



Kevin J. Murphy
City Manager
Michael McGovern
Assistant City Manager

School Building Committee MSBA Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Date: May 4, 2017
Time: 10:00AM
Location: Mayor's Conference Room

1. - Attendance

Attendees: Kevin Murphy, Conor Baldwin, David Beati, James Cook, Rodney Elliott, Gary Frisch, Robert Healy, Salah Khelifaoui, Brian Martin, Jay Mason, William Samaras, Richard Underwood and Mike Vaughn.

Also in attendance: Mike McGovern and Rodney Conley.

From Skanska: Jim Dowd, Mary Ann Williams and Dale Caldwell.

From Perkins Eastman: Robert Bell, Joe Drown, Alicia Caritano, Dawn Guarriello.

From Birchwood Design: Ashley Iannuccilli

2. - Building Options Plan Refinement

2.1 Phasing and Site Plans Update

Full Renovation (5 years + summer overlap)

A. Iannuccilli began the discussion regarding the full renovation option and how the plans relate to the existing site. The fire access would be the same. Currently the plan allows trailer trucks to continue backing-into the site.. The team proposes curb cuts on Arcand Drive left of the paved plaza. Fire and safety access will continue to be developed as the plans evolve. R. Bell continued that for the sake of presentation, the team reduced the floor plans to create a snap shot for each phase. The phases are illustrated in the vertical columns, totaling six phases. Each phase includes the lower, first floor, second floor, third floor and attic space of all buildings. The team worked with educators to discover that 40 rooms can be taken offline by increasing utilization, consolidating spaces and utilizing storage trailers The total number of vacant rooms in the first summer would be estimated at 40 rooms for swing space. R. Bell proposed that the space beside the Ayotte garage can be utilized for a temporary gym structure, with the additional bathrooms associated with the space. When students come back in September, the contractor would be able to take the field house offline, and one side of the Lord building. Full Reno would be the most disruptive phasing, which is why 40 classrooms should be used as swing space. The contractor can also take space up in designated stairwells and corridors. Corridors may be used as buffer

space, which will be determined in later plans. R. Bell stressed that the details are not finalized. PE will require 11 teaching stations including the adapted physical education. The lower level phasing would begin with the chorus/band and ROTC classrooms would need to be moved and recreated. R. Bell commented that a few more rooms may be cleared out that could be used as team access as well. The cafeteria may be used as gym space when not in use for cafeteria purposes (4 out of 7 periods a day). The current plan is conceptual, but there is still time to work things out. R. Bell mentioned he spoke to the LHS Athletic Director Jim DeProfio, who is looking into doing more programming that would fit into different spaces. The athletics on site in the fall include cheerleading, volleyball, swim and dive. The swim and dive team would need to use an offsite pool, which there are two pools that may be available in the area. Cheerleading may be able to use the Freshman Academy cafeteria or gym. The volleyball team could possibly use a temporary gym structure. Phase one would last approximately one year and three months.

R. Bell continued that there would be a clean break in the summer in which the contractor would be able to take down and replace separation barriers. The Main office would be renovated, and take class rooms in the 1922 entry as the main entry for one year. The contractor would vacate one part of the building that would then be usable. The same green space used for temporary gym area would be utilized for science labs.

The program pieces down the street and across the road may work easier for relocating freshman temporarily. It would be beneficial to have a set group that would predominantly exist there and travel back to the main building. The Contractor would then take over the Lord and 1980s buildings along one side (up to the corridor that would act as a buffer). The plan would maintain the foot bridges for corridors and student access to those programs. The contractor may have access to upper or lower floors while the middle floor may be used for circulation space. The goal would then be to renovate one side of the 1922 Building, build a second two story bridge and demolish the existing bridge. The auditorium would be renovated over two summers while students are not in the building. The stairwells and breakpoints would separate students from contractors at all times. Phases four and five would entail renovating the second half of Colburn Hall as well as taking on the second bridge. The 1922 and Lord side of the building would be available. The contractor would then move on to the Freshman Academy. R. Bell noted it would be crucial to the project to track the number of classrooms off line by the contractor and how many are available.

