Joint Meeting of City Council & School Committee

January 7, 2019

School Building Project
City of Gardner
AGENDA

• Greeting & Introduction
  • Mark P. Hawke, Mayor

• The Role of the MSBA & Local Timeline
  • Colliers – Owner’s Project Manager

• The Need & Process
  • Jones Whitsett Architects & Mark Pellegrino, Superintendent

• Project Plans
  • Jones Whitsett Architects

• Project Costs & Construction Timeline
  • Colliers – Owner’s Project Manager & Mark Pellegrino, Superintendent

• Q & A
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

- Mark Hawke, Mayor, Chair
- Mark Pellegrino, Superintendent
- Wayne Anderson, Dir. of Facilities
- Ashley Chicoine, Teacher
- Ronald Cormier, City Council
- Jennifer Dymek, Purchasing
- David Fredette, Principal
- Catherine Goguen, Academic Officer
- Robert Hankinson, Citizen
- Heidi Jandris, Citizen
- Earl Martin, Principal
- Jennifer Pelavin, School Comm.
- Robert Swartz, School Comm.
- Christina Thomas, Teacher
- Joyce West, Pupil Services
- April Yu, Business Manager
**MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY PROCESS**

**MSBA** is the state authority that administers and funds a program for grants for Massachusetts school projects

**MSBA** mandates a multi-step rigorous study and approval process

**MSBA** will reimburse all *Eligible* Costs.

- Examples of *Ineligible* Costs include:
  - Site Costs over 8% of construction costs
  - Building Costs over $333/sf
  - Removal of asbestos floor tiles
  - Costs associated with modular classrooms
  - Site acquisition costs
  - FFE/Technology Costs over $2,400/Student
Gardner submits Statement of Interest to MSBA

MSBA and District agree to enrollment: 365 K-1 students OR 925 K-4 students

MSBA accepts Gardner into Feasibility Study process

Anticipated MSBA Board Approval of Schematic Design & Project Budget

Gardner Public Vote on Project and Costs

Colliers hired as Owners' Project Manager

JWA hired as Architect

Preliminary Design Program to MSBA

Preferred Schematic Report to MSBA

Schematic Design Report with Costs to MSBA

Anticipated School Opening
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THE NEED – WATERFORD AND ELM STREET SCHOOLS

- District is split amongst four buildings in three different areas of the city
- Inefficient building envelopes lead to high utility costs
- Overcrowding
- Antiquated mechanical, electrical & plumbing systems
- Existing buildings do not meet current standards:
  - Size of classrooms
  - Adequate facilities for SWD
  - 21st century learning & teaching
WATERFORD STREET SCHOOL

- Built as a Junior High School in 1953
- Serves only Pre-K – 1st Grade
- Overcrowded and inadequate General Classroom, Administration & Students with Disabilities (SWD) spaces
- Many spaces are not handicap accessible
- Roof is at end of useful life
- Flooring is at end of useful life
- Water issues in basement and on adjacent fields
- Boiler has been updated, but many systems are original and out of date
- No major structural issues identified
ELM STREET SCHOOL

• Built as a High School in 1926
• Serves 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 4\textsuperscript{th} Grade
• Overcrowded and inadequate General Classroom, Administration, Kitchen & Students with Disabilities (SWD) spaces
• Classrooms are very undersized – some only 60% of current standards
• Many spaces are not handicap accessible
• Access to site is congested and sometimes dangerous. Inadequate parking and drop-off.
• Boiler has been updated, but many systems are original and out of date
• No major structural issues identified
• June 12 – Elm teachers & staff
• June 14 – Waterford teachers & staff
• June 18 – SBC & Community Leaders
• July 17 – Leadership Team
• August 28 – All teachers and staff

- Discussed 21st C Learning Goals
- Reviewed Design Pattern Examples
- Performed Strengths, Challenges, Opportunities, and Goals (SCOG) Exercise
- Developed Priorities for Gardner
FAVORED DESIGN PATTERNS & PRIORITIES

Clusters of Learning

New School Design Patterns

Welcoming Entry

Community Access

Flexible Classrooms

New School Design Patterns

Clusters of Learning

Priorities
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- School as Community Resource
- 21st Century Teaching & Learning
- Learning Communities
- Healthy & Sustainable School
- Outdoor / Nature Connections

3 SCHOOLS WITHIN A SCHOOL

- 4TH CLUSTER (185 STUDENTS)
- 3RD CLUSTER (185 STUDENTS)
- 2ND CLUSTER (185 STUDENTS)
- 1ST CLUSTER (185 STUDENTS)

COMMON SPACES

- K CLUSTER (185 STUDENTS)
- PK CLUSTER (80 STUDENTS)

ADMIN
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OPTIONS

Three Possible Sites:
- Waterford Street
- Elm Street
- Middle / High School Site

Two Possible Grade Configurations
• Pre-K – 1st Grade 365 (+80) students ~ 83,000 sq ft 227 sf/pupil
• Pre-K – 4th Grade 925 (+80) students ~ 145,000 sq ft 157 sf/pupil

