

<b>JOHN R. PIERCE SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA</b>	<b>MEETING MINUTES Approved 11/08/21</b>
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------

<b>PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>October 21, 2021</b>
Location:		Online Zoom Meeting
Time:		4:00 PM
<b>Name</b>	<b>Assoc.</b>	<b>Present</b>
Bernard Greene	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, Select Board	N
Helen Charlupski	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, School Committee	Y
Melvin Kleckner	Voting Member – Town Administrator	Y
Andy Liu	Voting Member – School Committee	Y
Dr. Linus Guillory	Voting Member – Superintendent of Schools	Y
Charlie Simmons	Voting Member – Director of Public Buildings	N
Daniel Bennett	Voting Member – Building Commissioner	Y
Lesley Ryan-Miller	Voting Member – Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning	N
Carol Levin	Voting Member – Advisory Finance Committee	Y
Steve Heikin	Voting Member – Planning Board	Y
Ken Kaplan	Voting Member – Building Commission	Y
Aaron Williams	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	Y
Nurit Zuker	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	Y
Nancy O'Connor	Voting Member – Parks and Recreation Commission	Y
Sam Rippin	Voting Member – Assistant Superintendent of School Administration & Finance	N
Jamie Yadoff	Voting Member – Pierce School Principal	Y
Melissa Goff	Non-Voting Member – Deputy Town Administrator	N
Michelle Herman	Non-Voting Member – Deputy Superintendent	N
Tony Guigli	Non-Voting Member – Building Department Project Manager	Y
Matt Gillis	Non-Voting Member – School Department Director of Operations	Y
Jim Rogers	LEFTFIELD	Y
Lynn Stapleton	LEFTFIELD	Y
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Will Spears	MDS Architects	Y
Amy Mackrell	MDS Architects	N
Margaret Clarke	MDS Architects	Y
Vinicius Gorgati	Sasaki	Y
Carla Ceruzzi	Sasaki	Y
Kate Tooke	Sasaki	Y
Tamar Warburg	Sasaki	Y

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Steve Heikin made a motion to approve meeting minutes from the August 4, 2021, September 9, 2021, and September 30, 2021 SBAC Meetings. The motion was seconded by Helen Charlupski. Roll was called and the motion passed 10-0-2.

The chair of the meeting clarified that the SBAC will not be ready to vote today on which option to pursue into Schematic Design without hearing from the public at the Public Forum scheduled for October 25<sup>th</sup>.

MDS reviewed the two options that seem to best meet the Town's need. These options are 3B (an all new construction option that does not connect to the existing Historic Building) and 3B-H (a mostly new construction option that does connect to the existing Historic Building)

Sasaki reviewed the existing site conditions and what they observed as important pathways through the site that should be maintained. They noted the building would be next to the library and feel the relationship between the buildings should be celebrated. The existing Pierce School does not interact well with the School Street streetscape and it is important to create a more welcoming building along that façade to turn School Street into an enjoyable neighborhood street.

3b-H connects to the Historic Building. This design softens the experience at School Street with a courtyard, the school is pulled back off the street a bit, and the school is only three stories along School Street. 3b allows for more space between the school and the library building, which allows for an accessible route between the civic campus of Town Hall down to School Street. This also opens a view from School Street up to the Historic Building. Sasaki noted that while option 3b is a four-story option, the Driscoll School in town is also four stories with an additional fifth story in the basement. A member of the committee noted that the Driscoll School is sited along Washington Street closer to other taller or commercial buildings and is farther away from residential buildings than the Pierce School will be. The designers explained that the comparison was for travel within the building, which has been of concern heard from members of the SBC.

Sasaki explained the exterior landscape opportunities for both options, noting that both options allow for a widened sidewalk, tree lawn, and courtyard along School Street. While Option 3b-h allows for more usable space along School Street, Option 3b allows for more usable space at the interior of the block. 3b allows for more permeability through the block, while 3b-H prioritizes quieter courtyards that emphasize school use.

A member of the committee asked if there is an opportunity to create a bridge connector between the Historic Building and the rest of the school to create some more permeability through the block. MDS explained that the connection between the two buildings would disrupt the programmatic connection between the two buildings and would result in the need for an additional elevator. A member of the committee noted that students could travel a short distance outside between the buildings or there could be a vestibule that allows the public through the building at that location. MDS noted that the school would need to weigh in on what could be acceptable.

The Town Administrator noted that the SBC needs to consider future use of the Historic Building. If the SBC chooses not to connect to the Historic Building, more work needs to be done to determine what program could go into that building and how upgrades would be funded.

The Building Commissioner noted that one of the larger concerns between 3b and 3b-H is that connecting to the Historic Building does not allow for permeability between the two buildings. He added that if this can be opened somehow it would maintain that path of travel. MDS noted that this issue will be discussed in more detail if this scheme is chosen.