K. Murphy asked where the modules are tentatively placed, whether on the greenspace or the parking lot. He mentioned it would be beneficial to utilize the city owned land next to the lot that forms a triangle area by Jean D'Arc. W. Samaras asked if the phasing plan includes regular day schedules. R. Bell noted that at this time it does through increased utilization of available space.



Kevin J. Murphy
City Manager
Michael McGovern
Assistant City Manager

S. Khelfaoui inquired to the reconfiguration of how classes function within the class room. The phasing uses 6-7 class periods, which does not necessarily make it extended day as long as teacher ownership of classrooms would change. J. Mason inquired as to usable space, if a temporary wall would be constructed in the hallways. R. Bell noted this was not worked out yet, but half to a quarter of the hall may be used for the contractors. Contractors have built temporary stairs in other projects to as alternatives to mobility and access to offline classrooms. J. Mason inquired as to if the students and contractors would share stairs. R. Bell replied that the phasing is not definite, it is still being conceptualized. The Construction Manager would take ownership of phasing and proposal for shifts when they join the team. R. Bell continued that having adequate restrooms for students is also important and needs to be worked out. J. Dowd mentioned that it will be determined later how much of an egress pathway is necessary for the temporary conditions.

R. Bell noted that in effect, the contractor would begin working from a new boiler room that would extend throughout the building. The new system would require new feeds continually extending out and removing older pipes. The corridors may be used by students without finished ceilings or flooring during the duration of phasing. The full renovation option would take approximately 5 years and 3 months.

Site plan discussion by Ashley (new entry plaza, plantings and similar site access)

Addition/ Renovation Option 2 (4 years + summer overlap)

R. Bell continued onto the next option, which is addition/renovation existing site. The option includes plans for improving paving and sidewalks around the perimeter of the school. He commented on taking advantage of the open courtyard, which may be used for outside class rooms. This would be by far the tightest option; fire trucks and large trucks would not be able to turn around. Although it is the tightest option, it is just one constraint of the site plan, the city can feasibly choose this option as it can be designed around. The diagrams in the presentation are test diagrams, R. Bell noted that dozens of new options can be born out of this for changing options depending on spaces.

During phase one of this option, the field house would be taken down for the existing site. A five story replacement would be constructed in its place that would house the Freshman Academy, business labs and the 2-story fieldhouse. This phase would last two years and 3 months and would require a temporary gym area, but would require no modular classrooms, since forty classrooms are projected to be vacant. Phase two would continue with an additional sixty-four new classrooms, leaving a total of over one hundred classrooms worth of swing space. The contractor would then take portions of both buildings, with the ability to take larger bites

with the additional swing space. The entire project for this option would last 4 years and 3 months. K. Murphy inquired to clarify the number of modular classrooms needed for this option. R. Bell noted that this option does not require modular classrooms, but it does require a modular for sports and athletics.

Site plan discussion by Ashley (tighter service, requires backing-in)

Addition/Renovation Option 3 (4½ years + summer overlap)

R. Bell reminded the SBC that this option takes the adjacent parcel. The field house would be constructed on the new parcel. The entire project is pulled back farther from Father Morrisett Blvd. as there is more space for improving sidewalk conditions as well as the entrance. The plan has room for bump outs for busses and improvements for the plaza. This is adequate space to accommodate fire and box tractor trailers. The handicap parking spaces are highlighted in the site plan.

