

DRISCOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA	MEETING MINUTES APPROVED 10/29/20
---	--

DRISCOLL SCHOOL BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE		August 20, 2020
Location:		Online GoToMeeting
Time:		7:30 AM
Name	Assoc.	Present
Susan Wolf Ditkoff	Town of Brookline, Co-Chair SBS, PSB	Y
Heather Hamilton	Town of Brookline, Co-Chair SBC, TOB Board of Selectmen	Y
Karen Breslawski	Building Commission	Y
Ken Kaplan	Town of Brookline, Building Commission	Y
David Leschier	Advisory Committee	Y
Ali Tali	Transportation Board	N
Nancy O'Connor	Parks and Recreation Commission	Y
Dan Deutsch	Community Representative	Y
Victor Kusmin	Community Representative	Y
Linda Monach	Community Representative / Special Education Parent Advisory Council	N
Arjun Mande	Community Representative	N
Lakia Rutherford	Parent Representative / METCO	Y
Sara Stoutland	Community Representative	N
Mel Kleckner	Town Administrator	Y
Dr. Jim Marini	Interim Superintendent of Schools	N
Matt Gillis	Director of Operations	Y
MaryEllen Normen	Deputy Superintendent for Administration and Finance	N
David Youkilis	Interim Driscoll School Principal	Y
Helen Charlupski	School Committee	N
Tony Guigli	Project Manager, Town of Brookline	Y
Dan Bennett	Building Commissioner	Y
Charlie Simmons	Director of Public Buildings	N
Jim Rogers	LEFTFIELD	Y
Lynn Stapleton	LEFTFIELD	N
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Matt Casey	LEFTFIELD	Y
Adam Keane	LEFTFIELD	N
Jonathan Levi	Jonathan Levi Architects	N
Philip Gray	Jonathan Levi Architects	Y
Carol Harris	Jonathan Levi Architects	Y
Eduardo Vivanco	Jonathan Levi Architects	N
Walt Kincaid	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Lynda Callahan	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Robert Braga	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Joe McCoy	Gilbane Building Company	Y
Sam Ditzion	Community Member	Y
Carla Benka	Community Member	Y
John VanScoyoc	Community Member	Y

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 AM.

Nancy O'Connor made a motion to approve meeting minutes from the July 23, 2020 School Building Advisory Committee meetings. David Lescohier seconded the motion with the condition that the minutes be updated to strengthen a paragraph explaining displacement air systems. Eleven members of the School Building Advisory Committee voted in favor of approving the meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were approved 11 – 0 – 0.

Leftfield provided an update on the 100% DD Estimate process explaining that due to being in an uncertain market, the team had three estimators review the drawings rather than the typical two. CHA was the estimator for Jonathan Levi Architects (JLA), PM&C was the estimator for Leftfield, and Gilbane Building Company (GBC) provided an estimate as well. The team also hired Rider Levitt Bucknell (RLB) to complete a market study that would inform the escalation carried in the estimates.

A cost estimate comparison was presented which can be found on the website as part of the meeting materials. CHA's estimate came in at \$98.6M, GBC's was \$92.9, and PM&C's was \$93.1M – compared to the \$92.8M budget. Generally, projects typically use the Construction Manager's estimate, so in this case, comparing just GBC's estimate to the budget, the project is currently \$138,000 over budget. Leftfield added that all three estimates construction costs were very close to one another, indicating that the level of detail in the drawings is good for this stage. Escalation costs as noted above were informed by the RLB market study and were determined to be between 1.5% and 2%. Design contingency was carried at 5% at this stage.

GBC noted that as recently as last week they have seen trade bids coming in more favorably than is typical, though it was added that non-trades like concrete, drywall, and carpentry are coming in a little less competitive. These recent findings were reflected in the estimates.

Leftfield reviewed a Value Management (VM) list that was developed by the Project Team and reviewed with many Town stakeholders to date to ensure none of the items proposed would negatively impact the educational program, maintenance needs, or student experience. A similar process occurred at 50% DD drawings with approximately \$1.5M value engineered out of the drawings at that point. The current construction budget is \$92.8M. \$1.06 M in add alternates have been identified which would bring the estimated costs down to \$91.8M.

JLA explained that add alternates are items included in the bid set to be decided on once bids come in. The bids will provide a real cost for the items and for the rest of the drawings, so the Town will have real costs for the project at the time they are deciding whether to add an alternate back into the Project. Exterior sunshades and bumper guards in classrooms and corridors are the two alternates being considered at this time.

With the bid alternates, the project is estimated to be \$916,000 under budget prior to taking any VM. The Project Team is recommending \$792,000 worth of VM items which would put the project 1.8% under budget. The VM list was reviewed item by item and can be found in the presentation materials for the meeting.

The first VM item reviewed was the geothermal wells which are currently included in the budget. The Project Team will be reviewing this item in detail with Building Commission on 8/24 to determine

whether to include the wells in the project, to eliminate them from the project, or to include them as an add alternate. A cost cycle analysis has been developed to help inform this discussion. If geothermal wells become an add alternate, air source heat pumps will be included instead. This change will not have an impact on how heating and cooling will be experienced or on the the Fossil Fuel Free commitment of the project as both systems are all electric. Air sourced heat pumps require more maintenance and are less efficient overall than geothermal wells which have a 25 year payback based on the life cycle cost analysis.

JLA explained that the team is looking at large cost saving items such as the geothermal wells because Co-chair Susan Wolf Ditkoff and the Town have been clear that significant items need to be identified in order to allow the Town the option to come in further under budget if they decide to.

Leftfield continued through the VM list explaining noting that the item to eliminate the balcony at the multipurpose room, which moves sound and light controls and a small storage room to the first floor, needs to be discussed with the school in more detail before a decision on this item can be made.

