

## NOTES OF MEETING

**project**      **Driscoll School**      project      1823  
no.      location      Brookline Town Hall

**date**      10/18/18, 7:30 am

**re**      **School Building Committee #1**  
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  
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  
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) S. Wolf Ditkoff opened the meeting summarizing the site tours of Coolidge Corner School and Dearborn School. The response was very positive to both

and there was recognition of the challenge to get the types of 21<sup>st</sup> century learning spaces observed to fit in an existing school.

Meeting Minutes from 10/04/18 meeting were approved.

- 2) Program Summary: Draft Space Summary was distributed for review. Comparisons to the existing Driscoll, Coolidge Corner School, and the MSBA guidelines were provided. Comments and responses included:
  - General Classrooms: 900sf classroom proposed is less than the 950sf MSBA standard. The MSBA standard is based on 25 students per class, Brookline standard is 21 students per class. The classroom size proposed is similar to those at Coolidge Corner.
  - Science Classrooms: questioned if 3 science classrooms were enough for a 4 section school. It was responded this number makes the most efficient use of the Science Rooms as they are not scheduled as much as a general Classroom.
  - Classroom Flexibility: questioned if there should be classrooms per subject rather than grade level. Responded that having classrooms of the right size would allow for such future flexibility if desired.
  - Small Gym: A Small Gym is about half the size of a typical gym and is good for younger grades and P.E. uses. Other schools, including Coolidge Corner School, have this type of space.
  - Dining and Food Service: MSBA guidelines indicate more area, but is sized for 2 seating dining. This project is proposed for 3 seatings; area is sized accordingly.
  - Multipurpose Room: questioned if this space would be stepped or flat. Proposed to be flat for better use of space and flexibility.
  - Cohort diagram: questioned if the cohort break-out spaces have been approved by key groups. The principal of Driscoll, S. Talukdar, responds yes, and that the school is currently organized in this way.
- 3) Revised Alternative Designs and Discussion: Options reviewed. The renovation options have been consolidated since substantial additions would be required in a code renovation option to meet the basic need. Options are as follows:
  - Option A.1 - Code Renovation with East Addition. Consolidates previous Options A and B. Would require swing space during construction.
  - Option C.1 – Code Renovation with South Addition. Consolidates previous Options C and D. Would require swing space during construction.

- Option E – Star: New construction/ temporary gym. Swing space not required during construction.
- Option F – Magnet: New construction/ occupied site/ temporary gym.
- Option G – Shoal: New construction/ temporary gym. Swing space not required during construction.

Option comments include:

- A. Mandé suggests a benefit to Option E is that it breaks down the Building to a smaller scale.
- JLA to consider a 4 story scheme to make the footprint smaller and create more open space.
- JLA to consider locating structured parking underneath the building for economy of construction and to maximize open space.
  - Evaluation Matrix Topics: An example of an Evaluation Matrix that will be used to evaluate each option was shown. Potential topics for inclusion were broken down into groups: Project Viability Issues, Site, Teaching and Learning, Building Environment, and Long Term costs. Risk is included as a subset to Project viability Issues, and includes any threat to project viability including swing space, unforeseen costs, and logistics. Project Estimates include 36 modular units of swing space. JLA will provide graphic of what that may look like on the site as follow up.
  - Locating the modular on site comes at a price of losing open space.
  - Recognized that a renovation option is more disruptive to students in phasing and use of modular units.
  - Both renovation and new options would be impacted with lack of access to open space during construction.
  - Use of old Lincoln School may be considered as swing space, potentially utilizing modular units at Lincoln. Use is subject to the High School construction schedule and not available the full time anticipated for this project. Coordinating the schedules for use could delay the construction schedule for Driscoll by 1 year. There may also be competition for use for the Pierce School.
- Categories to be added to matrix:
  - Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation
  - Disruption to Families

- LEED/ sustainability: R. Masak clarifies this project aspires to be LEED platinum and Net Zero with a minimum requirement of LEED Silver.
    - All options target the same standard of sustainability.
    - Town standards and aspirations will be clarified at a later meeting. The design sustainability approach will be developed in Schematic Design.
  - Parking: A. Tali asks if school department is looking for additional parking to the number of spaces identified. M.E. Dunn responds no additional parking requested.
- 4) Cost Estimate: P. Gray presents the preliminary costs for the Options. It is noted that the estimates include modular units, structured parking, and outdoor areas. Estimates will be updated with pending existing conditions reports.
- Renovation options indicate wider range in costs due to the potential unknowns. Renovation costs are comparable to new and possibly less as some portions of the existing building already have right-sized classrooms that do not need to be corrected in area. This is not typical as renovation projects are often more expensive than new.
  - Differences in E, F, G pricing due to the complexity of construction. Options F, G have a larger atrium space.

N. Wishinsky notes the costs for renovation and new options are more than previously anticipated (\$60M-\$83M). Looking for explanation as to why they are more than prior estimate and what can be done to bring back down.

P. Gray responds that these preliminary numbers are generated to recognize the need to not go back to the town to ask for more at a later date. The estimates also take into account the current “smoking hot” construction market. The estimates include 8%/year escalation (as documented by the MSBA) and assumes this trajectory will continue. This is projected as standard procedure to the midpoint of construction, anticipating 10/2020.

The Town is to clarify if swing space, structured parking, and new field were included in previous estimate so can provide adequate comparison.

R. Masak requests building construction cost \$/sf number. This will be included at next meeting.

The Cost Estimator, Daedalus, is requested to be at the next meeting on Nov. 1. for clarifications.

- 5) Traffic update: G. Ham of VHB provided a Traffic Study status report. Traffic, pedestrian, bicycle counts were taken on Oct. 11 at locations identified. Drop-off and pick-up times were also monitored. It takes 2-3 weeks to process the



data gleaned into a final report. The final report determines existing conditions pros & cons and will provide counts and directional movement at locations identified.

Committee/Community comments include:

- Questioned if there are any Boston project that would affect counts. Developments at Corey Road, Washington Street, and Whole Foods will be monitored.
- D. Deutsch requests to come back in colder weather as rain and weather changes affect pedestrian activity. G. Ham responds he will be on site 4-5 times to process such variables.
- Drop-off/pick-up Westborne Terrace: Street goes in wrong direction for ideal drop-off/pick up; kids end up crossing street. There is double parking and parking on sidewalks. There are conflicts at upper portion of street where there is double sided parking. Concerns of how affects neighbors.
- Drop-off/pick up Crescent Street: no school monitoring currently, Packed at 7:40 in morning, Inability to turn around.
- Additional areas of concern include: alley behind retail at Beacon St., Salisbury Road, and Bartlett Court.
- Questioned if there will be bicycle storage for the new building. Responded that there will but not defined at this stage. It is also a targeted LEED requirement.
- The Traffic Study report will address benefits and disadvantages of alternative design options.

VHB will provide an update on their report at the next meeting, 11/1.

- 6) Select Board asked for Town Meeting to vote on Schematic Design funding on Dec. 13

---

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