Six Options:
1. Waterford Street up to code
2. Add/Reno PK-1 @ Waterford
3. New PK-1 @ Waterford
4. Add/Reno PK-4 @ Elm
5. New PK-1 @ Middle/High
6. New PK-4 @ Middle/High
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code Upgrade Waterford</th>
<th>Waterford Add/Reno PK-1</th>
<th>Waterford New PK-1</th>
<th>Elm Add/Reno PK-4</th>
<th>Middle/High New PK-1</th>
<th>Middle/High New PK-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets educational goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses entire PK-4 population</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for district to share resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require swing space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not result in high, unreimbursed site costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require MHC review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses City’s historic schools</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of new construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx Project Costs</td>
<td>$33-37 M</td>
<td>$42-46 M</td>
<td>$44-48 M</td>
<td>$78-82 M</td>
<td>$47-51 M</td>
<td>$84-88 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets educational goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses entire PK-4 population</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for district to share resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require swing space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not result in high, unreimbursed site costs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require MHC review</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses City’s historic schools</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of new construction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx Project Costs</td>
<td>$33-37 M</td>
<td>$42-46 M</td>
<td>$44-48 M</td>
<td>$78-82 M</td>
<td>$47-51 M</td>
<td>$84-88 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 2: Waterford Add/Reno PK-1

**Estimated Project Cost:** $42-46 Million  
**Pros:**  
- Least costly  
- Working with Waterford Street plan  
- Higher MSBA reimbursement for building reuse  
- School is in a neighborhood location  
- Structurally sound, well-built building  
- Project phasing disruptive and adds cost and time to project  
- Extensive infrastructure rehabilitation and replacement  
- Fails to meet District’s educational plan goals  

**Cons:**  
- Requires additional environmental testing

### Option 4: Elm Add/Reno PK-4

**Estimated Project Cost:** $78-82 Million  
**Pros:**  
- One 21st C building for all PK-4 students  
- Rehabilitates Existing Historic Building  
- Higher MSBA reimbursement for building reuse  
- School is in a neighborhood location  
- Larger building to maintain (20,000 sq ft larger than Opt. 6)  
- Structurally sound, well-built building  
- Capitalizes on prior building investments  

**Cons:**  
- Working with Elm Street building plan  
- Extremely tight site for vehicular requirements  
- Requires additional environmental testing

### Option 6: Pearl Street New PK-4

**Estimated Project Cost:** $84-88 Million  
**Pros:**  
- Supports district long-term plan - one 21st century building for all PK-4 students  
- Unites all elementary administrators & specialists in one building  
- More design flexibility by building new  
- Adjacent to Middle/High campus for possible connection  
- Provides more spaces for community use

**Cons:**  
- Most expensive option  
- Requires site acquisition  
- Extensive unreimbursed site work is required  
- Adjacency to wetlands and woods  
- Relieves vehicular congestion from existing neighborhoods
Option 2: Waterford Add/Reno PK-1

- Estimated Project Cost: $42-46 Million
- Pros: Least costly, Working with Waterford Street plan
- Cons: Higher MSBA reimbursement for building reuse, Only addresses PK-1 student needs, Hydrologic issues at this site, Requires additional environmental testing, Project phasing disruptive and adds cost and time to project, Fails to meet District’s educational plan goals

Option 4: Elm Add/Reno PK-4

- Estimated Project Cost: $78-82 Million
- Pros: One 21st century building for all PK-4 students, Rehabs Existing Historic Building
- Cons: Working with Elm Street building plan, Extremely tight site for vehicular requirements, Requires additional environmental testing, Parking required at Stone Field

Option 6: Pearl Street New PK-4

- Estimated Project Cost: $84-88 Million
- Pros: Supports district long-term plan - one 21st century building for all PK-4 students, Unites all elementary administrators & specialists in one building, More design flexibility by building new, Adjacent to wetlands and woods, Provides more spaces for community use
- Cons: Most expensive option, Requires site acquisition, Extensive unreimbursed site work is required, Leaves 2 buildings for City to repurpose, Relieves vehicular congestion from existing neighborhoods
WHY A PRE-K TO GRADE 4 FACILITY?

- Equitable access to 21st century education
- Eliminates moving students from school to school – fewer transitions
- Technology to support 21st century college and career readiness
- Resources to better support students with disabilities
- Opportunity for staff to collaborate and share ideas and resources
- Opportunities for older students to mentor younger students
- Improved instructional spaces for Art and Music
- Least expensive when considering dollars/student
- Addresses district’s long-term goal of all PK-4 students in one building
WHY ADDITIONAL LAND?

Wetlands Points Mapped

We may look to have the loop road cross these wetlands, to open up more of the remaining land for development.

Potential Vernal Pool

Certified Vernal Pool

- 100' no build

There is a 100' buffer to all wetlands, but we can develop within the buffer as long as we file a notice of intent, which we need to do for the crossing anyways.

Developable Area
FIRST FLOOR PLAN
THIRD FLOOR PLAN
## CONSTRUCTION & PROJECT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 6 – New PK-4 School (145,750 sq ft)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New School – Estimated Trade Costs</td>
<td>$41,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework – Estimated Trade Costs</td>
<td>$8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies and Escalation</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>$7,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Approximate Construction Cost**: $65 – 69 million
- **Other Project Costs (Fees, Contingencies, Etc.)**: $18 - 20 million
- **Approximate Project Costs**: $83 – 89 million
- **Approximate MSBA Reimbursement**: $48 – 52 million
- **Approximate City Costs**: $36 – 40 million
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited into MSBA process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire OPM &amp; Designer</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBA Approves Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
<td>May 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Bid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LOCAL APPROVALS TIMELINE
WHY ACT NOW?

• Gardner has not built a new school since the Middle School in 1996

• Gardner has not built a true Elementary School since the 1800’s

• Gardner base reimbursement rate is 78.6% of eligible costs

• Including all reimbursable and non-reimbursable costs, MSBA will reimburse the city for approximately 60% of the project costs

• An opportunity to provide new facilities for the entire elementary school population

• Keep Gardner students in Gardner – reducing choice out & out of district placements

• PK-4 approach is most efficient in terms of square feet / student, as well as cost / square foot.