The phasing would start off earlier than the other options due to the acquisition of the adjacent parcel. The beginning of the project would start with the demolition/abatement and construction of a new field house. The demolition would probably begin in January, while the foundation for the new building would be set in early spring. This plan still includes vacating 30 classrooms. The next phase would begin during February vacation, when the contractor would take over other parts of the building. The goal is to have a five story Freshman Academy built within 1 ½ years. Once the fieldhouse is demolished, classes can move right into the gym eliminating the need for a temporary gymnasium. There would be no impact of demolishing the existing fieldhouse educationally. The plan may require 10 classrooms for higher level of efficient room use. The third phase would include 30 room swing space, which can be accomplished with efficient scheduling. The new building would create more than 64 more rooms, allowing the contractor to take large chunks of space at a time. The last phase would last 1 year and 3 months, in which the 1922 building would be renovated. 100 classrooms would be taken off line. The entire project is estimated to take 4 ½ years, of which education would only be impacted for 3 ½ years.

W. Samaras inquired as to the cafeteria work in the third image. R. Bell stated that if the lower level of the ROTC and Music was cleared out, it could create 4 gym stations, and locker rooms. A temporary cafeteria space can be created, approximately the same size, as the culinary classrooms can be taken over for serving. W. Samaras asked if once the project is complete, would the cafeteria be next to the kitchen. R. Bell replied that it would. B. Martin asked about the room utilization issue for special education. He commented that the life skills children cannot be scheduled in regular classrooms. R. Bell noted that in options 2 and 3, the Freshman Academy



Kevin J. Murphy
City Manager
Michael McGovern
Assistant City Manager

becomes available to the rest of the schools. Option 3 does not need a temporary physical education facility as the fieldhouse will be built prior to needing it. G. Frisch asked about the timeline in which the Freshman Academy would be available to the school department. R. Bell replied that it would depend on the option selected and when the project starts; it could be between 4 ½ - 5 years after drawings are put out to bid (7+ years total)

Site plan discussion by Ashley (large green, ample service access & building set back from street)

Cawley

The Cawley option may be condensed into a smaller foot print if the building is extended to five stories. The design team is working with the educational group to consolidate the plan and keep teams/grouping the classrooms by subjects. The concept illustrated in the presentation has arts, ROTC and more administrative classrooms on the first floor. The first story may be higher, perhaps 16 feet tall, with upper floors around 13' to keep the total 5-story option to about 68' and under the 70' high-rise threshold. The design maintains the classroom clustering to efficiently stack curriculum over the cafeteria. R. Bell stressed that this is an early conceptualization.

W. Samaras asked if the five story campus would be beneficial to stack 3,000 students on top of each other in regards to management and safety. He stated it would not be beneficial to choose this option in lieu of the four story option, and inquired if a three story option may be considered. R. Bell replied that the design team will look into whatever the SBC requests, and that they could look into reducing the building to three stories if selected as the preferred option. A. Caritano noted that the school foot print needs to be taken into consideration as well as the fields and parking onsite, as along with the wetland and other setbacks. W. Samaras stated that the parking lot should not take precedence over the safety and needs of students. He continued that is there was a problem on the fifth floor, it may be difficult to ask. M. Williams noted that there would be a tradeoff, but it is worthwhile to exploring 3,4 and 5 story options.

J. Mason inquired as to the replication of fields, as the wetlands have just been flagged. K. Murphy noted that the city will be scheduling a meeting within the next week to discuss the replication plan proposal to the EEOA.

3. - Schedule Update

J. Drown commented on the current schedule of submitting the PSR by the end of June. He noted that the team was targeting middle of May for submission, but further site investigations moved the timeline back. The first upcoming meeting is City Council meeting on May 16th in which the Hazmat, Geotechnical environmental and Traffic reports will be presented. The School

