

# Nashoba Regional School District

## Minutes of the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee May 17, 2022 (Meeting held via Zoom Technology Video Conferencing Platform)

**VOTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Joseph Gleason, Amy Cohen, Ken Frommer, Robert Czekanski, Stacey Dupuis, Tania Rich, Kim Earley, Maura Bailey, Kristen Kendall, Scott Gibson, and Superintendent Kirk Downing.

**NON VOTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Pat Marone, Rob Frieswick, Kate Boynton, and Todd Maguire

**ABSENT:** Steve Rubinstein, Leah Vivirito Christopher Buck, David Hartnagle,

**NON-MEMBER INVITEES:**

None

**SKANSKA - OPM**

Mary Ann Williams, Sy Nguyen

**KAESTLE BOOS ASSOCIATES (KBA)- Architects**

Joe Milani, Craig Olsen, Paul Dominov, Kate Jessup

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Gleason called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM

**CITIZENS COMMENTS:**

None

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

A request was made to approve the minutes of February 8, 2022, March 15, 2022, and April 12, 2022 of the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee (hereinafter "SBC").

Motion to approve: Robert Czeskanski

Motion was seconded by: Kristin Kendall

Motion was approved by all voting members in attendance. No discussion on the motion.

**STATUS AND UP-DATE REPORT FROM SKANSKA USA**

Ms. Mary Ann Williams reported for Skanska that they are working with KBA, the District, and the SBC's Working Group, reviewing presentations, attending meetings, coordinating with the Working Group, preparing materials for the MSBA submission. They reviewed the draft vision report and material on site conditions and have been working with the project team in exploring the educational program. The design team continued with collecting information on the existing conditions and working with their consultants on developing a narrative for estimates and design options.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **(a) Discussion on approval of project invoices**

Ms. Patricia Marone presented Skanska Invoice #7 in the amount of \$11,080 and KBA Invoice #4 in the amount of \$31,250. Ms. Marone has reviewed the invoices and is recommending approval.

Motion to approve Skanska Invoice #7 in the amount of \$11,080 and KBA Invoice #4 in the amount of \$31,250.

Motion to approve: Robert Czeskanski

Motion was seconded by: Kristen Kendall

Motion was approved by all voting members in attendance. No discussion on the motion.

### **(b) Preliminary Building Concepts:**

Slides were presented to the SBC. Mr. Olsen provided an update on the progress of the Preliminary Design Program (PDP). Project is on schedule to submit the to the MSBA on June 27, 2022. The SBC's approval for submission of the PDP to MSBA will be requested at the June 21, 2022, meeting.

The evaluation of the existing conditions is complete. The preliminary geotechnical analysis came back with positive results indicating the design team does not need to come up with unique building foundations. They are currently working on developing and evaluating of multiple options.

Mr. Olsen presented a summary of the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Space Summary Guidelines. This guideline provides the room types, number of rooms, and square footages that they will be reimbursed for. MSBA provides an Excel spreadsheet that generates these numbers based on the number of enrollments, multipliers, and utilization rate of 85%. The 85% utilization rate is a national standard of how often a classroom should be used. For Nashoba with a proposed enrollment of 925, the MSBA will reimburse for a gross building square feet (sf) of about 185,000 sf.

Mr. Olsen reviewed the analysis of the spaces of the existing school verses the spaces per MSBA's guidelines. On average, sizes of the existing spaces are undersized based on current national educational standard. For example, existing general classrooms are an average of 686 and the guideline is 850 sf. The total net sf for the existing school is about 113,398 sf and per the MSBA Guideline it is 121,897 sf, however the Total Building Gross sf for the existing school is 200,372 verses per MSBA Guideline is 185,000. This gives the grossing factor for the existing school at 1.77 verse the MSBA Guidelines at 1.52. The grossing factor includes square footages for walls, circulations, toilets, storage, etc. This means that, based on modern spaces, the existing school is less efficient and is undersized per the programmed areas, but oversized as a building. This is due to the sprawl corridors connecting additions.

The space summary goes hand in hand with the education programming. From there, it will be developed to achieve what is needed in the building for the District to deliver the education.

Mr. Czekanski asked if the Administration and Guidance are considered by the MSBA to be at 0 sf and if they are considered in the grossing factor. Mr. Olsen clarified that, in the

spreadsheet presented, the grey lines are “buckets” of spaces that MSBA will reimburse for and the Administration and Guidance spaces are included, but not listed on this presentation. Mr. Olsen explained that for some spaces the project will work with MSBA on the reimbursement and the agreed upon space summary.

Ms. Cohen commented that if a new building is recommended, per the MSBA guidelines, we would have a smaller building, but it will contain more usable spaces. Mr. Olsen confirmed that if doing new construction, then yes, because it would be more efficient, and the project wouldn't be working with existing inefficiencies. If doing an additional/renovation, there will be compromises because of the inefficiency and work to the existing space and the project team will be working through with MSBA on what is reimbursable and what is not.

Ms. Kendall asked what the existing auditorium seating capacity is and what would MSBA reimburse for. Ms. Williams stated that MSBA will allow up to 2/3 of the design enrollment, but not to exceed 750 seats. For Nashoba, with a design enrollment of 925, it would be about 616.

