

**Tisbury School Building Committee**  
**5:00PM, Monday, September 11, 2017**  
**Tisbury School Library**

1

**TSBC Members Present:** Chair Colleen McAndrews, Ian Aitchison, Wiet Bacheller, Harold Chapdelaine, Catherine Coogan, John Custer, Leo De Sourcy, Cheryl Doble, Melinda Loberg\*, Reade Milne, Erika Mulvey, Sean Mulvey, Amy Tierney,

**TSC Members Present:** Colleen McAndrews,

**Others:** Basia Jaworski, Marie Larsen, Paul Massey, Larry Mollin  
Daedalus – Richard Marks,  
Turowski2 – Libby Turowski, Peter Turowski  
Horiuchi Solien – Evan Hammond, Dan Solien

**Planning Bd.:** Ben Robinson, Cheryl Doble,

\* Late Arrivals or early departures.

The Tisbury School Building Committee (TSBC) was called to order at 5:02PM. The meeting was being recorded by MVTV and by audio for secretary Marni Lipke who was at a conflicting meeting.

I. Approval of TSBC Minutes of 8/28/17

• ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. JOHN CUSTER AND SECONDED BY MS. WIET BACHELLER THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 28, 2017 TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING WERE UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED; 12 AYES, 0 NAYS, ABSTENTIONS.

II. Schematic Design Options

III. Architect Report

Mr. Peter Turowski of Turowski2 Architects (T2) and Mr. Dan Solien of Horiuchi Solien Landscaping, presented the three remaining options (see 8/28/17 TSBC Minutes p.4) which the TSBC discussed at length, asking for clarifications, making suggestions and examining various factors especially exterior issues. (*Reporter's Note: these discussions happened throughout the Option descriptions but have been re-grouped for clarity.*)

Option 3B – the preferred schematic design (allowing use of the current building) was a little revised (by turning the gym) to encompass Planning Board goals (see documents on file) including a centralized green “spine” for better pedestrian/biking access. The lot would be re-graded to be fairly flat lowering the building height by 7 ft. Parent and bus drop-off were separated and the primary grade play area was close to the classrooms and protected. Parking impact was reduced by a number of smaller lots. There was adequate room for plant buffers to screen abutters and the service entrances. Although the building setbacks for West William St. and the septic wicks were adequate at 25-35 ft., the Spring St. setbacks varied sometimes narrowing to 9 ft. however this might be modified.

- Primary grades were on the first floor, with elementary and shared spaces on the second floor and middle school on the upper floor.

Option 3C – would require demolishing the gym wing with adjacent classrooms (world languages, etc.), resulting in the need for some temporary provisions. The current grading would be maintained so this building, which was the most compact design and lowest height, would be stepped into the bank of the hill. There were two front entrances, the lower for community and primary grades and an upper level for the higher grades. It did include an out-of-grade corner crawl space and the lower grade play areas were farther from their classrooms but these issues might be mitigated. The community spaces were segregated vertically on the ground floor, with lower grades on the middle floor and middle school on the upper floor.

- There was good separation of bus and parent drop off with easy access. Parking was more adjacent to the neighbors but was tucked down lower and buffered to reduce the visual impact. Setbacks off West Williams and Spring St. were at least 45 ft. improving pedestrian traffic and allowing totally accessible classrooms. The Community use recreational space was centralized on the west end of the property.

Option 3D(1) These two variations were in response to community request for a centrally located new building, requiring the demolition of the current building. Although this was the most familiar location on the site, it would require a larger building due to the narrowing of the lot and would have the greatest height. The Main entrance faced north (not ideal for winter weather exposure) with another facing south to West Williams. The interior had primary grades on the first floor, elementary and shared spaces on the second floor and middle school on the upper floor.

- It had the best setback from the neighbors but consolidated parking (similar to the current lot) along Spring St. posing some aesthetic objections that might be mitigated by screening. In addition a pedestrian zone along the middle of the parking might require monitoring. Bus drop-off had a long walk to the entrance and there was a separate, limited queue for parent drop off.

Option 3D(2) had the same issues except that parking was a little better w/less visual impact (provided there was some remote parking). School and community recreational use was divided. However it would be difficult to screen the service areas and there was limited access to kitchen/cafeteria for deliveries.

- Architect Ian Aitchison asked about a series of provisions as follows.
- Design should consider community shelter issues and hurricane conditions, including the possibility of extensive flooding and storage for emergency supplies (beds, power, etc.). The current generator was fairly new but there were questions of pad and moving cost efficiency. Storm water would be routed to drainage under the parking lots. (The impact of material cost increases (~2%) from rebuilding booms after this season's hurricanes was taken into account probably minimized by project timing/materials).
- State of the art building security both internal and external would include door locks, faculty access cards, wifi, dedicated communications, etc.
- Swimming pools and skating rinks were consistently voted down by the Towns.
- The previous Safe Streets study included a goal to improve pedestrian and biking safety which was a problem throughout the Town; for example the sidewalks around the school were not plowed of snow. Owners Project Manager Richard Marks of Daedalus Projects emphasized that Town and neighborhood concerns were heard and acted on, as well as their willingness to partner with the Town on these issues.

