

# District & Professional Team Responses February 7, 2022

## ATTACHMENT A MODULE 3 – PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT REVIEW COMMENTS

**District:** Town of Brookline

**School:** John R. Pierce School

**Owner’s Project Manager:** Leftfield, LLC

**Designer Firm:** Miller Dyer Spears Inc.

**Submittal Due Date:** December 28, 2021

**Submittal Received Date:** December 23, 2021, supplemental documents provided January 10, 2022

**Review Date:** December 23, 2021 – January 24, 2022

**Reviewed by:** K.Brown, J. Jumpe

### MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments<sup>1</sup> on the Preferred Schematic Report submittal are issued pursuant to a review of the project submittal document for the proposed project presented as a part of the Feasibility Study submission in accordance with the MSBA Module 3 Guidelines.

### 3.3 PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT

Overview of Preferred Schematic Submittal	Complete	Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Not Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Receipt of District’s Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
OPM Certification of Completeness and Conformity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table of Contents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3.1 Introduction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3.2 Evaluation of Existing Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3.3 Final Evaluation of Alternatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3.4 Preferred Solution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3.5 Local Actions and Approval Certification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> The written comments provided by the MSBA are solely for purposes of determining whether the submittal documents, analysis process, proposed planning concept and any other design documents submitted for MSBA review appear consistent with the MSBA’s guidelines and requirements, and are not for the purpose of determining whether the proposed design and its process may meet any legal requirements imposed by federal, state or local law, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances and by-laws, environmental regulations, building codes, sanitary codes, safety codes and public procurement laws or for the purpose of determining whether the proposed design and process meet any applicable professional standard of care or any other standard of care. Project designers are obligated to implement detailed planning and technical review procedures to effect coordination of design criteria, buildability, and technical adequacy of project concepts. Each city, town and regional school district shall be solely responsible for ensuring that its project development concepts comply with all applicable provisions of federal, state, and local law. The MSBA recommends that each city, town and regional school district have its legal counsel review its development process and subsequent bid documents to ensure that it is in compliance with all provisions of federal, state and local law, prior to bidding. The MSBA shall not be responsible for any legal fees or costs of any kind that may be incurred by a city, town or regional school district in relation to MSBA requirements or the preparation and review of the project’s planning process or plans and specifications.

### 3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Overview of the process undertaken since submittal of the Preliminary Design Program that concludes with submittal of the Preferred Schematic Report, including any new information and changes to previously submitted information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Summary of updated project schedule, including				
	a) Projected MSBA Board of Directors Meeting for approval of Project Scope and Budget Agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Projected Town/City vote for Project Scope and Budget Agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Anticipated start of construction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Target move in date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Summary of the final evaluation of existing conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Summary of final evaluation of alternatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Summary of District's preferred solution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	A copy of the MSBA Preliminary Design Program project review and corresponding District response	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### MSBA Review Comments:

*No review comments for this section.*

### 3.3.2 EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	A narrative of any changes resulting from new information that informs the conclusions of the evaluation of the existing conditions and its impact on the final evaluation of alternatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	If changes are substantive, provide an updated Evaluation of Existing Conditions and identify as final. Identify additional testing that is recommended during future phases of the proposed project and indicate when the investigations and analysis will be completed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## MSBA Review Comments:

- 1) *The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment identified “recognized environmental conditions” on neighboring properties and a 5,000-gallon #2 oil tank on the school property. As noted in the PDP review, costs associated with the removal of fuel storage tanks and any contaminated soil are considered ineligible for reimbursement. In addition, all costs associated with the removal of asbestos containing floor and ceiling materials are ineligible for MSBA reimbursement. The project team should be aware of the current policies associated with MSBA’s participation in the abatement and removal of hazardous materials. Note that all abatement costs must be itemized in the following Project Scope and Budget submittal. Please acknowledge.*

### **Response:**

*Acknowledged.*

*The submittal also noted ongoing community concerns regarding the School Street crossing and significant changes to the School Street design and use, including potential permanent closure of School Street as a part of this project. Describe how these decisions going forward may impact the project approval schedule. Note that all off-site costs must be itemized in the following Project Scope and Budget submittal and will be considered ineligible for funding by the MSBA (please acknowledge).*

### **Response:**

The Traffic Consultant has been directed to conduct a traffic study that reviews the regional impacts of the following options:

- 1) Full closure of School Street, creating two dead ends that maintains access to the school’s loading dock and resident and business driveways;
- 2) Partial closure during school hours;
- 3) Turning School Street into a one way in the eastbound direction;
- 4) Turning School Street into a one way in the westbound direction.

The traffic study is expected to be completed in April 2022. The report will then be reviewed by the SBC and various Town Departments and then presented to the Transportation Board, who will conduct a series of public hearings to determine which option is appropriate for School Street.

At this time, the Transportation Board’s decision is not expected to impact the project approval schedule. The Project Team will provide an update to the MSBA as the process unfolds.

*No further review comments for this section.*

### **3.3.3 FINAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

Include at least three potential alternatives, with at least one renovation and/or addition option. Include the following for each alternative where appropriate:

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	An analysis of each prospective site including:				
	a) Natural site limitations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Building footprint(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Athletic fields	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Parking areas and drives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Bus and parent drop-off areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Site access and surrounding site features.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Evaluation of the potential impact that construction of each option will have on students and measures recommended to mitigate impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Conceptual architectural and site drawings that satisfy the requirements of the education program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	An outline of the major building structural systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	The source, capacities, and method of obtaining all utilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	A narrative of the major building systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	A proposed total project budget and a construction cost estimate using the Unifomat II Elemental Classification format (to as much detail as the drawings and descriptions permit, but no less than Level 2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Permitting requirements and associated approval schedule	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Proposed project design and construction schedule including consideration of phasing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Completed Table 1 – MSBA Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing spreadsheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**MSBA Review Comments:**

4) The structural narrative indicates design standards based on the 2015 International Building Code and 9th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code. See comment #8 below. Please review & comment.

**Response:**

The Project Team must design to the current code, until the next IBC code is adopted and / or amended by the CMSBC, 10th Edition. The team is not anticipating any changes that would be significantly more restrictive for this proposed building. However, the design documents will be updated to accommodate any modifications that could arise from future code revisions, prior to the permitting process.

6) The information provided references a Building Management System (“BMS”). In response to these review comments, confirm that building and District maintenance personnel have been included in discussions regarding the selection and long-term operational and maintenance costs of the BMS and mechanical systems and that the training program will be coordinated with the District’s facility staff and will include sufficient training hours to learn how to operate the proposed BMS before the opening of the proposed project as well as hours post turnover.