The Project Team is recommending eliminating the 16' wide operable partitions between adjacent classrooms and replacing them with paired 4' doors, resulting in an 8' wide opening between classrooms.

The Town has asked that an option for operable windows be reviewed. JLA explained that the mechanical systems are designed to run without operable windows closed but will still function with opening. JLA also noted that per code, windows are only allowed to open 4" at their widest point.

Under counter neutralization tank at science classroom sinks are recommended instead of central acid waste and vent system – smaller tanks eliminate long runs of piping resulting in a savings. The Town prefers to have smaller tanks under sinks for maintenance reasons.

If geothermal wells are included in the project, they will be installed under the existing building, meaning the building will need an interim cooling system before wells are installed. A dry cooler located at roof level was in the original design, but putting the cooler at grade saves on piping. Building Department Project Manager Tony Guigli noted that if the geothermal wells become an add alternate, the dry cooler would also become part of the alternate as it would only be required for the project if the wells are installed.

The full list of VM items can be found on the Driscoll School project website under presentation materials.

A member of the Advisory Committee asked whether the 16' operable partition openings would allow for more spacing for more children in the times of COVID than 8' door openings. JLA noted that the openings allow for greater flexibility because it is easier to operate than a partition and that 8' is a wide enough opening to connect the spaces. A member of the committee asked whether the doors would be utilized. The Driscoll principal noted that an opening between classrooms is preferred by teachers as it is easier to get the teacher next door to watch a class quickly if a teacher needs to step out for a minute. The principal asked if doors are lockable for security purposes – JLA confirmed that the doors will be

lockable and added that the doors will have an acoustic rating that allows for acoustic separation of the two classrooms when the door is closed.

A member of the committee asked whether the HVAC system's intake in each room is sufficient to pull in air from a 4" opening, or if need cross ventilation by opening another window or door elsewhere would be necessary. JLA explained that the building is designed to work without any windows open, it is as if the building is wearing a mask, the air is pulled from outside and is filtered before it goes into any classrooms. The air is then distributed at low velocity from low in elevation inside each room, the air is pushed upwards slowly and is then removed from above. The air is filtered again once it leaves a room. System is designed to provide fresh air into every occupied room without the need to have windows open.

JLA explained that the code limits window openings to 4" so that kids aren't able to stick their heads out of an opening, which could result in their head becoming stuck. It was asked if any of the ground floor windows are allowed to open further to become egress in case of an emergency. JLA explained that the 4" opening code does not allow for this and windows are not considered forms of egress by code.

Co-chair Susan Wolf Ditkoff explained that the goal of the VM items recommended is to minimize impact on program and on student experience while maintaining the Fossil Fuel Free commitment, appropriate lifecycle costs, health and safety, and providing a "COVID-ready" building. The team has been asked to take an aggressive look at "nice to have" items, to ensure no systems are over-designed, and to make sure the "need to haves" are unaffected. She added that there are items included in the VM list spreadsheet that show items that were implemented previously, as well as items reviewed, discussed, and decided against.

JLA presented the lifecycle cost analysis for the geothermal wells vs. air source heat pumps. The comparison compares the two in the following categories: capital cost, annual electrical usage, annual CO2 emissions, annual and long-term maintenance costs. The analysis shows that geothermal would pay for itself in 25 years and provide additional savings beyond that timeline. It was noted that geothermal is more sustainable as geothermal is a renewable source whereas two thirds of the electrical energy that would power the air source heat pumps would likely come from a non-clean source, whereas only one third of electric energy is renewable currently.

A member of the committee asked how the VM from the 50% DD stage and the change in schedule have impacted the budget so far. It was noted that \$1.5M in VM was taken out of the project from 50% DD. GBC added that the budget change due to the change in schedule is best reflected in the escalation number carried in the current estimates. GBC noted that budget flexibility is the most important gain explaining that a few modest add alternates that are low in complexity give the option at the time of the bid for flexibility which can be the difference between a project being over or under budget.

Karen Breslawski made a motion to approve the recommended Value Management items resulting in a project savings totaling \$792,967, with the condition that the balcony at multipurpose room is not approved until that item is discussed with the School. Matt Gillis seconded the motion. Fourteen members of the School Building Advisory Committee voted in favor of approving the recommended

Value Management items. Two members noted that while they personally agree that the operable windows are not necessary in this building because the mechanical systems are designed for a building without operable windows, they understand the importance to others in Town and would like to vote in favor of operable windows for that reason. Recommended VM items list totaling \$792,967 was approved 14 – 0 – 0.

Leftfield noted that there was a successful Public Forum held on August 3, 2020 that included a design update by JLA, and a construction update by GBC that covered schedule and safety, logistics, work hours, dust control, pedestrian routing, temporary play areas, noise and air quality, traffic management, contractor parking, as well as sidewalk and alley impacts. Leftfield noted that there have been significant concerns raised by retail abutters about the sidewalk along Washington and the portion of the alley closest to Washington Street. They feel the logistics will negatively impact their businesses. The Project Team is working through discussions with these abutters on site. A survey was completed that shows new building limits, property lines and the proposed fence line to clearly show the difficulties with constructability. The team will continue to work to be good neighbors to bridge the gap on access.

Town Administrator Mel Kleckner asked noted that if the Town can provide the team with assistance from any necessary Town departments to help coordinate with the commercial abutters.

There is no update on Schedule since last month. The School Committee did vote to approve the newly proposed schedule. The project is targeting a March 1, 2021 start date which will result in a completed building by May 1, 2023 with a school opening in September 2023. Fields will be completed by May 1, 2024.

Committee member and Parks and Recreation Commission member Nancy O'Connor noted that she is pleased that the Pre-K roof terrace play area is still included in the project as she feels outdoor play space is an important part of the school design and program.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00am.