recommended a pump test to determine the rates of flow.

Flansburgh has not scheduled a follow up meeting with DEP.

Current Design Option Costs vs. 2006 Flansburgh Feasibility Study:

Jon and Vince noted that 5 areas are contributing to the increased costs:

1. Classrooms in the 2006 Study were 750 nsf; current MSBA guidelines set the minimum at 850 nsf.
2. Special education spaces are more significant in the current design.
3. A middle school gym is included in the current design which was excluded from the designs in the 2006 Feasibility Study.
4. Central Administration spaces were not included in the 2006 study.
5. Key middle school support spaces—namely, computer labs, team common room, and 3 foreign language classrooms—were not included in the 2006 Feasibility Study.

Christine raised the issue of GSF allowed for an 840 student population vs. the gsf of Option C & D. Options C & D appear to have more gsf than allowed by the state for a projected enrollment of 840 students. Christine shared a list of questions regarding allowed space and space in our current design with the OPM and Chair. These questions will be distributed to the other SSBC members.

Wendy stated that the design options are preliminary and gross square footage (gsf) changes can be made prior to the presentation of the preferred option to the MSBA.

Discussion ensued as to the feasibility of moving the athletic fields to Shaw Property to allow Option D to be considered. Ken raised the issue of whether the costs for fields at Shaw would be included in this project if the fields do not fit on the school site. Jim Smith stated it is possible that Shaw could be looked at as an option. If Shaw was to be utilized for fields, the two sites would have to be connected. Site work would be an unreimbursed additional cost.

Glenn commented that in the preliminary stages of this project with the MSBA when we presented at Town meeting in May 2009, a project cost of \$43M was presented to the voters. How will we reconcile this cost with the current project cost? Jon Winikur stated that the \$43 was preliminary to help determine the funding for the feasibility study phase, and the MSBA was clear that the \$43M would not be the final amount.

Glenn stated that the MSBA used the 2006 Flansburgh Feasibility study to determine the \$43M so how did the project costs grow to \$67M?

Ross would like to have Flansburgh look back into the files to determine if the \$43M included soft costs.

Jim Smith asked if Flansburgh could complete a comparison of the 2006 study to the current project. Vince and Jon provided a quick breakdown of the NSF difference as consisting of :

- a. the change in nsf for class size from 750 nsf to 850 nsf.
- b. the second gymnasium
- c. special middle school spaces
- d. administration spaces

24,000 nsf
x 1.5 grossing factor
36,225 gsf
\$12M

Christine asked how the grossing factor is determined. Vince and Jon stated it is determined by the MSBA.

Asked about the MSBA reimbursement rate for this project, Jon stated that he has not contacted the MSBA for the current project being discussed. Fundamentally, more reimbursement dollars would be received to build new. From a program standpoint, new is better. MSBA does offer incentive reimbursement points for renovated buildings. This increases the reimbursement rate.

Next Steps: The goal is to provide the MSBA with a general plan on Monday, October 26, 2009. The completed feasibility study with preferred option must be presented by December 11, 2009. An operating budget must be included. Based on preliminary conversations with the MSBA, 3-4 options were submitted with Options C (renovation of core) and D (standalone new building) being the preferred options by the SSBC. The MSBA, at this point, would accept either Option C or D.

Cecilia updated the SSBC on a PTO presentation held today. Options C & D were reviewed with the PTO attendees. Several concerns were raised regarding the phasing involved in either of the Options. How long portable classrooms would be needed? What is the project duration? What is Day 1?

Jon stated that these answers will be flushed out once the SSBC provides the OPM and Flansburgh a direction, Option C or D.

Glenn asked what the significant differences between the current existing building and the Core as it stands now?

Jon stated that the second level of the core will have 6 classrooms added.

Glenn commented that 6 potential classrooms on the Core Building were included in the original design. A reasonable option for the phasing of Option C is to add the 6 classrooms and then build the new portion of the structure. Jon stated that Option C does that already. Once the Core sees significant work, the entire structure must be brought up to current code.

Options C & D Phasing: Jon presented a phasing summary of each option.

Option C: Total of 41 months

1. Portables
2. Move all middle school administrative spaces
3. Space comes down
4. New construction takes place
5. 18 months of construction
6. Shuffle students
7. Renovate Core Building for 1 year

8. More portables

Options D: Total of 35 months from local approval date.

