

Arlington High School Building Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
AHS-School Committee Room-Sixth Floor
6:00 pm

Present: Jeff Thielman, School Committee Representative, Chair
Kathleen Bodie, Superintendent, Co-vice chair
Adam Chapdelaine, Town Manager, Co-vice chair
Kirsi Allison-Ampe, School Committee Representative
Francis Callahan, Community Member Representative
John Cole, Chair, Permanent Town Building Committee
Tobey Jackson, Community Member Representative
Matthew Janger, AHS Principal
Ryan Katofsky, Community Member Representative
Kate Loosian, Community Member Representative
William McCarthy, AHS Assistant Principal
Steve Nesterak, Facilities Director (absent)
Judson Pierce, Community Member (absent)
Sandy Pooler, Deputy Town Manager
Brian Rehrig, Capital Planning Committee Member (absent)
Daniel Ruiz, Community Member Representative
Amy Speare, Community Member Representative
Shannon Knuth, Teacher Representative (absent)
Kent Werst, Teacher Representative

Also present: Jim Burrows, Victoria Clifford, Skanska Inc.
Lori Cowles, Arthur Duffy, Melissa Greene, HMFH Architects, Inc.

Call to order: 6:00 pm

Public Participation – None

Exterior Design Review

- HMFH explains that they are perusing Option A with a more traditional feel to it.
- HMFH also pointed out that 13 out of 16 requested that the auditorium is expressed. They have followed this direction.
- HMFH also pointed out that they are owning certain amount of cost related to studying the façade
- HMFH’s presentation tonight is paired down due to the fact that the design team has done a lot of leg work over the past few weeks getting the designs to the estimators
- On the concept drawings, the angled auditorium is outlined in red and the straightened-out auditorium is in yellow. HMFH explained that the angled, red version, saves some green space in the front and makes the length of the front façade seem shorter due to the illusion of depth. The straight across version, in yellow, was explored in an attempt to appeal to a more “traditional” design.
- Draft Concept 1
 - Most similar to existing colonnade in the existing façade
 - Columns are attached to the building.
 - The D-Lab is no longer at the front – HMFH is not sure in this version where where it will go

- Auditorium wing is straightened out (yellow perimeter version)
- Showing a sun shade sticking out over the window – HMFH will do sun studies in the Design Development phase to evaluate cost and performance
- Draft Concept 1A
 - Building on Concept 1, while including the cupola and clock at the same scale
 - Could the D-Lab fit in the cupola? HMFH thinks yes, but it may change the shape of the room. It may not be the most desired proportions.
 - Q: Could HMFH Scale down the copula and clock tower?
 - We could, but it wouldn't be a historical reuse
 - Q: Kathy asks; Have you considered going back to a previous design?
 - A: Lori – no because we don't have time, and this is the direction that was been decided to date
- Draft Concept Plan 2
 - Modern interpretation of the columns
 - D-Lab would be expressed at the top
 - Level of transparency to see what is going on – bringing light to the central spine
 - Q: What are HMFH's thoughts on the material used to make the columns?
 - TBD
 - Could be wood could be panelized
 - Showing them as white to keep the traditional white trim aesthetic – could be changed
 - Q: Could the D-Lab be simplified?
 - A: Yes.
- Draft Concept Plan 3
 - Thought was to bring the columns upwards
 - Showing no windows in the auditorium
 - Bringing in more of the color white to the building design
 - Depth of the top portion is flush with the bottom canopy
 - HMFH is working on scaling down the top portion
 - Q: Kathy asks: Are sun shades beneficial for LEED point? Is it better to have actual shades?
 - A: Lori: The sun shades goal is to use the sun, not block it out. The shades will manage the impact of the light, not block it out. With it comes the responsibility to manage the shades to maximize light and energy shading – we will provide diagrams for.
 - A: Dan Ruiz: It's part of the net-0 of the building, it doesn't give points – it will help take the burden off the occupants to manage the shades for energy management
 - Matt: The advantage of the D-Lab where it is, is that it's closer to the performing arts and the shared spaces. It was seen as a specialized space for the humanities, but now it's closer to the STEAM wing. The D-Lab needs to be located and accessed easily to the Central Spine.
 - Lori: The D-Lab cannot go in the back of the spine, because the library needs space.
 - Kate: not sure that the DL-ab needs so much attention in the façade design. Kathy- Agrees with Kate. It would have been nicer near the humanities wing and also, it's currently shown with a lot of glass.
 - John Cole: Does not accept that the D-Lab can't be moved as it is the architect's job to appease the client. Jon states that is the administration wants the D-Lab to be moved, then they need to make a formal request for it to be moved.
- Draft Concept 4:

- Curved front entrance
- Draft Concept 5:
 - Minimizes the columns to just the canopy
 - Windows in façade will show the central spine not the D-Lab
- Draft Concept 6:
 - Introducing wood as a material used in the front façade
 - Has the least windows
 - Arthur mentioned that the D-Lab is a way to show expression that is not a decoration
 - Matt says that he is ok with the D-Lab location as long as it is near the spine
- Q: Sandy: What is the advantage of the auditorium having windows?
 - A: Lori: when the space is being used for practice, the windows will bring in light to fill the space – it makes it more functional throughout the day.
- Sandy – There seems to be a sense of proportions to colonnades. I think some of the columns here are not proportionate to classic design. Not sure that they look “right”.
- Q: Kate: What is the goal for tonight?
- John Cole follows up: based on conversations with fellow architects and leadership – we put together the provided green sheet (“Mass Ave Façade and Entry Design Alternatives to Scheme A”). We could make some hard decisions that would give the architect specific directions on items to be selected. Here are the critical questions to answer tonight:
 - Should the auditorium be pivoted or straight?
 - Should there be a cupola or representation of column house?
 - Should the D-Lab be on this façade prominently?
- This could lead to the ultimate decision of eliminating a few concepts
- Q: Kent: On the steam wing, the back angle, could you switch the angle from the front and back of the wing?
 - Q: It could happen in design development phase, but It would have impact to logistics of the project phasing and design on the classroom courtyard
- Adam comments that shifting the façade to the straight (yellow) version would take away the green that we’ve promised to the community – going off good faith we should attend to keep the as drawn (on the angle)
- Ryan: Keeping the red line will add space to the geothermal wells, which we assume we will utilize the front green for.
- Q: Does the yellow configuration make a positive impact to the size of the amphitheater?
 - A: Matt: The size the amphitheater currently is large enough. If it were bigger, we would have trouble filling it.
- **VOTE: Committee votes on position of the arts wing (red or yellow perimeter drawing):**
 - **All vote for red.**
 - **Kathy votes for yellow.**
- Recommendation for the D-Lab:
 - Kathy does not like it as a focal point of the design. Also, doesn’t like the idea that the façade of glass is primarily glass.
 - Bill: would like it in the front or back, close to an exit.
 - John: Do we have direction on a location of the D-Lab?

- Ryan: Struggling to make a decision on the D-Lab location without seeing the D-Lab in the back of the building.
- Dan: Sees the D-Lab as a perfect symbol for the school as a place to come together and across all disciplines and have meaningful conversations – is hearing from the administrators that the D-Lab location is fine where it is from an adjacency standpoint
- Frank: Thinks it's important that whatever we put in the front facade is programmatic not decorative. Shouldn't be a massive overrepresentation. Liked the older version of concept A at scale.
- Matt: The D-Lab is in a fine location, It's important to be accessible from the spine corridor. It might work well in the back, but we haven't seen it like that yet – Matt proposes we study showing the D-Lab in the back to compare.
- Q: What would it take to see the D-Lab in the back?
 - A: Lori – would have to show it in the design development phase
- Jim: The cupola and clock has a higher cost impact above and beyond the estimate. The other concepts are confidently going to be covered in the estimate.
- Kathy expressed that she is disappointed to hear that the estimate won't cover the cupola and clock
- Adam followed up: When we selected option A, we didn't include a cupola and clock. Doesn't have a recollection that we would include the cupola and clock in the estimate
- Dan: would not like to ask HMFH to develop designs further are this time 2/12 due to the timeline of the Schematic Design submission
- Frank concerned with moving the D-Lab to the back due to publicity of the floor plans thus far
- From a cost perspective, 1A would have the most cost impact and be the least attractive for the sustainability features. 6 might also have a larger cost impact due to the tilt roof and wood treatment.

Jeff asks committee to rank their top two concepts. The top choice will be our final directions.

Kathy Bodie – 1A / 1

Michael Mason – 1 / 4

Adam Chapdelaine– 2 / 4

John Cole – 2 / 4 (scheme 2 with a 2-story colonnade)

Sandy Pooler– 6 / 1 (wish the D-Lab was on top of 1)

Matt Janger– 1

Kent Werst– 1 / 2 (maybe with a combo of 2 and 4)

Bill McCarthy– 2 / 1

Kate Loosian– 2

Ryan Katofsky– 2 / 5

Toby Jackson– 2 / 1

Dan Ruiz– 3 / 2 (request for less windows on the close theater façade)

Amy Speare– 2

Frank Callahan – 2 / 4

Kirsi Allison-Ampe – 2 / 6

Jeff Thielman – 4 / 2

Concept 2 has the majority

MOTION Adam Chapdelaine moves to direct the architect develop scheme 2 with direction from John Cole to extend the second story entrance. Seconded by Kate Loosian.

All those in favor to adopt the motions proposed by John Cole –

Vote to approve the adoption of the motion:

- **In Favor: 11**
- **Opposed (2) – Kathy Bodie, Matt Janger**
- **Abstain (1) – William McCarthy**

Finance Subcommittee Update

SBC Reviews the “Updated Parmenter Analysis – Cost Factors”

- Q: Amy: Is there any possible way to get 9 classrooms at Parmenter
 - A: It is not possible
- Kathy: We have no choice but to accommodate for the size of the preschool – If we moved the preschool to Parmenter, we would probably have to move classrooms to a different elementary school, which we have at Ottoson.
- Sandy: Do we need to include an elevator?
 - We have included it because the program leaders asked for one – and this is a special education program – also code could require one.
 - Sandy would like to look at the code requirements and the possibility of keeping an elevator temporarily – also

Kirsi moves to reaffirm the vote of the AHSBC to keep the preschool permanently at the High School. Kirsi sees it as important to keep it the Preschool at the High School because relocating to Parmenter would short change the community, also, the adjacency for the Early Childhood program is important for the high school students and if we build the space as part of this project, we could use it in the future to accommodate future enrollment growth. Motion is seconded by Kate.

Jeff asked the committee for a roll-call vote: All in favor say I, the I's are unanimous.

- Kathy adds that Parmenter needs work. There needs to be an investment in the building in the near future.
- Q: Is there a possibility that the MSBA will reimburse the Preschool if it is built in the HS? Possibly.
 - It is possible, but the MSBA has not formally accepted it as reimbursable space. We will know by the Project Scope and Budget meeting.
- Jeff touches on the issue of the previously submitted Parmenter figures not including soft costs. Jeff asks that Skanska reviews future proposal's more carefully and every meeting with the understanding that figures can be voted on.

DWP Project Update

Adam gives an update on the DWP Project Design

- Adam explains that the project would like to develop their design with knowing the relationship between our two properties
- Kathy asks if adding the connection to Grove will add traffic as a cut through will be a concern – it may be necessary to add a remote operated gate
- Matt: thinks that the Grove Street access could have a gate during the majority of the day, and opened for drop off pick up hours

- Adam – if there is access at all through Grove Street, the salt shed design on the DWP site will need to be altered
- Committee discusses possibility buying the property between the school and the DWP site – we would need to begin conversations with the owner – town would need to bring the decision to town meeting
- Matt asks if we have discussed potential buying of properties on Schooler Court. Jeff answered that we have not.
- The committee has favored the idea of the Grove Street Connection. Adam sees no need for a motion unless the DPW plans change.

Sustainability Subcommittee Update

- Ryan gives preliminary results from the energy model effort
- The goal EUI baseline target: 38 with the hopes to get to 30
- The preliminary model gets us to 36, so we already meet our baseline target
- Based on programing, the school programing is a third of the energy use, the rest is summer programing, night and weekend programing.
- We have a ballpark estimate of the required solar to run the school - it is a large number and we are unlikely to meet it.
- This work has been informing the cost estimating exercise
- Q: When is the analysis of the life cycle assessment?
 - o A: That will be in the design development phase
- Q: When will we know if we are going to reach net 0?
 - o A: Ryan thinks it is safe to say we won't reach it due to the constraints on the site. Which doesn't mean we shouldn't aim to get as low as possible
- Arthur comments that the main goal of Design Development is to price out and explore areas to add PV
- Q: Amy asks if the campaign request an estimate on the life cycle/cost comparison for the design we are proposing
 - o Ryan doesn't see it as possible
- The estimate that we are getting for the SD will cost out the sustainable features
- Request from John: Can we do a benchmark that shows our EUI compared to other EUI's? Ryan says yes.
- Adam: We could probably set some goals on geothermal / PV's to build a conceptual life cycle analysis. Believes we should advertise the global impact we are making by getting the building to where we have it today.

Communications Subcommittee

No forums planed at this time

- Jeff: suggests we do road-show presentations to different town committees:
 - o Select board
 - o Finance Committee
 - o Town Meeting Committee
- Jeff also proposed that we invite town meeting members here (give two dates)
- High School Comparison blog has been well received
- Starting on Feb 12, we will be the featured table on the Robinson Library

New Business

None

Minutes for Approval

None

Motion by Adam to adjourn, seconded by Kate Loosian at 9:30 p.m.

Recorded By:

Victoria Clifford, Skanska

Submitted by:

Karen Tassone

Recording Secretary

AHS Building Committee

ktassone@arlington.k12.ma.us