

## NOTES OF MEETING

<b>project</b>	<b>Driscoll School</b>	project no.	1823
date	10/04/18, 7:30 am	location	Brookline Town Hall
re	<b>School Building Committee #1</b> Project Introduction and Overview of Process		
present	Neil Wichinsky, Co-Chair, Select Board Susan Wolf Ditkoff, Co-Chair, School Committee Karen Breslawski, Building Commission David Lescohier, Advisory Committee Nancy O'Connor, Parks and Recreation Commission Dan Deutsch, Community Representative Victor Kusmin, Community Representative Arjun Mande, Community Representative Lakia Rutherford, Community Representative/METCO Sara Stoutland, Community Representative Mel Kleckner, Town Administrator Andrew Bott, Superintendent of Schools Dr. Nicole Gittens, Deputy Superintendent of Schools for Teaching and Learning Mary Ellen Dunn, Deputy Superintendent of Schools for Administration and Finance Dr. Suzie Talukdar, School Principal Representative Ben Lummis, Project Manager, School Department Ray Masak, Project Manager, Building Department Daniel Bennett, Building Commissioner Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects (JLA) Philip Gray, JLA Carol Harris, JLA  Heather Hamilton, alternate Select Board Ali Tali, Public Works, Engineering and Transportation David Pollack		

Distribution: attendees; project file

---

- 1) Committee Charge and Overall Goals: Susan Wolf Ditkoff opened the meeting with an introduction of each Building Committee Member and a summary of the Committee's responsibilities.

R. Masak noted the Committee's need to comply with Open Meeting Laws. All issues are public, Committee Members are to be contacted to add topics for inclusion on Meeting Agenda.

- 2) District Need Overview: See attached. S. Wolf Ditkoff reviewed the town's K-8 enrollment from 2012 to projected 2022. Over this 10 year period, there has been an increase of 789 students.
  - The Driscoll School is identified as having the highest enrollment growth at 67% of all the Brookline Schools.
  - In June 2018, the Site Feasibility study slates the Driscoll School to become a 4 section school at 758 seats, to help meet these projections. This study anticipated an additional 9 classrooms required and provided a preliminary project cost estimate at \$60M-\$83M.

- 3) Schedule and Process Overview: See attached. S. Wolf Ditkoff reviewed the Project Milestone schedule including design phases, Town input, construction, and final occupancy. A Nov. 2018 Town Meeting approval of Schematic Design Funds is targeted, N. Wishinsky identified that a special Town Meeting may be proposed in Jan 2019 in lieu of Nov. 2018.

J. Levi reviewed the Feasibility Phase Working Schedule. See attached.

J. Levi reviewed the design process and provides examples of the types of documents and graphics that will be presented at the different phases of the project.

- 4) Driscoll Needs: J. Levi reviewed a list of challenges with the current Driscoll Building. See attached. Overcrowding is a primary issue. Many classes at Driscoll already have 23 or more students per classroom whereas the district objective is 21 students per classroom.

J. Levi reviewed a Room Size Analysis of the existing School. Plans highlight rooms that are 10% (orange) or 20%+ (red) deficient in size in comparison to Massachusetts School Building Authority [MSBA] standards. Key spaces such as Science Classrooms, Gymnasium, Kitchen are significantly undersized.

- 5) Existing Conditions Update: J. Levi reviewed a list of studies being conducted on the existing Driscoll School. Findings include:
  - Historic review – the existing Driscoll school does not show up on historic registers.

V. Kusmin noted that though there may not be legal historic designation there is community's input of it's historic significance and should still be reviewed and discussed.

The project will be discussed with the Brookline Historic commission.

- Code review – a review of existing building will identify upgrades required to meet current building code as required in a renovation of this scale. This includes requirements to meet current earthquake code.
- Structure – the Structural Engineer has done a walk thru and will document structural elements of this load bearing masonry structure.
- The current Mechanical/ Electrical/ Plumbing [MEP] engineers have worked on past renovations of the existing building and have good knowledge of its existing conditions.
- Town sewer and drainage documents indicate a “culvert” that goes through the site. Town utility officials provided a historic plan showing this to be a storm drain which can likely be relocated.

V. Kusmin asks if these reports are available for review. B. Lummis confirms they will be posted on the website as they are finalized and made available.

- 6) Programming Update: J. Levi reviewed the Education Visioning process. See attached. This collaborative effort compiles input from the faculty, administrators, parents, students, community on what the “Driscoll for tomorrow” should be. JLA has conducted all day drop-in sessions with faculty and administrators, Visioning Session, Community Meeting, and had in depth meetings with Superintendent Bott, Dr. Gittens, and Special Education representatives, to develop programming for Driscoll.

J. Levi explained the Educational Program Diagram developed to meet the needs identified. Program includes: 3 cohorts: grades PK-2, 3-5, 6-8 are identified with allocated classrooms, special education, collaboration areas, and administration. The cohorts surround a central core including cafeteria, gym, admin, music and media.

- Question raised if a 4 section school is sufficient. Superintendent Bott responds that the site fits up to a 4 section school. The Coolidge Corner school had a larger lot and therefore is a 5 section school.

A detailed Space Summary spreadsheet is in the process of being developed. This itemizes each space, by size and quantity. The Proposed Driscoll School program will be documented alongside of the current building, Coolidge Corner School, and the MSBA standards for comparison.

- 7) Preliminary Concept Design Alternatives: J. Levi reviewed (7) options including renovation/addition (renovation to code and renovation right-size) and new construction. See attached.

Options A-D are renovation/ addition projects and require swing space. Swing space may be modular or potentially use of the old Lincoln School (availability subject to High School use). Proposals include structured parking addition.

- Questions about open space availability arise and the inclusion of a turf field. It is determined to include a discussion of turf field on the agenda for another meeting so that all of the Design Options can be described within the time allotted.

Option A and C accept that the existing building layout and constraints dictate the program. The current deficient classrooms sizes would not be corrected and would remain sub-sized. It was observed that these options would result in a smaller school gross area as space corrections would not be realized.

Options E-G are new construction. The existing structure could remain occupied while the new construction is built on the open space. Once the new building is complete, the existing would be demolished. Swing space for the gym only would be required.

- These schemes include an underground parking facility below the playing fields.
- A. Tali requested for more information on the parking counts, drives, drop off and pick up areas. J. Levi noted that this information is to come as the designs progress.
- K. Breslawski asked why the Kitchen is not relocated in the Renovation options. J. Levi noted the significant cost associated with relocating the utilities, services and MEP.

- 8) The Building Committee Members were sworn in
- 9) Traffic Update: JLA has had an initial walk thru with the Traffic Engineer and will be meeting with the Town to review the scope of the Traffic Study counts. Traffic counts are scheduled to start Oct. 11.

10) Discussion:

- B. Lummis distributed an updated schedule. See attached. .
- B. Lummis announced tour dates of the Dearborn School (10/11) and Coolidge Corner School (10/16) for the Building Committee.

---

END OF MEETING NOTES

Addressees believing these notes are in error or are inaccurate should contact the writer within five business days, otherwise these notes will be considered accurate.

---

by Carol Harris