**Response:**

Building and District maintenance personnel have been included in discussions regarding the selection and long-term operational and maintenance costs of the BMS and mechanical systems and the training program will be coordinated with the District’s facility staff and will include sufficient training hours to learn how to operate the proposed BMS before the opening of the proposed project.

The plumbing narrative references provision of an acid neutralization system in the proposed building. Refer to the report on the MSBA website [Review and Recommendations of Best Practices for K–12 STEM Learning Spaces](#) for current recommendations regarding acid neutralization systems and emergency shower drains, notably for a school that is limited to students in the elementary and middle grades. Please review & comment.

**Response:**

Review of the Chemical List for Pierce Building Project, provided by the district, confirms that there are chemicals used by the Science program that are corrosive to cast iron. These include acetic acid, citric acid, calcium chloride, hydrogen peroxide, and hydrochloric acid. An acid neutralization system will be required. The team will pursue the least costly and least maintenance option available to the district.

The HVAC and electrical lighting narratives indicate design standards based on the 2018 International Energy Conservation Code. See comment #8 below. Please review & comment.

**Response:**

Noted. HVAC & Electrical system designs and associated design narratives will be based on upcoming 10th edition.

8) The MSBA notes that although the 2015 International Building Code (“IBC”) and 2018 International Energy Conservation Code (“IECC”) are in effect as the basis for the current 9th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code, a 10th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code based on the 2021 IBC and 2021 IECC (including any MA amendments) is currently scheduled to take effect in June 2023. Note that the project schedule indicates an anticipated building permit date of March 2024. In the District’s response to these comments, the design team should review the project’s anticipated permit date based on the project schedule and verify coordination with the code analysis and all systems basis of design narratives.

**Response:**

The Project Team must design to the current code, until the next IBC code is adopted and / or amended by the CMSBC, 10th Edition. The team is not anticipating any changes that would be significantly more restrictive for this proposed building. However, the design documents will be

updated to accommodate any modifications that could arise from future code revisions, prior to the permitting process.

No further review comments for this section.

### 3.3.4 PREFERRED SOLUTION

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Educational Program				
	a) Summary of key components and how the preferred solution fulfills the educational program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Design responses including desired features and/or layout considerations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Proposed variances to, and benefits of, any changes to the current grade configuration (if any) and a related transition plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Preferred Solution Space Summary				
	a) Updated MSBA Space Summary spreadsheet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Itemization and explanation of variations from the initial space summary (and MSBA review) included in the Preliminary Design Program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Preliminary NE-CHPS or LEED-S scorecard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Conceptual floor plans of the preferred solution, in color that are clearly labeled to identify educational spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Clearly labeled site plans of the preferred solution including, but not limited to:				
	a) Structures and boundaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Site access and circulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Parking and paving	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Zoning setbacks and limitations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Easements and environmental buffers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Emergency vehicle access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Safety and security features	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Utilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Athletic fields and outdoor educational spaces (existing and proposed)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	j) Site orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	An overview of the Total Project Budget and local				

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
	funding including the following:				
	a) Estimated total construction cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Estimated total project cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Estimated funding capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) List of other municipal projects currently planned or in progress	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) District's not-to-exceed Total Project Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Brief description of the local process for authorization and funding of the proposed project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Estimated impact to local property tax, if applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Completed MSBA Budget Statement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Updated Project Schedule including the following projected dates:				
	a) Massachusetts Historical Commission Project Notification Form	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) MSBA Board of Directors meeting for approval to proceed into Schematic Design	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) MSBA Board of Directors meeting for approval of project scope and budget agreement and project funding agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Town/City vote for project scope and budget agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Design Development submittal date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) MSBA Design Development Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) 60% Construction Documents submittal date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) MSBA 60% Construction Documents Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) 90% Construction Documents submittal date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	j) MSBA 90% Construction Documents Submittal Review (include required 21-day duration)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	k) Anticipated bid date/GMP execution date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	l) Construction start	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	m) Move-in date	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	n) Substantial completion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **MSBA Review Comments:**

2a) *At the MSBA's request, a revised copy of the District's space summary spreadsheet was provided to MSBA on January 10, 2022. Refer to Attachment B for detailed review comments regarding the proposed space summary.*

3) *The submitted LEED scorecard indicates that the District and its consultants are targeting 5 points in Credit EAc1 for Enhanced Commissioning. Note that per the updated commissioning process for MSBA-funded projects, the commissioning consultant's contract includes a scope of work achieving 6 points in Credit EAc1. Please reference Project Advisory 63 for more information. Upon assignment of an MSBA commissioning consultant, the targeted points and scope of work should be discussed and coordinated. In the response to this review, describe the District's intent and provide a revised LEED scorecard with the next submission.*

### **Response:**

The Project Team intends to take full advantage of the revised MSBA scope of commissioning consultant services. The LEED scorecard will be updated to reflect the 6 points in Credit EAc1 for the SD submission.

4) *The proposed design includes occupied building area that is located over an open parking garage with untreated air. Describe how the floor slab and structure above the garage will address thermal insulation and thermal bridging in these areas.*

### **Response:**

Sasaki and MDS will develop a detail for this that meets the R-values that are needed to achieve the energy consumption targets.

5a) *The OPM's Certification of Completeness and Conformity states that there is ongoing research being conducted to obtain the title to the properties associated with the project, and that the property titles will be provided when available. The MSBA will not sign a Project Funding Agreement and will not reimburse the District for any costs incurred beyond the Feasibility Study Agreement until all land ownership issues are resolved in accordance with MSBA Project Advisory #45. Refer to MSBA Project Advisory #45 for MSBA policy regarding Requirements for Land Use. Please acknowledge.*

### **Response:**

Acknowledged.

5d) *The submittal notes that the preferred option 3b-H would not conform with zoning relative to building height, and that the Dover Amendment allows reasonable exceptions to local zoning. Provide any updates in the response to this review regarding discussions with the local authorities regarding potential zoning considerations, and how these approvals may affect the project schedule.*

### **Response:**

There are no updates to the information provided at this time.

5f) *Describe any future consideration to review access for emergency vehicles to the building exterior with local authorities, specifically for fire trucks in those areas of the building where access may be limited due to surrounding structures or the steeply sloping site.*



**Response:**

The Project Team has met with representatives from the local Police and Fire Department to review and discuss access for emergency vehicles to the building. The future condition will provide similar access as the current condition. Given the proximity to the three streets, street access is acceptable to them. The Project Team will continue to meet with Police and Fire Department representatives throughout the project to ensure the building design reflects their feedback.