Committee will meet May 4th (today) to discuss project updates. He also noted the school forum was held on May 3rd in which there was a positive input from students. The sustainability meeting will be held on May 10th to establish goals and strategies for the project. J. Drown noted that the team is targeting the City Council presentation on June 6th for the PSR report. This would be followed by the City Council vote on June 13th. K. Murphy noted that there will be several public forums starting on June 8th similar to the PDP submission in which a presentation will be made to the City Council and general public. He also noted that there will be a community meeting on June 10th and 12th. The compressed schedule is driven by the June 29th MSBA submission. K. Murphy stated that his office would reach out to the CBA and the CMAA to set up additional meetings as well. He continued that additional public input into the process will be required prior to the City Council vote. D. Beati asked if the reports will be given this month. J. Mason also commented on the asbestos and soil reports having already been made available to the SBC. K. Murphy stated that his office gives the committee all information in a timely fashion. R. Elliott asked about the traffic study if it would include both sites. J. Drown noted that the current traffic study is based on a model to predict the impact of traffic on site. The traffic study does not address vehicles or traffic relative to construction. When the construction manager becomes involved, it will be determined which streets will house stage materials; this will be detailed on how to manage the site.

J. Dowd stated it may be beneficial to consider a construction manager at risk. K. Murphy noted that this is an interesting concept considering the judicial center construction manager is a manager at risk. R. Elliott asked if it would be congested during the day and expressed his concern for the downtown location. J. Drown replied that this will be considered when an option is selected. M. Williams commented on the pros and cons of a construction manager at risk being decided after a site is selected. The procedure for a construction manager at risk is considered preconstruction to determine a safety plan, lay down of materials and orders from the Conservation Commission. B. Martin stated that they did receive the geoenvironmental report, and inquired to the estimates for capsulation and if infrastructure will be included. Sidewalks off site would not be included in the design estimate, but the City will provide an estimate for these. More information will be given when updated estimates are received. (ex. Square footage). J. Drown stated it is important to understand the budget and cost module, but the team will keep working towards the programming changes and adjusting the costs to reflect the changes. The traffic study would be used to determine where cars are coming from. B. Martin inquired if this would start another review for improvements off site for the students who walk. The traffic report will suggest sidewalk recommendation. A. Caritano stated that the intent is to take all of the information to date, and update on costs so that the SBC may receive all the information for the June meeting.



Kevin J. Murphy
City Manager
Michael McGovern
Assistant City Manager

4. - Update on Additional Existing Conditions Investigations

A. Caritano discussed the additional investigations including the asbestos removal. The PDP included a best guess based on experience of the consultants' observations and the PDP estimated costs for each building. The PSR report will incorporate updated costs. The ceiling sampling and investigations did not result in additional costs beyond what was included in the estimate. The team will update what has been found in the reports. R. Underwood asked what the procedure would be if the City Council denies option 3 if the SBC recommended it. He asked if there was a process to go back to revise the suggestion. The role of the SBC is to make a recommendation, but ultimately the City Council determines which site is chosen. J. Mason inquired to the cost in the February reports for total project cost and the estimated city share. J. Drown noted that this will be updated starting next Monday. The cost update will incorporate investigations to date to provide realistic costs of each option for the SBC and City Council to select the preferred.

5. - Update on MSBA PDP Comments and Response

K. Murphy noted that he has gone through each comment. M. Williams stated that with input from the city, executive leadership team, education plan, and space summary, all the information was put together as a draft and reviewed by the group. The responses were submitted within the allotted 14 days to the MSBA. She stated that there has been no response since from the MSBA for additional feedback.

6. - Community Outreach

6.1 Additional Community Meetings

In June there will be additional community meetings prior to the City Council vote.

7. - Website Development Update

R. Conley noted that the Lowell HS Project website is now public and contains the same information as the older site. He stated that we will continue to maintain transparency by posting reports as received for the general public to access. Visit: www.lowellhsproject.com

8. - Next Steps

The next SBC meeting will be June 1, 2017 and June 8, 2017.

R. Healy motioned to adjourn, seconded by B. Martin. All in favor, so voted.



Heather Varney
HEATHER VARNEY
Notary Public
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
My Commission Expires Oct. 2, 2020

Notes taken and certified by: