

**Present:** Matthew Wells, Sr. Business Analyst; Brian Schlegel, Facilities Manager; Heather Bout, School Committee; Matt Andersen-Miller, Volunteer; John Flaherty, Superintendent of Finance and Operations; Wally Johnston, School Committee; Drew Rosenshine, CMS Principal; Maria McDermott, CMS Teacher; Karin Baker, CMS Teacher; Chris Popov, Volunteer; Eve Isenberg, Volunteer; Lauryn Gorli, Volunteer; Diana Rigby, Superintendent; Pat Morss, Finegold Alexander; Regan Shields Ives, Finegold Alexander

- I. Call to Order  
Heather Bout called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and noted the meeting is being recorded. There were no public comments.  
The agenda was a further update on the CMS Facility Study.
- II. Vote to Approve Minutes  
A motion was made to approve the March 23, 2017 minutes by Wally Johnston and seconded by Brian Schlegel. The motion passed unanimously.
- III. Presentation by Finegold Alexander Architects  
Finegold Alexander Architects (FAA) distributed hard copies of the PowerPoint presentation, and several copies of the 10 and 50-year plan cost estimate by Fennessy Consulting Services (also available digitally).

The presentation included:

- Brief review of updated 10-Year Maintenance Plan for both buildings presented at the 3/23/17 meeting; incorporates additional action items and relocation of some items from the Optional to the Recommended column.
- Meetings, site visits, and MSBA program information that informed development of design options.
- Presentation of alternative long term diagrammatic plans:
  - o Option 1 – Occupy both buildings – Comprehensive physical plant and teaching environment renovations over time; addition of auditorium and enlarged gym at Peabody.
  - o Option 2 – Renovated Sanborn with additions – Comprehensive renovation of Sanborn with addition of a second 2-story classroom wing, and expansion of the cafeteria, library/media center and maintenance dept.
  - o Option 3 – Major Sanborn reconfiguration with demolition and additions – Demolition of classroom/administrative wing, retention and comprehensive renovation of auditorium/gym wing and construction of a large 2-story classroom/cafeteria wing.
  - o Option 4a – New building to MSBA program – Totally new school that meets MSBA space standards for 700 students.
  - o Option 4b – New building including desired program – Same as Option 4a but with addition of auditorium and enlarged gym.
- Presentation slides comparing the Options for scope of work and present day construction costs.

General discussion:

- MSBA may press for reduction in projected student population of 700, but retain this number in the study.
- Confirm that cost estimate covers relocation of playing fields.

Discussion of the design options:

- On Scope Comparison slide, Option 3 could also remain occupied if addition is constructed before major demolition. However, the modular classrooms must be replaced during construction of the addition.
- FAA indicated preference for either Option 3 (retains auditorium, and enlarged gym and music program, which are desired by Concord) or Option 4b (best opportunity to meet future teaching environment needs and Concord's desired program). The Study Committee concurred.

Adjustments to PowerPoint presentation (and Study Report):

- Is there a way to graphically or numerically indicate cost impact of triggering added code compliance for life safety, accessibility and seismic enhancements?
- Is there a way to depict time-line impact and cost for logistics (e.g. new construction is faster with less overhead and fewer temporary accommodations)?
- Similarly, prepare a combined chart with construction costs, soft costs (time sensitive), required use of modular classrooms, and other project costs? Maybe just for favored Options 3 and 4b.
- Break out hazardous materials costs for the different design options.
- Could a bar chart illustrate probable MSBA eligible contributions by design option (e.g. Option 4a should be 100% eligible at a rate of about 30%, equaling "X" dollars)? The committee suggested deferring this until design interface with MSBA.
- Could use different color shading on the "purple" construction cost bar chart to indicate that Options 1 and 4a (lighter) are not viable for the Town of Concord, but Options 2, 3, and 4b (darker) are related and acceptable project approaches. Option 2 might be a shade in between. Also suggest the bars be stacked in different colors to separate construction costs from soft, modular classrooms, hazardous materials, and other project costs.
- Explain on slides that the work effort and costs are significantly different between the 10-year maintenance plan and 50-year Option 1. The latter is considerably more aggressive in renovation for the long term and responds to the evolving learning and technological environments.
- Don't show the 10-year and 50-year costs on the same Cost Summary page; include scope summary for 50-year Option 1.
- On the purple construction cost chart, show the full \$50M+/- height of the comparative bars to indicate the design options are quite close.
- Change numbering of Options. Unacceptable Option 1 becomes "Status Quo" in 2 versions – the first is the 10-year Maintenance Plan, and the second is current Option 1 which also transforms the educational environment. Option 2, 3, and 4a/b become Options 1, 2, and 3a/b.
- Caption the Willard and High School photographs as to why we are showing them.
- Delete the "doughnut" cost breakdown slide. The enhanced purple bar chart will be sufficient.

Preparation for next Study Committee meeting (May 16, 2017):

- Need to prove why the 10-year Maintenance Plan is not adequate long term if we were to keep both buildings. Clearly delineate in a narrative how the existing conditions for infrastructure and teaching environment are untenable, and what the needs are for a dynamic Concord Middle School. At the end of 10 years there will be another 10-year plan. Spending \$50M to create a better teaching environment won't eliminate the 2-building operations and teaching obstacles.
- Must address a previous proposal to locate 6th grade in Peabody and 7th and 8th grades in Sanborn. Sixth graders would have an unacceptable step back from the new/renovated elementary schools that have superior features such as auditoriums and large gyms. No one is looking for a two-school option; 700 students in a single middle school is acceptable.
- Also indicate the School Department has investigated and discarded options for a different site.
- Study Committee members volunteered for a sub-committee to develop a "Chapter 1" for the study that clearly lays out the non-architectural needs for a single state-of-the-art school. Explain "why we are doing this," and "what's wrong and what do we want." The PowerPoint "Input for Stakeholders" slide is a guide for the needs.
- FAA will work with the sub-committee and committee members on a list of soft and other costs to add to construction estimates.

Schedule:

- Week of May 1-5: Subcommittee will have "Chapter 1" to FAA for integration into the study report and the PowerPoint presentation.
- Friday May 12: FAA will forward final study report to the Study Committee for review.
- Tuesday May 16, 6:00 pm at Sanborn: Study Committee meeting to discuss final report and updated PowerPoint.
- Tuesday June 13, 6:30 pm (tentative): PowerPoint presentation to School Board.

IV. Additional Items

The next meeting will be at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2017 at Sanborn.

V. Public Questions/Answers

None

VI. Public Comments

None

VII. Adjourn

A motion was made to adjourn by Wally Johnston and seconded by Brian Schlegel at 8:02 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,  
Matthew Wells

Approved: 5/16/2017