7a) The submittal states that the Project Team is coordinating a meeting with the local Historic Commission prior to submitting the Project Notification Form (“PNF”) to the Massachusetts Historic Commission (“MHC”). The project schedule indicates that the PNF was submitted to MHC on Dec 8, 2021. Provide any updates in the response to this review.

**Response:**

The Project Team reviewed the PNF with Town Preservation Department staff prior to submitting the PNF to the MHC on December 15, 2021. This date has been updated in the Project Schedule.

No further review comments for this section.

**3.3.5 LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVALS**

Provide the following Items		Complete; No response required	Provided; District’s response required	Not Provided; District’s response required	Receipt of District’s Response; To be filled out by MSBA Staff
1	Certified copies of the School Building Committee meeting notes showing specific submittal approval vote language and voting results, and a list of associated School Building Committee meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s):				
	a) Submittal approval certificate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Grade reconfiguration and/or redistricting approval certificate (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Provide the following to document approval and public notification of school configuration changes associated with the proposed project:				
	a) A description of the local process required to authorize a change to the existing grade configuration or redistricting in the district	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) A list of associated public meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Certified copies of the governing body (e.g. School Building Committee) meeting notes showing specific grade reconfiguration and/or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	redistricting, vote language, and voting results if required locally				
d)	A certification from the Superintendent stating the District’s intent to implement a grade configuration or consolidate schools, as applicable. The certification must be signed by the Chief Executive Officer, Superintendent of Schools, and Chair of the School Committee.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**MSBA Review Comments:**

*1) The submittal indicates that certified copies of the December 6 and December 13, 2021 School Building Committee meeting notes will be forwarded separately once approved by the Building Committee (draft copies of the notes are included in the submittal). Provide any updates in the response to this review.*

**Response:**

Certified copies of the December 6, 2021 and December 13, 2021 Pierce School Building Committee meeting minutes have been attached to this document.

*2a) The Local Actions and Approvals Certification provided with the submission is in electronic format. Please forward an original hard copy of the certification including wet signatures by all required signatories when available.*

**Response:**

On January 26, 2022, the MSBA confirmed via email that the original hard copy of the Local Actions and Approvals Certification was received on December 27, 2021.

*2b,3) Indicated as not applicable (no response required)*

*No further review comments for this section.*

**Additional Comments:**

- *The MSBA issues project advisories from time to time, as informational updates for Districts, Owner's Project Managers (“OPM”), and Designers in an effort to facilitate the efficient and effective administration of proposed projects currently pending review by the MSBA. The advisories can be found on the MSBA’s website. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the District’s consultants have reviewed all project advisories and they have been incorporated into the proposed project as applicable.*

**Response:**

Confirmed. The project consultants have reviewed all project advisories and they have been incorporated into the proposed project as applicable.

- *The MSBA offers the following information to assist the District and its Owner’s Project Manager in completing the total project budget template that is required as part of its Schematic Design Submittal.*
- *The District must include negotiated costs for OPM and Designer fees for the remainder of the project as part of their Total Project Budget. The fees must be listed separately by the*

*applicable line items that are included in the MSBA's Total Project Budget Template. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the District and its consultants will negotiate fees for the remainder of the project that are to be included in the District's Schematic Design documents to the MSBA.*

**Response:**

**Confirmed. The District and its consultants will negotiate fees for the remainder of the project that are to be included in the District's Schematic Design documents to the MSBA.**

- *The PSR indicates the District is targeting MSBA approval of its proposed project scope and budget at the August 31, 2022 board meeting. The District's reimbursement rate before incentives for calendar year 2022 is 31.00%. Please note that the MSBA updates district reimbursement rates annually and applies the reimbursement in effect at the time the MSBA Board of Directors approves a district's proposed project scope and budget. The reimbursement rate is established based on statutory requirements and information provided by the Departments of Revenue and Elementary and Secondary Education.*
- **Maintenance (0-2) - 1.66%.** *This value is based on MSBA review of district provided materials regarding routine and capital maintenance programs during Eligibility Period at which time the value is finalized.*
- **CM@Risk** – *Because the District received an invitation into Eligibility Period on January 1, 2017 or later, this incentive point does not apply.*
- **Newly Formed Regional School District** – *The District is not a newly formed or expanded regional school district as a result of working with the MSBA, therefore these incentive points do not apply.*
- **Major Reconstruction or Reno/Reuse (0-5)** – *The District's preferred solution is an addition/renovation project and therefore will qualify for incentive points, which will be determined based on MSBA's review of the District's Schematic Design submittal. Please note that ineligible gym, auditorium, and parking garage areas will be excluded from the calculation.*
- **Energy Efficiency – "Green Schools" (0 or 2)** – *The PSR indicates the District's intent to achieve the 2% additional reimbursement through the MSBA Green School Program. Please note, subject to the District's intention to meet certain energy efficiency sustainability requirements for the Proposed Project, the MSBA will provisionally include two (2) incentive points, however if the District does not ultimately qualify for some or all of these incentive points the MSBA will adjust the District's reimbursement rate, accordingly.*

**End**

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**MODULE 3 – PREFERRED SCHEMATIC SPACE SUMMARY REVIEW**

**District:** Town of Brookline

**School:** John R. Pierce School

**Owner’s Project Manager:** Leftfield, LLC

**Designer Firm:** Miller Dyer Spears Inc.

**Submittal Due Date:** December 28, 2021

**Submittal Received Date:** December 23, 2021, supplemental documents provided January 10, 2022

**Review Date:** December 23, 2021 – January 24, 2022

**Reviewed by:** K.Brown, J. Jumpe

---

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (the “MSBA”) has completed its review of the proposed space summary of the preferred alternative as produced by Miller Dyer Spears Inc. and its consultants. This review involved evaluating the extent to which the Brookline John R. Pierce School’s proposed space summary conforms to the MSBA guidelines and regulations.

The MSBA considers it critical that the Districts and their Designers aggressively pursue design strategies to achieve compliance with the MSBA guidelines for all proposed projects in the new program and strive to meet the gross square footage allowed per student and the core classroom space standards, as outlined in the guidelines. The MSBA also considers its stance on core classroom space critical to its mission of supporting the construction of successful school projects throughout the Commonwealth that meet current and future educational demands. The MSBA does not want to see this critical component of education suffer at the expense of larger or grander spaces that are not directly involved in the education of students.

MSBA recognizes the benefits and the challenges associated with saving or renovating existing spaces, and may consider variations in the guidelines for renovation projects beyond those included below. Please note that any spaces in new construction or substantially renovated spaces must be compliant with MSBA space standards for both allotted area and room quantity unless otherwise approved in writing by the MSBA.

The following review is based on the submitted addition/renovation construction project option with an agreed upon design enrollment of 725 students in grades K-8. MSBA notes that the review below is based on the corrected "Overall Building" space summary provided to MSBA on January 10, 2022.

**The MSBA review comments are as follows:**

- **Core Academic** – The District is proposing a total of 51,823 net square feet (“nsf”) which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 18,893 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 3,203 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *MSBA notes the following:*

- *The combined classroom and cubby areas for both Pre-K and K exceed the maximum allowable of 1,300 nsf. Note that no proposed classroom in new construction can be outside of the 1,100 – 1,300 nsf range. Please comment, and note that the following submittal must comply with this requirement.*

**Response:**

The Schematic Design submittal will comply with this requirement.

- *In the response to this review, confirm that the following submittal will provide a minimum of two sinks in each K-6 classroom.*

**Response:**

The Schematic Design submittal will provide a minimum of two sinks in each K-6 classroom.

- *The proposed space summary indicates a total 200 nsf overage for the two 7-8 prep rooms. The MSBA does not object to including additional area however any area in excess of MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for funding in the following phase of the Feasibility study.*

**Response:**

The equivalent of (3) 200sf prep rooms will continue to be shown. The MSBA will consider reimbursement on the 6th grade prep room equivalent to an STE storage room as 6<sup>th</sup> grade is programmed as a middle school grade. MDS will move this 200sf to the STE storage location on the space summary and rename it on the drawings as “Prep/STE Stor”.

- *In the PDP review MSBA asked if the 1,697 total nsf “Youth in Transition Program” is a district-wide program. The response stated that “The Youth in Transition is a district-wide program that benefits students across the District.” and “... the program is housed at the Pierce School.” As a District-wide program, any area associated with this program will be considered ineligible for funding in the following phase of the Feasibility study.*
- *Refer to the Administration and Guidance category below for direction regarding the 100 nsf Youth in Transition Clinician’s office which is currently shown in the Core Academic category. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:**

Acknowledged.

- **Special Education** – The District is proposing a total of 5,763 nsf which is 3,297 nsf below the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 1,417 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *Please note that the*

*Special Education program is subject to approval by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (“DESE”). The District should provide this information for this submittal with the Schematic Design Submittal. Formal approval of the District’s proposed Special Education program by the DESE is a prerequisite for executing a Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA.*

**Art and Music/ Voc-Tech** – The District is proposing a combined total of 12,821 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 3,331 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 6 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines. As noted in the PDP review, square footage in this category that exceeds MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:**  
**Acknowledged.**

**Health and Physical Education** – The District is proposing a total of 11,602 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 3,208 nsf. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 860 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *Based on the proposed enrollment and the scheduling information provided, the MSBA accepts one additional 3,000 nsf physical education station for an adjusted eligible area of 11,322 nsf. Square footage in excess of this amount will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:**  
**Acknowledged.**

**Media Center** – The District is proposing a total of 4,071 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 2 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to align with MSBA guidelines. Any square footage in this category that exceeds MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:**  
**Acknowledged.**

- **Dining and Food Service** – The District is proposing a total of 9,785 nsf which meets the MSBA guidelines. The proposed area in this category has decreased, by 383 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The overall proposed square footage for this category meets the MSBA guidelines. No further action is required.*

**Medical** – The District is proposing a total of 729 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 119 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 29 nsf

since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines. As noted in the PDP review, square footage in this category that exceeds MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:**  
Acknowledged.

- **Administration and Guidance** – The District is proposing a total of 6,641 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 3,472 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 264 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal.

*MSBA notes the following:*

- *In the PDP review, the MSBA asked that the 100 nsf Youth in Transition Clinician’s office be reallocated to the Administration and Guidance category. This is not reflected in the submitted space summary. This space should be included in the Administration and Guidance category in subsequent versions of the space summary. As noted in the Core Academic category comments above, any area associated with this program will be considered ineligible for funding in the following phase of the Feasibility study.*
- *Although the MSBA does not object to spaces in excess of MSBA guidelines in this category being added to the project, all space in excess of MSBA guidelines in this category will be considered ineligible for reimbursement by MSBA.*

**Custodial and Maintenance** – The District is proposing a total of 2,322 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 25 nsf. The proposed area in this category has decreased by 333 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines. As noted in the PDP review, square footage in this category that exceeds MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:** Acknowledged.

**Other** – The District is proposing a total of 1,328 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 1,328 nsf. The proposed area in this category has increased by 7 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *The overall proposed square footage for this category includes a total of 1,335 nsf associated with Extended Day Storage, Extended day office, PTO space, staff showers, and ADA Wheelchair Lift Storage. As noted in the PDP review, this square footage is in excess of the MSBA guidelines and will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response:** Acknowledged.



- **Total Building Net Floor Area** – The District is proposing a total of 106,885 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 27,152 nsf. The proposed area has increased by 576 nsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *Address the comments provided in the categories above as part of the District’s response to these review comments in order for the MSBA to establish an allowable net square footage.*
- **Total Building Gross Floor Area** – The District is proposing a total of 175,443 gross square feet (“gsf”) (excluding garages) which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 55,844 gsf. The proposed area has increased by 5,243 gsf since the Preliminary Design Program submittal. *Address the comments provided in the categories above as part of the District’s response to these review comments in order for the MSBA to establish an allowable net square footage.*

*MSBA notes the following:*

- *The proposed design includes 79,920 gsf of garage area that is not considered in the space summary comments above. For purposes of construction cost per square feet calculations in subsequent submittal reviews, the entire gross area of the building, including the garages (currently totaling 255,363 gsf) will be considered.*

*As previously noted, the review above is based on the “Overall Building” space summary provided to MSBA on January 10, 2022. The “New Construction Only” space summary shows a Total Building Net Floor Area of 93,312 nsf, and, exclusive of garage area, a Total Building Gross Floor Area of 140,425 gsf. Therefore, the New Construction Only portion of the proposed project results in a grossing factor of 1.50. In the subsequent Project Scope and Budget submittal, MSBA will require updated versions of the three space summaries already submitted including 1) “Addition/Renovation Only”, 2) “New Construction Only” and 3) “Overall Building” in order to confirm that the New Construction Only portion of the proposed project continues to conform to the 1.50 maximum grossing factor requirement. Please acknowledge.*

**Response: Acknowledged.**

Please note that upon moving forward into subsequent phases of the proposed project, the Designer will be required to provide, with each submission, a signed, updated space summary that reflects the design and demonstrates that the design remains, except as agreed to in writing by the MSBA, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of the MSBA. Should the updated space summary demonstrate changes to the previous space summary include a narrative description of the change(s) and the reason for the proposed changes to the project.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment No. 1** – Approved December 6, 2021 SBC Meeting Minutes
- Attachment No. 2** - Approved December 13, 2021 SBC Meeting Minutes

**End**



<b>JOHN R. PIERCE SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA</b>	<b>MEETING MINUTES</b> <b>Approved 1/13/22</b>
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

<b>PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>December 6, 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	Y
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	Y
Carol Levin	Voting Member – Advisory Finance Committee	N
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	Y
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	Y
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.