Mr. Olsen provided an update on the educational program development. KBA and Skanska have been meeting with the Educational Leadership Team weekly since May 2, 2022, and furthering the adjacency diagram which has evolved since the educational visioning. Reviewing the bubble diagram development from the Educational Visioning sessions and the updated one from the meetings, some of the spaces and Student Common have remained relatively the same, but the media/applied arts space will be bridged to the smaller learning communities as the whole school diagram approach. The learning communities were divided into four small learning communities with each having classrooms, collaborated spaces, special education, and teacher planning spaces. The learning communities would be connected to the applied arts program and media center. Mr. Olsen stated that this is a work in progress, but wanted to give an updated to the SBC.

Ms. Cohen asked how much outdoor spaces was factored into the discussions. Ms. Kate Jessep said that outdoor spaces and connections were discussed but not defined and the design team will be bringing in the landscape architects for the development of the outdoor learning environment.

Mr. Olsen reviewed 3 options required by MSBA that the project needs to evaluate and their pros and cons:

Option 1 – Base Repair/Code Upgrade

Pros: Brings the existing building up to current code

Con: Does not meet the education program and not eligible for MSBA reimbursement, longer construction timeline, construction schedule limited around school, disruptive to existing school programs, and undersized educational spaces remain the same.

Option 2 - .Additional / Renovation

Pros: Addresses existing deficiencies in existing program spaces and existing athletic fields would stay the same and have minimal impact.

Cons: Longer construction timeline, construction schedule limited around school, disruptive to existing school programs, may not allowed for increased enrollment, phased abatement, and may require temporary classrooms which is not reimbursable by MSBA.

Option 3 – New Construction. Three options for the new construction of the building were presented for this and on all three alignment with Educational Program was listed as a Pro. The cons were that all three would disrupt the existing athletic fields and, depending on where the new building is placed within the existing school property, the leaching field would be impacted or construction occurring adjacent to the existing school.

For the PDP submission, a high-level evaluation – building footprint to replace a building the same shape and size in this site – will be done to get a rough cost base on cost per square foot for each option. The costs in PDP will be a rough number and the cost will be further refined for the Preferred Schematic Report submission. The project team will continue to evaluate but wanted to bring the SBC along and understand what has been done and where the project team is going with this. As the project progresses, the project team will continue to look and evaluate each option so that educated decisions can be made and find a solution that is educationally appropriate and fiscally responsible.

Ms. Bailey asked if the MSBA would reimburse for new athletic field if the new school is built on the existing one. Mr. Olsen said yes, but MSBA will only reimburse up to 8% for sitework, fields included, of the building construction cost.

On the next SBC on June 21, 2022, a draft Preliminary Design Program Submission will be presented to the SBC and review of the further development of the building options.

Ms. Kendall asked if there are options to go higher than 2 stories. Mr. Olsen said that different story configurations will be explored and that a 2 story in the presentation is used for a simplicity standpoint for where we are right now.

Ms. Cohen asked when solar energy will be considered in the project. Mr. Olsen said that multiple alternative fuel sources – air such as heat pumps, ground such as geothermal, and solar – will be considered. This will be part of the building system analysis during Preferred Schematic and will not know if it will be solar.

Mr. Czekanski asked if the educational visioning report can make it available. Mr. Olsen said that it's still in draft form and can be made available.

Mr. Czekanski noted that the fire department should be consulted regarding the height of the ladder truck if considering a 3-story building. Mr. Czekanski also noted that the Town of Bolton is serviced by 3 lines from National Grid that do not connect, and when Bolton wanted to put solar near the transfer station, National Grid said that it cannot absorb any more solar energy from that part of town. Therefore, when considering solar, the project needs to see if it's the same line going through the high school, if the solar power will be put back into the grid.

Mr. Gleason asked for Option 3B of the new building if there are any exemption from local zoning and setback. Mr. Olsen said that generally the project would follow all the zoning ordinance and would apply for variances if needed.

Mr. Gleason said that SBC did vote for the existing site as the selected project site and he reported as such to the District Committee meeting, but with a caveat that despite the vote of the School Committee, the design team was not prepared at that time to committee to the existing site and asked Mr. Olsen, based on tonight's meeting, if that this matter is still under advisement. Mr. Olsen did not recall making that comment, clarified that the existing school

site makes the most sense, and noted that the comment may be about if it make sense to look at adjacent spaces should additional spaces be needed.

**(c) Public Forum #3:**

It was discussed and agreed that a virtual option will be available for the Public Forum #3 and using StreamYard to allow for questions from community members participating remotely. Superintendent Downing will coordinate with Bolton TV and Dr. Boynton volunteer to monitor questions from StreamYard.

Ms Mary Ann Williams stated that on the June 21, 2022 SBC meeting, the SBC will be asked to approve the PDP submission. The SBC will also be asked to approve the Minutes that night because MSBA requires the approval of the PDP by the SBC.

**CEO SUBCOMMITTEE**

Ms. Amy Cohen reported that there was CEO report.

**ADJOURNMENT**

No further business being before the Nashoba Regional High School Building Committee. Chairman Gleason requested a motion to adjourn.

Motion was made by: Robert Czekanski  
Motion was seconded by: Amy Cohen  
Motion was approved by all voting members.

Meeting adjourned at 8:26 PM

Respectfully submitted by Sy Nguyen, Skanska USA. Recording Secretary