1. Final planning stages
2. 18 months of construction
3. 6 months of demolition of old buildings

Option C adds 6 months to the total project.

Glenn inquired whether public water/sewer should be brought to the site as 20% of our town's population is on the site during the school day. Should this project incorporate water/sewer services, or a parallel project, as a more comprehensive way to supply the needs of the future? Are there any costs or operating cost savings by having public services at the site?

Savings could be realized immediately as we would not have to deal with the Water Treatment issue currently on hold with the DEP.

Glenn asked if these savings could be quantified to make the argument for making this expenditure now versus at some point in the future.

Jim stated that, "Yes, we have thought strategically." The Town had a private developer that was going to pick up part of the costs. The developer is now gone. Any infrastructure project for water/sewer at this point would be entirely borne by the Town.

SSBC Member Surveyed for Preferred Option:

Option C – 8 members

Option D – 4 members

Old and New Agenda Items:

Wendy inquired if any SSBC members would be interested in taking over the duties as Recording Secretary. Please consider it and let her know.

Jim presented the name of town resident Lea Ann O'Neal as a candidate to fill the open seat on the SSBC. Lea Ann lives on Mendon Road. She works in construction project management. She is LEED accredited.

Wendy stated that the vacant seat is open to any town resident. Interested residents should contact Jim Smith or Wendy. The SSBC's recommendation will be presented to the Board of Selectmen on November 4, 2009. Please provide a cover letter and resume.

The issue was raised regarding the current qualifications of committee members as they relate to the MSBA guidelines, i.e. finance, school personnel, school committee, construction background, etc. Our current members meet and exceed the state statute, and, therefore, the seat does not need to be filled by an individual with particular skills.

Wendy stated that given the progress of the project, the SSBC may have to meet twice a month as well as any additional needed meetings.

Next meeting is scheduled for November 4, 2009.

Wendy will disseminate Christine's questions to the SSBC. They will be discussed at the next meeting. The total gym square footage needs to be resolved.

Jon stated that the SSBC is an advisory body and the building is an educational issue. Educators are best left to resolve the educational problems. The SSBC can have a dialogue with the educators.

Wendy recommended that the administrators attend the November 4 meeting. Cecilia stated that the administrators should probably meeting with Jon and Flansburgh before they meet with the SSBC.

Jim and Wendy recommend that the administration goes back to the drawing board with Jon and Vince to further reduce the square footage of the project.

Motion to adjourn by Dave. Seconded by Jim. Meeting adjourned at 8:27 pm.

Respectively submitted,

Christine M. Watkins
Recording Secretary

Fw: A few more observations

From: wendymeadpc@verizon.net

Smith, James <jsmith@town.sutton.ma.us>; Raymond, Roger <RaymondR@suttonschools.net>;
Jerz, Mike <Maj1952@verizon.net>; Suhl, David <davidsuhl@aol.com>; Davis, Donna

To: <DBBDavis@verizon.net>; Stuart, Ken <kstuart@chasecorp.com>; Harrison, Timothy
<TJH0313@aol.com>; Weaver, Ross <rossweaver@charter.net>; Coulter, Glenn
<gcoutler9854@verizon.net>; Watkins, Christine <JCGWATKINS@aol.com>; DiBella, Cecilia
<DiBellaC@suttonschools.net>

Cc: Jon Winikur <jwinikur@go-sbs.com>; Carl Weber <cweber@go-sbs.com>;
vdube@faiarchitects.com; aross@faiarchitects.com

Date: Thu, Oct 22, 2009 10:44 am

Greetings All - I am forwarding Christine's emails with her observations and questions regarding the proposed designs. Please keep in mind that the questions concerning proposal "D" are no longer relevant. In keeping with the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law restrictions, please do not engage in back and forth discussion.

Finally, it is important to remember and recognize what the specific charge of our Committee is during this process. In accordance with 963 CMR 2.10(3)(a), we are organized for "the purpose of generally monitoring the Application process and to advise the Eligible Applicant during the construction of an Approved Project." I hope that we are able to take full advantage of the professionals that we have engaged to work on our behalf.

Thank you all again for your efforts.

Regards, Wendy

CHRISTINE'S COMMENTS TO FOLLOW:

I am working on some space analysis, and noted that on the Final Approved Program Space Summary provided to the SSBC on 9/22/09 by Flansburgh, page A-2, Art & Music - High School and Shared, in the Proposed Column, does not foot to the total. CB107 HS Art Classroom - 2,400 nsf is excluded from the total. The total should be 6,550, not 4,150. All other categories total correctly.

In addition, on Page A-5, Total Building Net Floor Area (NFA) with District Wide Facilities in the Proposed Column excludes this 2,400 as it is a summary of all the area subtotals on the previous pages.

Am I missing something or should this have been included in both the subtotal for proposed HS Art & Music Space and total proposed building net floor area? The Final Approved Space Summary Proposed Column is the basis for the building design, correct, as it totals 177,480 gsf and Option D is 177,500?

----- Original Message -----

From: jcgwatkins@aol.com

To: jcgwatkins@aol.com ; jwinikur@go-sbs.com ; wendymeadpc@verizon.net

Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2009 6:34 AM

Subject: A few more observations

Jon,

A few more quick observations from the Final Approved Space Guidelines provided by Flansburgh on 9-22-09

1. Current core academic space for the high school is 20,537 gsf consisting of 19 general classrooms, 6 science rooms and 6 storage/prep rooms. The proposed space has 20,340 gsf (less than we currently have) with only 16 general classrooms, 1 small group seminar room, 5 science classrooms and only 3 storage areas. Granted some of the spaces are larger than we currently have, but how does the program fit into less classrooms if we have been cutting into every available space to make the program work?
2. Media Center. Page A-3 details 2,710 gsf existing. Page A-4 details 2 computer labs having a current gsf of 2,108 which are moved to the media center in the proposed column. Addition of these two amounts implies a 4,818 gsf media center. Am I to surmise that our proposed 5000 gsf media center is simply a combining of these two separate current spaces into one combined space and that actual book storage and table space will not be significantly different than currently exists? I noted 50 computer stations in the new media center.
3. Current TV production gsf is 1,728; proposed is 1,000 gsf. Does the current space appear larger than it is because usable space is shared with another discipline?
4. Recycling/Trash rooms. We have 600 gsf (300 for MS & 300 for HS). Option D is one building. Is this gsf related to population or number of buildings, ie a standalone MS and a standalone HS would each need a trash room, but our combined building in Option D needs only 1.
5. Custodians' workshop. Same as above. Indicates 250 gsf each for a MS & HS. Given we are one complex, are two spaces required. Also, the current custodians' workshop gsf is 1,067 plus the 1,679 of external storage. MSBA does not allow for external storage. As this space, according to the Flansburgh Space Summary falls into District Facility, which is not reimburseable, does total custodian space need to be reviewed?
6. Music. A 1000 student HS is allowed 2275 sf of music space including practice & ensemble. Our proposed plan for a smaller population has 4800gsf. Can the music department support the need for this additional space to the taxpayers? Is it a program issue whereby the band and chorus share the same block and cannot both utilize the large ensemble room in the elementary school? Since the new school will have a new auditorium, couldn't Chorus utilize the stage there vs. having a separate 1200 gsf room. What will the utilization % of the auditorium be on an average school day?

One last interesting analysis: An 840 student elementary school is allowed 145 gsf per student = 121,800 gsf (140 students K-5)

Current combined gsf of ELC & Elementary School = 152,195 gsf

Excess space 30,395 gsf

A review of gym & cafeteria current spaces indicated adequate gsf at 840 students.

Use of Excess Space: Oversized Auditorium for an Elementary school:	4,757 gsf
MS/HS Music program	4,500 gsf
Oversized media center	283 gsf
Special Ed spaces in excess of 8% MSBA Flansburgh Report 13% gsf sped)	3,640 gsf (source 2006)
Pre-K (3 classrooms)-State does not allow	4,464 gsf
10 Classrooms used by MS (984 sf/1.34 grossing)	13,186 gsf
2 Science classrooms used by MS	2,881 gsf
 Total	 33,711 gsf

I guess the compromise was to split the gsf from the 12 classrooms used by the MS of approximately 16,067 gsf between central administration and additional elementary program needs. Point being, I guess there is always a need for more space, however, financial constraints must be considered carefully as we move forward. It is extremely important to get any analysis correct as the decision of our 13-member committee gets one-shot with the taxpayers.

I should be busy with yardwork today, so I don't anticipate too many more observations.

Thanks
Christine

-----Original Message-----

From: jcgwatkins@aol.com

To: jwinikur@go-sbs.com; wendymeadpc@verizon.net

Sent: Tue, Oct 20, 2009 10:16 pm

Subject: (No subject)

Jon,

If you have a chance to look at the below questions/comments before the meeting, I would appreciate it. I have a working spreadsheet which analyzes the space and where it is, ie media center, cafeteria etc. I compare our proposed building with 840 students to a comparatively sized MS and HS. My argument being, that once you get over a certain number of students, the support spaces gsf does not substantially change. If you would like, I can forward it to you or I can print it out and provide you with a copy at the meeting.

Specific spaces which I think are oversized are the phys. ed space, music space, general office space, ; conversely, some spaces appear to be undersized for a building with 840 students-- namely, the auditorium and the cafeteria (option D). I see that we currently have two exterior storage buildings. Is this normal at schools? It is not reimbursed, and all schools must put their lawn and snow equipment somewhere?

Option D:

1. Where is the future expansion option for this design? The building appears to be "sandwiched" in between the well protection zone, the ELC & Elementary Schools, and the private residence? I thought one of our goals was to design a building which allows for future expansion.
2. 5th Tennis Court – Why? Isn't a track more needed by our sports program? What is the estimated cost of a track? Does the size of the Tennis program warrant 5 courts? What is the cost of a court? Since Option D already adds \$2.1m, what is the incremental cost of track if we retain only 4 tennis courts?
3. Current cafeteria gsf is 7,204. MSBA allows 6,300 gsf (1/3 HS enrollment x 15

- gsf = 2,100) + 2/3 MS enrollment x 15 gsf = 4,200). According to the "Final Approved Space Summary" 9-22-09 provided to the SSBC, the proposed building has only 4,200 gsf. How will we accommodate the lunch periods? Does Option C, with its retention of the core, retain the larger cafeteria space?
4. If a 750 student MS is allowed 8,400 gsf of phys ed space, and a 1000 student High School is allowed 20,300, why does our proposed building for 840 MS/HS students have 24,700 gsf which significantly exceeds buildings of similar population?
 5. The proposed gsf needs of 177,480 from the 9-22-09 Space Summary from Flansburgh includes a 1,675 gsf exterior storage facility. It is located adjacent to the southern most soccer field on Option D. I could not find it on Option C. Would option C retain the current structures allowing this gsf to be removed from the building project? MSBA does not allow gsf for this. Where do other schools store equipment?
 6. MSBA recently approved a 900 student 130,000 gsf for Shrewsbury (approx. 145 gsf/student) and a 900 student 171,000 gsf HS for Wayland (approx. 190 gsf/student). MSBA used the Elementary gsf/student rate for Shrewsbury (grades 5 & 6). A 900 student middle school is allowed 160 gsf/student. That notwithstanding, our 165,000 gsf for 840 students equals 196 gsf/student. Given that support spaces, namely, physical education and media center are less at the middle school level, I would expect our gsf/student to fall somewhere between the 160 gsf/student and the 190 gsf/student. Perhaps 175 gsf or 147,000 gsf vs. the 165,000 being tossed around. Comments? I know you mentioned the MSBA's positive feedback thus far; however, given the recent Massachusetts state budget information, should we revisit this? I, as a taxpayer, am interested in why Shrewsbury and Wayland can meet their program needs in less gsf than we can.
 7. MSBA allows 1400 sf for custodian/maintenance for a 750 student MS and 1575 sf for a 1000 HS as well as 600 sf for general storage respectively. We have an 800 sf storeroom and 2200 sf of custodial space included in district facility. Aren't these spaces, up to the allowed amount, reimburseable and should be excluded from the District Facility space?
 8. What is the gsf used in the Elementary School for District Facility in Options C & D? The drawings imply more gsf used in Option C. Why wouldn't we use the same space in Option D?

Status Quo Option

1. Did MSBA indicate a potential reimbursement rate for a renovation of the current gsf? This information could be helpful at the meeting.
We cannot discuss the option, if we do not know the anticipated cost to taxpayers.

I'm looking forward to Wednesday's meeting.

Christine