1. Project Approvals:

A member of the Committee noted a correction to the November 8, 2021 minutes to clarify a note made about potential changes made at School Street – to add that members of the committee noted a traffic study should ensure that traffic from School Street isn’t pushed into another neighborhood.

Bernard Greene made a motion to approve meeting minutes from the November 6, 2021 SBAC Meeting. The motion was seconded by Helen Charlupski. The motion passed 10-0-0.

2. Announcements, Updates, and Comments:

Co-Chair Greene asked that the Design Team incorporate secure and visible spaces for art that is in the existing Pierce School. Specifically he noted John Wilson etching of Martin Luther King, Jr. Co-Chair Charlupski added that there is a miniature replica of the Elgin Marbles, the original on which it is based was stolen from the Parthenon. An early School Committee member, William Lincoln, purchased the friezes as a gift to the Town in the early 1900s. The Design Team will find a location in the new school for these pieces of art and others identified during the course of design.

3. Parking Garage:

Leftfield explained that the parking garage is being designed to replace the existing 160 parking spaces on site. If this number changes significantly, there will be considerable impacts to the design which would result in major cost and schedule impacts.

A Transportation Board member noted that 160 parking spaces is more than other schools in town adding that underground parking can be expensive. The project team clarified that the 160 parking spaces are not only for the school, but also for Town Hall and the Library. Leftfield explained that once the building is demolished, there will be a void left from the existing parking garage, and as much of the cost of building underground parking is in the cost of excavation, this would likely be less costly to replace the existing space with parking. It was noted that if the parking need ever went away, the space could be built out as another use in the future.

A member of the committee asked what constitutes a “significant change” in the number of parking spaces. The design team clarified that it would be subject to when the change was made to the project.

The Pierce School principal noted that the Police Department parks their vehicles in the garage during snow emergencies. She also noted that because the area is a business district, there are many metered parking spots where parking permits are not allowed. She added that this pushes teacher parking further away from the school and would make Pierce a less desirable place for teachers and staff to work. She explained that while she would prefer money be spent on academic spaces, she can see the negative effect to the overall the long-term health of the educational community and staffing.

Leftfield noted that there are other schools in Town that have permit radii that encroach on what might have been available for the Pierce School.

A member of the committee, who is also a neighbor, noted that there is not a single spot available on her street during the day due to a combination of residential permit holders, as many houses in the area do not have driveways, and teacher permit holders. She added that this makes it difficult for the residents to have visitors or who would prefer to park close to their homes to make tasks like bringing groceries into their homes easier.

Another member of a committee, who is also a neighbor, noted that if School Street is closed to through traffic, parking could be added along that street.

Todd Kirrane, Transportation Administrator, explained that the Pierce School and the surrounding neighborhood is very different from other schools in town. There are 74 effective spaces in the Pierce School garage – 52 lined spaces with an additional 22 cars squeezed in daily. Lower Town Hall garage has 76 lined spaces but 120 permits for employees for that garage. The police department uses the garage during snow emergencies, but their vehicles are parked on the street otherwise (except for a small number that tandem park behind the station). There are 11 spaces for the library. There are another 53 spaces in the upper town hall garage. The Brookline Village commercial area has the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest permit use rate – there are over 100 permits for businesses that park in the Brookline Village residential neighborhoods. The Brookline Village residential neighborhood has one of the highest permit use rates in Town as well, so there is already a lot of competition for street parking in the area. He added that the permit parking for the Lawrence School, the Coolidge Corner commercial district, and the High School also bump up against one another in the Brookline Village area. He concluded that if the Town does not invest significantly in getting teachers and staff to the site via other means, this location is not one where underground parking should be taken away.

A member of the committee asked for the cost of the garage.

#### 4. Traffic Study Scope

Leftfield presented the proposed traffic study scope that was developed through meetings with the Traffic Consultant and the Transportation Department. The Traffic Consultant is planning to provide a proposal for the following scenarios:

- Closing School Street
- Closing School Street from 7am – 3pm
- Turning School Street into a One Way
- Impact of previously proposed traffic calming measures (including modeling turning queue impact with shortened turning lanes)
- Impact of moving garage exit to Harvard Street
- Track current volume and speeds at School Street
- Studying sight distances School Street Crossing
  - On-grade crossing
    - With flasher/traffic light at on grade crossing
    - Raised crossing – study length for traffic calming
  - Pedestrian Bridge crossing – What clearance should be provided? Sight line impact etc.
- Impact of garage entrances changes
  - Move existing School Street garage entrance/exit to Harvard Street
    - Limited turning upon entering and/or exiting garage?
    - Location relative to existing turn lane?
    - Sight distances
  - Garage access/exit at Washington Street. This is currently entrance only (for the Town Hall portion under the school). This requires additional data collection at Washington Street/Garage driveway.
- Review of All-Way Stop Control at Holden/Pierce intersection

Vanesse Associates (VAI), the traffic consultant for the Pierce School project, added that they are working with the project team, the Town and the School Department to address the impacts of the potential changes to School Street that have been proposed. They are working on scope of study that includes review of regional impacts to ensure any option does not negatively impact nearby

neighborhoods. They are working with DPW to access data available. MDS emphasized the importance of ensuring any changes made to School Street do not create a dangerous situation elsewhere around the site or beyond.

VAI shared a map of the area they are looking at initially. They will be sending a final version of this map along to the Transportation Department to confirm they have captured the scope the Town is looking for in this study.

A member of the public asked if the study will consider impacts over time as new routes are found around the area. VAI considers a 5 to 7 year projection, though they are limited to the information available now.

A member of the committee noted that the study's scope seems to prioritize cars, but not pedestrians or bikes. He added that the benefits of creating a safer situation for pedestrians and bikes traveling to and through the Pierce site needs to be weighed at least equally. Todd Kirrane explained that the purpose of the study includes multiple modes of transportation and is geared to ensure that by diverting cars, an unsafe condition for pedestrians and bikers is not created elsewhere in Town.