The Pierce School principal explained that having transitions inside the building is important given the additional time that is required to transition during inclement weather. Students make these transitions now, so it can be done, but emphasized a desire to eliminate outdoor transitions. She explained that the students that will be on the first floor of the Historic Building in the 3b-H design are the littlest students,

many of whom are in the BEEP program due to special needs, so either an outdoor transition or adding in an extra vertical to their transition time would be difficult for this particular population. She also advocated for a more compact building as this works better programmatically for transition times.

A member of the committee explained that losing the connection from Harvard Street up toward the current main entrance would leave a bad connection across Harvard Street. There is a desire line that was created up a grassy hill that many school kids and parents use. This project should consider that path and create better access from Harvard at Linden. MDS noted the importance of the connection to that side of the site.

Sasaki addressed sustainability across both options. They noted that 3b is more efficient because it is smaller, more compact, and therefore there is a lower energy usage per square foot than 3b-H, and once you multiply that by the number of square feet, 3b uses less than half the energy of 3b-H on an annual basis.

Both options are well below the EUI threshold for Mass Save incentives, but 3b is the option closest to becoming a net zero energy project through the use of geothermal and photovoltaics. Net zero carbon is also the most achievable with 3b because it is lower in its original embodied carbon, but also over time the operational carbon over time is less because the new construction does not have to accommodate for the less efficient Historic Building.

A member of the committee asked if the new construction components perform equivalently. Sasaki noted that while the new components will perform similarly, 3b-H requires more square footage to connect to the Historic Building, and while upgrades can be done to the Historic Building to make it perform more efficiently, it will never be up to the same efficiency level as new construction.

It was noted that if the Historic Building is not used as part of the new Pierce School design, there would be an increase in parking on site that would need to be addressed.

A member of the committee noted that some portion of the building will be reimbursed by the MSBA, so the net cost to the Town should be considered. There would be a cost associated with the renovation, there would be moving rented space into the Historic Building that could result in savings over time. He added that he needs more information on this breakdown before deciding which option is better for the Town.

MDS reviewed the programmatic differences between the buildings, taking the SBC through each floor of each option. Greatest travel distances were reviewed for each option. For Option 3b, distances between 6<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms to the Cafeteria would be 258 horizontal feet plus three flights of stairs, to the Gymnasium would be 370 horizontal feet plus three flights of stairs. In Option 3b-H, distances between 6<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms to the Cafeteria would be 304 horizontal feet plus two flights of stairs, and to the Gymnasium would be 420 horizontal feet plus two flights of stairs. A member of the committee noted that having fewer levels of program fosters connection better than having more separation through more levels of program.

The Pierce School Principal will provide typical daily schedules for students in order to better understand student-lived experiences. She added that currently 35 minutes of instructional time a day are lost to transition time for middle schoolers alone. That translates to a lot of time over the course of the school

year. A member of the committee noted that transition times should be compared across the school system.

Leftfield presented a cost comparison between 3b and 3b-H, adding that these costs are comparative only at this time – the estimates were done based on square footages and narratives, not a real set of plans.

Leftfield explained that 3b was estimated to be \$180m total vs. 3b-H at \$194m total. It was explained that if you consider the cost of renovating the Historic Building when reviewing the options, the cost for a new school plus a renovated Historic Building would total about the same cost as the 3b-H option.

Leftfield prepared draft MSBA 3011s for both options to show the potential MSBA participation for each option. These spreadsheets have been completed with many assumptions made and may not represent the actual reimbursement that the MSBA would agree to. This also makes a lot of assumptions around project soft costs based on other recent projects, though it was noted that the complexity of this project would likely result in higher project costs.

Leftfield presented a comparison of square footage between the proposed Pierce School, the new Driscoll School project and the Ridley School. It was explained that Pierce and Driscoll, which have a similar design enrollment, are very close in net square footage (104,000sf vs. 100,000sf respectively), which is the programmable space of the building. The difference comes when the square footage is grossed up as the Pierce project has a much more complex site, and if the new construction is to connect to the existing Historic Building, additional square footage would be added to the gross calculation. Pierce is projected (at this time) to have a gross square footage of 170,000sf while the Driscoll School has a gross square footage of nearly 157,000sf.

Because the design team has only laid the building out conceptually at this stage, there will likely be a decrease in gross square footage once an option is selected because the overall concepts are based on a series of assumptions that have left room for tightening up, for instance 12-foot-wide corridors throughout the entire building.

A member of the committee noted that going forward as the project is developed, relocating parking for Town Hall employees needs to be considered as well as relocation costs associated with moving the students to a swing space location during construction.

Discussion followed on how to present the options to the public at Monday's Public Forum. It was decided that cost would not be presented as part of the Public Forum as the costs are very similar and comparative at this point. It was noted that if the public asks about the Historic Building functions if 3b is chosen, the Town should be prepared to respond as the future use of that building is not part of this project's scope.

It was noted that when presenting sustainability, option 3b is able to be a more sustainable building as it does not have to account for the inefficiencies of attaching to the Historic Building or the inefficiencies that would be inherent in upgrading an older building. A member of the committee noted that if the Historic Building is a separate project, it would still have the same performance characteristics as it would be attached to a new building and that it should be considered a wash.

The meeting adjourned at 5:53PM.