



Hill International

Lincoln Eliot School - NECP School Building Committee

Meeting: November 9, 2021, 6PM

Location: Digital, via Zoom

Committee Members: Josh Morse*, Alison Leary*, Emily Prenner*, Kathy Shields*, Liam Hurley*, Margaret Albright*, Alex Valcarce, Stephanie Gilman, Jonathan Yeo*, Danielle Morrissey*, Rebecca Grossman*, JJ Kazakoff*

* - Denotes Voting Member

Professional Team: Tina Soo Hoo, Daniel Jick, Larry Spang – Arrowstreet (AST)
Matthew Sturz, Duclinh Hoang – Hill International (Hill)

Guests: Maria Leo – Design Review Committee
John Mulligan – Design Review Committee

The meeting was called to order at 6:00PM.

1. Liam Hurley provided an introduction of attending School Building Committee members and project professional team members from and Arrowstreet, and Hill International.
2. **A Motion was made by E. Prenner and seconded by M. Albright to approve the 10/14/2021 and 10/26/21 Meeting Minutes. No further discussion. Motion passed by unanimously.**
3. J. Yeo reported there have been several meetings discussing the Criteria Matrix and opened it up to the committee for discussions.

Committee Discussion ensued including:

- Mr. Morse reported the matrix had been updated with the feedback given at previous meetings. The goal is to work towards a vote not for a preferred option but towards an approach of either addition/renovation (add/reno) options or new construction options.
- AST presented the Criteria Matrix and reported that there was some changes made since the last meeting. There was a correction in the building gross floor area for the add/reno options. The changes were to *Cost and Schedule* criteria from “yes” and “no” to “favorable”, “neutral”, and “unfavorable” and *Site* adding the criteria “optimizes stormwater resiliency.” AST noted the stormwater resiliency was neutral for all options and will meet state and location codes.
- **Inquiry about cost to maintain building from new construction and add/reno.** - Mr. Morse responded noting for this project there is nominal different between new construction and add/reno for maintenance. For add/reno the building gross square footage is larger but half the square footage is storage and auditorium which is low cost intensity for maintenance. Mr. Hurley added no change to staff.
- Mr. Morse noted all the options presented meet the school program. The primary difference is cost that ranges from \$41.5M to \$55.9M. Other factors include historic and environmental.
- Mr. Morse discussed the school program criteria noting meeting with user group to determine projected enrollment and using the MSBA guidelines to determine space requirements for example classrooms, restrooms and SPED classrooms.



Hill International

- ***Inquiry about the school program.*** – Mr. Hurley responded school program is space program for the school to quantify the number of classrooms, square footage, SPED classrooms, gym, cafeteria and music requirements.
- ***Inquiry about renderings.*** – AST presented thumbnails for the various options. Renderings can be found on the project website, <http://lincolneliot-necp-projects.com/>. Mr. Morse noted all schemes show future classroom addition location. Mr. Yeo added all the options include space for playground, field and parking.
- Mr. Morse discussed his six bullet items when reviewing the schemes.
 1. Add/Reno approach meets and exceeds Lincoln Eliot School Program because the gross square footage is larger and allows for more flexibility
 2. Add/Reno approach does not require any measureable compromise beyond what would be seen in New Construction options considering the challenges presented by the site. The site has a great elevation difference both inside and outside the building.
 3. Add/Reno approach preserves the historic building which assist and maintain the project schedule and the committee would not tackle as arduous process needed to weight the intrinsic and architectural value of the existing facility in respect to the Newton Historic Commission review and approval process.
 4. Add/Reno approach allows for preservation of large majority of structure which greatly reduces the carbon footprint of the project from the embodied carbon perspective. Mr. Morse added the City replaced the windows and curtain wall about four years ago.
 5. Add/Reno approach is more financially responsible and can deliver the project at a fraction of the cost.
 6. Add/Reno approach fits within the project budget and schedule that allows for students and teachers to move in as soon as possible.
- ***Inquiry about benefits of keeping the chapel, auditorium and public uses.*** – Mr. Morse responded the goal is to have the project be on schedule. Mr. Morse noted to table reviewing the benefits of the different criteria schemes at this time.
- ***Inquiry about if new construction would delay other projects.*** – Mr. Morse responded there would be a ripple effect for the rest of the projects coming afterwards and the current focus right now is the Lincoln Eliot School.
- AST presented the Building Evaluation Criteria Matrix.
 1. Building and Site Facts
 - I. AST noted the difference is in building square footage between the options. The Add/Reno approach square footage is close to the approved space summary.
 2. Cost and Schedule
 - I. AST noted the cost would impact the schedule on school opening and site plan approval.
 3. Educational
 - I. AST noted all the schemes meet education and space program. Generally all the options are neutral for flexibility, configuration and efficiency of design layout.
 4. Community
 - I. AST noted it is based on the community spaces for example gym, cafetorium, green space and playground
 5. Building



Hill International

- I. AST noted all the options meet the prerequisites of meeting building codes, MAAB/ADA requirements, healthy building environment and hazardous material remedial requirements.
 - II. AST noted the New Construction would be favorable in the use of natural light and daylighting and allows for efficient building design compared to the Add/Reno option. Option 1 and 2 preserves district central storage facilities and maintenance shop.
 - III. J. Morse added the glazing at 150 Jackson is 30% greater than Zervas School including store front that allows for natural light into the classrooms.
6. Site
- I. AST noted one prerequisite all the schemes meet the environmental remedial requirements.
 - II. All the schemes are neutral for sufficient parking for teachers and staff, minimized traffic impact and safety of pedestrian and bike access.
7. Sustainability
- I. AST noted the Add/Reno option is favorable and neutral for minimizing embodied carbon footprint while the new construction is unfavorable.
 - II. The new construction is more favorable for green school/ stretch code requirements and thermal performance compared to neutral for add/reno schemes.
- ***Inquiry about new construction and add/reno consideration*** – Mr. Morse responded noting the committee is just looking at direction and then will review different options, elevations and massing at a later date.
 - ***Inquiry about which building is the Convent and Chapel*** – AST presented the existing building noting the various locations.
 - ***Inquiry whether building elevations affects the neighbors on Walnut Street.*** – AST noted only option 3B where there is a new gym and cafetorium would be at or slightly higher than the Convent but the Add/Reno options are less high.
 - ***Inquiry on amount of parking a factor in retaining the auditorium?*** - Mr. Hurley responded each schemes have equal amount of parking. Mr. Morse added the project would develop a parking management plan for day and night time use factoring performances to not create unnecessary burden on the neighborhood.
 - ***M. Albright made the motion to preserve a portion of the existing facility located at 150 Jackson Road while considering various additional and renovation schemes for the purposes of delivering a new facility for the Lincoln – Eliot Elementary School. Seconded by Alison Leary. 10 in favor, 0 opposed. Unanimous decision.*** Ms. Grossman added not seeing a tangible benefit for the cost difference for the building to build on the same footprint.
5. Next SBC meeting is scheduled Tuesday, November 23, 2021 at 6pm via Zoom with link to follow.
6. ***M. Albright made a meeting to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by J. Morse. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.***

To the best of my knowledge, these notes are a fair representation of the items discussed at the meeting. Additional items or corrections should be brought to the attention of the writer. Submitted by: Duclinh Hoang 11/19/21