Leftfield noted that there is a cost impact that will need to be considered once the team receives the proposal as there is a limited amount of money left in the budget for added studies like this. The team will need to consider the impact to the budget before moving forward with the study.

Co-chair Greene asked about the timeline for the traffic study. MDS noted that the results of the traffic study should not have any impact on building design and the study should be undertaken in early Schematic Design so that any impacts can be addressed in the SD cost estimates.

A member of the Transportation Board asked if the study will consider historical data. He noted that a google maps image shows School Street closed in one direction in August 2019. He also asked if a pilot could be included in the study. VAI explained that they look at as many data sources as they can and tracking specific events is part of that. VAI added that they are include a pilot in a separate proposal. Leftfield explained that the pilot is separated out as a separate proposal because it will need to be considered against the budget before proceeding.

VAI explained that the proposal will be finalized this month, and the team expects to submit it as an amendment to MDS's contract by early January. The amendment will be presented to the SBC and then to the Building Commission if the SBC recommends the proposal. VAI said the study would be conducted early next year with a report expected in early Spring. He noted that it is important to keep the study out of the holiday season as traffic patterns are atypical during that time.

##### 5. Safe Routes to School Presentation

Rebeca Salguero and Christi Electris, co-chairs of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) in Brookline, introduced themselves to the committee. Both are Pierce parents and very familiar with the conditions around the Pierce site.

SRTS works to increase safe biking and walking among students by using a collaborative, community-focused approach. SRTS coalition of stakeholders includes parent and teacher representatives of the K-8 schools and Brookline High School, the state SRTS-coordinator, the School Committee, the Transportation Division, Police Department, Public Health Department, Public Schools of Brookline

Facilities Department, and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committees.

There are three pillars of the SRTS Task Force, the first is promotion of safe biking and walking through walk, bike, bus and roll to school days and walking school buses. The second pillar is Education through events, and the last pillar is Action.

SRTS explained that Harvard Street is very busy and biking there does not feel safe, they added that a protected bike lane would encourage biking to school. It was noted that there had been a hit and run of an 8<sup>th</sup> grade Pierce student that occurred at Harvard/Linden. SRTS explained that there is no crosswalk across Washington Street from Holden Street, which forces pedestrians to take a longer route. The Washington Street/Cypress Street/School Street intersection is very difficult to navigate for bikes and pedestrians.

SRTS noted that the issues along School Street include the fact that the playground is separated from the school by the street, there are narrow sidewalks, the Washington St. slip lane encourages speeding, few families use the overpass at arrival/dismissal or to cross to/from the playground and park outside of school hours, concerns about the safety of the bridge, there are no bike lanes, and cars traveling northbound from Washington and Cypress, cars speed to reach the green light at Harvard.

SRTS proposes studying options for addressing traffic hazards at School Street, including closing the center of School Street to vehicular traffic, connecting Pierce park and playground and creating a child-friendly, community-friendly green space. They propose involving the Transportation Division and the Transportation Board early in the decision-making process and involve SRTS task force in future SRTS-related decisions. SRTS proposes prioritizing the movement of people over the movement of vehicles to align with the Town's goals as defined in 2019 STM Warrant Article 31 on sustainable transportation goals. They encourage running a pilot study to understand any proposed changes to understand what will actually happen with any street changes.

Wendy Friedman, SRTS member, voiced support for the SRTS presentation and emphasized the importance of getting pedestrians and bikes to and through the site. She is in support of running a pilot study to understand how changes might affect actual human behavior.

Amanda Zimmerman, Bicycle Advisory Committee member and Town Meeting Member and Pierce parent and neighbor, voiced her support for ways to make School Street safer. She explained that cars speed up along School Street and it is currently not safe. She said it would be good to study school hours but also extended day hours.

Ms. Electris noted that she appreciates the opportunity to present to the SBC, she requested that when decisions are being made going forward that parents and neighbors be consulted.

Co-chair Greene asked if there are any changes that can be made now to make School Street safer. He noted the possibility of changing how the lights sync to discourage speeding down School Street. Todd Kirrane explained that the base plan put together by the design team includes a raised at-grade crosswalk with rapid flash beacons. He added that if the Transportation Board decides to take on traffic calming measures outside of the Pierce project, but he noted that immediate measures would likely be similar to what the project is proposing.

Ms. Electris noted that when cars are traveling from Aspinwall, the School Zone sign is easy to miss and she asked that a new location for the sign be considered. She asked how a rapid flash beacon can be programmed to get a whole class of kids across the street. It was explained that the beacons can be programmed for timing.

A member of the committee noted that there is very little indication to vehicles that there is a school in the area, she is wondering what can be done to fix this issue now outside of the project. Todd Kirrane clarified that there are School Zone signs along Harvard Street, as well as curb extensions at a number of intersections for traffic calming, there are Pedestrians in Crosswalk signs along with stanchions in the middle of the street at crosswalks. VAI noted that there may be a way to make the signs more visible, or update the sign installations with more reflective materials may help emphasize that there is a school in the area.

VAI confirmed that their study will analyze data that includes number of traffic and pedestrian-involved accidents over time. VAI has already done some research about this in the area, noting that the hit and run incident involving a Pierce student was not in the files reviewed, but they will be reaching out to further the research.

A member of the community asked if there is data supporting raised crossings are effective in slowing vehicular traffic. VAI explained that the combination of the rapid flashing beacons and the raised crossing are very effective, the flashing beacons have approximately an 88% effective rating in getting vehicles to yield to pedestrians.

A member of the committee noted that he has seen motorists speed up until they get to the raised crossing and then speed again on the other side. Todd Kirrane noted that the raised elements work well at getting vehicles to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks, but if the goal is to slow traffic the entire length of the street, more will likely need to be done. He cited another project in Town where raised elements were added at every crossing, which then takes away the vehicle's opportunity to accelerate.

Brian Kane, the chair of the Transportation Board noted that once the study is completed, the information will come before the Board and they will make sure that the process to reach a decision will be a very open and public one. He added that the effects of anything done at School Street will likely be felt town-wide, so the board will work to make sure they gather feedback from residents beyond the Pierce School neighborhood.

#### 6. Draft Preferred Schematic Report

Leftfield explained that since the SBC's last meeting on November 8<sup>th</sup>, the project team has been working to assemble the Preferred Schematic Report based on the chosen option 3b-H. The draft will be available to the committee by noon on December 7<sup>th</sup>. A final draft will be issued on Friday, December 10<sup>th</sup> with an explanation of what was updated in the document. The goal is to be able to vote to approve the report for submission to the MSBA at the next meeting scheduled for Monday, December 13 at 4pm.

Leftfield reviewed the table of contents of the PSR document, noting that the SBC should focus their review on sections 3.3.3 Final Evaluation of Alternatives, and 3.3.4 Preferred Solution. Both sections focus on the evaluation process to date. It is important that the report reflects the SBC's process to get to preferred Option 3b-H.

MDS provided an update on the plans to date. The project has been entered into Revit to get more accurate square footage of spaces. One task MDS has been focusing on is pulling the gross square footage of the building down to meet MSBA's required 1.5 grossing factor for the new construction portion of the building. After meeting with the MSBA, they were clear that the link to the garage and to the Historic Building can be considered part of the addition square footage of the building, which has a more lenient grossing factor. 175,924 is the gross square footage of the current building design including the Historic Building.

MDS noted that there is a corridor that was removed, the corridor connected two other corridors on around the specials part of the building. Another corridor that was next to the corridor was removed, but the cafeteria was expanded to account for this. Leftfield and MDS met with the MSBA twice to better understand how they calculate the gross square footage and how to separate out new construction, from addition, from renovated area.

The school principal asked if there will still be an opportunity to re-visit the lost corridor on the specials floor. Her concern is that there will be a number of students transitioning at the same time on that level and the connection to create a loop instead of two dead ends would help the flow during those busy transitions. MDS explained that there is time to review the plans and make some changes, but that there will be a trade off in the widths of other circulation areas. The principal explained that she would need a visual on widths before committing to narrowing hallways.

Leftfield explained that once the PSR is submitted, the project team will be developing a work plan for Schematic Design so it is clear what decisions are being made and when so the team can ensure they are hearing feedback from the right people at the right time.

Leftfield explained that the goal of the next SBC meeting will be to discuss any changes that need to be made. If members of the committee have changes to be made, they can send edits along to Jen Carlson directly. It was clarified that there is time for an additional meeting before the December 28<sup>th</sup> deadline to submit the report.

7. Old Business  
There is no Old Business.
8. New Business  
There is no New Business.
9. Public comment  
There is no Public Comment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:49 PM.



<b>JOHN R. PIERCE SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA</b>	<b>MEETING MINUTES Approved 1/13/22</b>
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

<b>PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>December 13, 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	Y
Helen Charlupski	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, School Committee	Y
Melvin Kleckner	Voting Member – Town Administrator	N
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	N
Lesley Ryan-Miller	Voting Member – Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning	Y
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	Y
Jamie Yadoff	Voting Member – Pierce School Principal	N
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	Y
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.

1. Project Approvals:

Approval of the meeting minutes from the December 6, 2021 meeting will be pushed to the next SBC agenda for approval.

2. Announcements, Updates, and Comments:

There were no Announcements, Updates, or Comments made at this time.



3. Discussion by the Committee on Preferred Schematic Report (PSR)

A member of the committee asked if mass timber is still being considered in the project and if moving forward this would be an alternate that would result in two separate structural designs. MDS explained that the structural consultant did not think a full mass timber structure would be possible on this project, but they are exploring options for partial mass timber and a decision will be made during Schematic Design. The project is carrying a premium for the total project cost.

A member of the committee asked if geothermal is currently in the project costs. Leftfield explained that it is being carried as an option within the total project budget amount at this time. The Town asked that the cost be moved into the above the line costs as opposed to being carried as an option at this time. Leftfield will update this in the PSR before it is submitted to the MSBA.

A member of the committee asked if the current schedule allows for the construction documents to be complete by December 2023 in order to be on target for an early 2024 bid period. The current project schedule shows the bid period starting in January 2024 and wrapping up by March 2024. Leftfield explained that the schedule could only start earlier if early bid packages were considered which may allow for early demolition work to begin over the summer with sitework starting in Fall 2023. Leftfield added that the Building Commission has historically not allowed early bid packages. This is a discussion that will need to be had with the Building Commission in early SD. The current schedule shows school opening in January 2027, while a schedule with early bid packages allowed the school to open for September 2026.

Leftfield outlined some of the main changes that occurred in the PSR between the initial draft sent to the SBC on December 7<sup>th</sup>, and the final draft sent on December 10<sup>th</sup>. The original draft was updated to correct a few documents that appeared out of order. The Design Team also updated the space summary spreadsheet per a conversation with the MSBA. The MSBA requested that the space summaries be broken into three separate spreadsheets to show total square footage, addition/renovation square footage, and new construction square footage.

Leftfield included an updated Comparison / Probable Cost Analysis to capture potential cost impacts including a conservative number to cover student relocation costs, potential costs for changes at School Street, and budget lines for Building and School Department administrative costs. The project team is confident that a not to exceed project budget of \$220 million will be more than enough to carry forward into Schematic Design.

There are several factors, including a decrease in overall square footage that has not yet been captured in the cost estimates, that is likely to drive this not to exceed number down before the end of Schematic Design. It is important to remember that the numbers in the initial estimates are based on narratives and basic square footage, which has gone down since the estimates were run, not real plans. The Design Team and Leftfield understand that the goal is to drive the cost of this project down over the course of Schematic Design and will work to ensure that happens, and keep costs at the forefront of our conversations as the project advances.

Members of the committee asked about the \$25 million being carried for potential student relocation costs. School Department Director of Operations Matt Gillis explained that he had taken a

close look at several options for relocating students and staff during construction. The \$25 million is a conservative number that allows for flexibility at this time as the plan for relocation has not been finalized. He noted that if there is a chance for early packages on this project, it would allow the school to open sooner and would shorten the length of time the Town would need to pay for another location, and therefore would save money in relocation costs.

A member of the committee asked if the school carries utility costs to run spaces that are used for relocation. Mr. Gillis explained that the Town does pay utility costs at the Old Lincoln School that is currently being used as swing space for the high school project. The committee member suggested the Town look into capitalizing the cost of utilities to the project instead of taking them out of the Town of School operating budgets – she would follow up with Mr. Gillis and Melissa Goff to determine a path forward on this. She asked if the relocation costs cover the cost to relocate Town archives that are currently stored in the Historic Building basement. Mr. Gillis explained that the places considered in the relocation cost study would have enough space available to house those archives.

A member of the committee noted that there are conversations by climate groups in town about district heating for the wider municipal campus. She added that it would be good to know if the MSBA would participate in shared infrastructure and how the project might include itself in, or at the least not preclude itself from, this wider campus plan.

Building Department Project Manager Tony Guigli explained that the integration of Pierce into a wider energy plan was not included in the scope of the Pierce School project and therefore there are no funds available to study this broader Town issue during the Feasibility Study. He added that the Traffic Study the Project Team has been asked to undertake is also beyond the scope of the project as it is a broader Town issue, and that study is already putting stress on the Feasibility Study budget.

A member of the committee emphasized the importance of the traffic study for the safety of the students crossing School Street, adding that this study should be a priority. The project team clarified that there is money for the traffic study, and that a proposal is being priced currently. The point being made was to show that all of the requests to add scope to the project do come with a cost and that there is a fixed budget for the Feasibility Study. There are contingency funds to address issues or concerns that come up during the course of Feasibility, but they are typically used for project-specific needs, not broader Town issues.

A member of the committee asked if the VRF system would be included in either HVAC option, whether there are geothermal wells or not. The VRF system was shown as an option to the base system in the cost comparison of the project. MDS explained that the two additional HVAC system options, VRF and Geothermal, were in addition to the base system as MSBA requires that three options be studied. MDS would pose the question to their MEP consultant, but noted that the VRF system is a different system than the geothermal and the base.

Co-Chair Charlupski moved to approve submission of the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA after it is amended as discussed in this meeting. The motion was seconded by Co-Chair Greene. The SBC voted unanimously with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained, to approve and submit the presented Preliminary Design Program documents to the MSBA on or before December 28, 2021.

#### 4. Old Business

Leftfield explained that the traffic study scope is being finalized this week with pricing expected by the end of the year. The proposal will be ready to be discussed in more detail at the next SBC meeting before it is presented to the Building Commission as an amendment to the Designer's contract. Leftfield expressed concerns about pricing for the study, which includes a much broader scope than is typical for a school project, echoing statements made earlier about having finite uncommitted funds for this phase of the project.

MDS explained that the original traffic study scope was based on the drop in school enrollment agreed upon by the Town and MSBA, and took a much more localized look at just the surrounding streets. The new traffic study is needed because the Town is now asking the team to look at potentially closing School Street which would have a much wider impact to the Town.

The traffic study will likely be conducted early in 2022 with a report expected in early spring. The report would be provided to the SBC and to the Transportation Board. While the SBC can make a recommendation to the Transportation Board, it is the Transportation Board that will ultimately make the decision based on the information provided and what it hears from the community on the subject. The project team and SBC do not make the decision on the best path forward.

Leftfield explained that there is approximately \$325,000 left uncommitted in the Feasibility Study budget. That amount is meant to cover competing interests, some of which have unknown cost impacts at this time. Leftfield noted that we need to include Town Administration costs, a potential geothermal test well (which cost \$150,000 at Driscoll) that could be conducted during SD to inform the number of wells likely needed which would help better define the cost going into Design Development (DD), property line due diligence and legal work needed to obtain the deeds for the site, the potential cost to bring a Construction Manager (CM) on board during SD given the complexities of this project – this would ensure cost and schedule confidence before asking the Town to vote on the project, and the traffic study. Leftfield will present the budget in more detail at the next SBC meeting.

A member of the committee noted that the original traffic study did not take into consideration the number of students crossing School Street at grade once the bridge is eliminated. She felt that School Street should be considered part of the school because the school has to cross the street to access the park and playground during school hours.

A member of the committee asked if there are existing traffic studies being done in Town that the school's traffic study could use to inform theirs. It was noted that there is a study being done for the impacts of route 9 being narrowed to one lane. The traffic consultant will be using all information and studies available. She suggested a meeting with herself, co-chair Charlupski, Melissa Goff, and Erin Gallentine to determine how to possibly align timing on broader Town-wide initiatives and to identify funding sources for further study by the project team.

A member of the committee emphasized that the traffic study should be a top priority for project funds as it ties directly to student safety. Leftfield explained that the traffic study will be completed, it is just a question of how the study is funded, or how it affects funding for other priorities.

Co-chair Greene noted that the safety of children on all streets surrounding the project campus is important and should be considered. Members of the committee noted that concerns are

heightened about crossing School Street as it is part of the school day, not just a route used getting to and from school.

A member of the committee noted that if the Town decides an at-grade crossing at School Street is the path forward, there should be money carried in the budget for a bridge/overpass to cross from the school to the park as there is now. The team explained that there is no bridge in the current budget.

MDS explained that because the decision on what is done at School Street is outside of the SBC and Project Team's purviews, there is a real concern about how the timeline is affected. A clear process is needed from the Transportation Board to understand the timeline once they have the traffic study report in hand. MDS needs to provide the estimators with documents in May 2021 to price – it would be helpful to know at that point whether a bridge is included in the project or not. MDS added that if the process for deciding what happens at the street cannot be decoupled from the school project, one process may delay the other.

A member of the committee commented that a future bridge will be required to be ADA accessible, unlike the bridge that currently exists. This would result in a larger footprint on the park side of School Street than there is now, which could result in the need to take away some usable park space. Another member of the committee suggested that if a bridge is needed, that properties along School Street be taken by eminent domain to avoid losing park land.

A member of the committee noted that she felt the Designer should be exploring broader Town-wide initiatives to ensure the timing of the school ties into other Town projects. It was clarified that these broader Town-wide initiatives are not part of the scope currently included in the Designer's contract and that additional funding and clear direction on what studies should be pursued would be necessary to expand their contract.

Co-chair Charlupski noted that the traffic study should be added to the project, but that tying into a municipal campus-wide energy is not part of the Pierce project and if funding is found for it, it should be pursued as a separate project that does not impact the timeline of the Pierce project. She emphasized the safety of children being the highest priority.

Leftfield noted that a meeting is needed with Transportation Board representatives to determine the timeline necessary to reach a decision on the School Street issue to see how that process could affect the project timeline, or how the project could be decoupled from the process as MDS suggested.

Leftfield reviewed next steps, noting that the Project Team would be updating the PSR with the few small changes indicated by the group today, and that there are a few graphics that will be updated in the report as well prior to submitting to the MSBA. There are also a couple of backup documents that the team is working to track down with the Town and a letter that will be circulated for signature now that the submission has been approved by the SBC.

The next SBC meeting will include information on the traffic study, the project budget, and the work plan as the team moves through Schematic Design. This work plan will inform when decision need to be made and will take a closer look at school and community engagement during this phase. Leftfield will reach out to schedule the next SBC meeting.

5. New Business

There is no New Business.

6. Public comment

There is no Public Comment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.