- As a principal route into downtown Spring St. was the more heavily trafficked road.
- Currently there were long queues for parent drop-off creating traffic and pedestrian problems in the mornings.
  - Parking options, proposals, aesthetics, proximity to neighbors, etc. were major issues.
- There was a good chance the Selectmen would vote to endorse a 15 year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) allowing September through June school use of the upper parking lot. The Legion generously allowed staff to park in their lot but this was not an assured option.
- School parking also had to accommodate about 20 staff and constant visitors to the Superintendent's Shared Services Office across the street.
- A proposal for underground parking was cost prohibitive (parking lot \$5,000/car vs. underground \$75,000 /car) due to ventilation, sprinklers, lighting, turning radii, etc.
- Prin. John Custer noted that the very limited lot size should be dedicated as much as possible to educational goals, with parking as a secondary consideration. Mr. Marks suggested the TSBC should weigh what was more important hiding parking or displacing playgrounds.
  - Outdoor classrooms, gardens and gathering spaces also generated a lot of discussion in terms of placement, micro-climates, and use.
- Such spaces were used for large or sometimes messy projects, as Science/Technology /Engineering/ Art/Math (STEAM) maker space, as well as in partnership with Island Grown Schools (IGS) on agriculture curriculum.
- Multiple outdoor spaces were possible: tables facing a teacher, seating in the round like an amphitheater, or roof space including solar readiness for sustainable energy curriculums. A shaded or covered space possibly with adjacent vegetable gardens, outside the cafeteria could be used for outdoor dining, with tables doubling for classroom learning.
- Plazas at entrances were also possible as community gathering spaces or for students, parents and staff before or after school.
  - Architects were meeting with the septic engineers on the wick requirements (paving, metal gratings, etc.) and the equipment building placement. However possible relocation options were dependent on pending April 2018 Town Meeting vote.
  - T2 was working on honoring the current building by using the old façade as part of the garden or as an interior wall display.
  - Mr. Marks was pricing out a 'bubble' for a temporary gym, but recess was likely to be difficult for the duration of the construction period.
- Seasonal resident Mr. Larry Mollin:
  - expressed his dismay at the loss of the current building, saying it looked in reasonable shape to him, and citing Oak Bluffs whose old schools was still in use as a library;
  - strongly recommended a more independent per square foot cost estimate breakdown than the OPM and Architect subcontractors;
  - objected to the increase in his taxes as a non-parent, property owner ineligible for the residential exemption.
  - Mr. Harold Chapdelaine explained his 180° about face on new construction versus renovating the current building (see 7/17/17 Minutes p.3).
  - The old Oak Bluffs School was purchased by the Catholic Church which had been pouring money into it ever since.

- As an experienced restoration contractor he looked closely at the current building and found significant façade issues (pointing, windows, flashing, etc.) making a simple interior remodel impossible and resulting in formidable expenses that would not serve the taxpayer well in the long run.
- As experienced top quality firms working in the educational building field both the T2 and Daedalus had large databases for accurate cost estimates.
- Resident Marie Larsen objected to his change of opinion, arguing that there had not been a real study on renovation costs and that there was still substantial town support for keeping the old building (including residents with children in the school).
  - There were questions on T2, Solien and Daedalus opinions of Options 3D(1 & 2). They responded that 3D presented significant cost penalty because of the difficulties of making the grade disability accessible; the cost of building a temporary school and the extended construction phase caused by the temporary structure location impeding completion. In addition it presented the least flexible educational and building options since the original placement lacked cohesive planning.
- Mr. Solien pointed out a number of excellent features for Option 3B: the open space corridor, the park-like foreground, the possibility for a dedicated primary grade parent parking, as well as garden space near the cafeteria, and direct entry to the school from the bus drop-off.
- Others including Mr. Marks expressed a preference for Option 3C with the more compact design, concentrated play areas, and slightly lower cost (pending the temporary gym price).

## VI. Upcoming Events

(See below: Meetings/Events.)

### A. Public Presentation

- Chair McAndrews referred Mr. Massey and Ms. Larsen to the 6:00PM, Public Forum on September 25th in the School Gym, to gather comment and information and respond to any questions. She welcomed any questions or comments by email before the Forum.
- School visits to the Edgartown and Oak Bluffs School would be scheduled shortly and a field trip to the Hannigan School (mostly complete but without furniture) and the Dearborn construction site was scheduled for September 28th.

## V. Working Groups

Every TSBC member was asked to join at least one Working Group (which would include experts and other community members. Working Groups were expected to meet once or twice in the course of the next few months.

## IV. Owner's Project Manager (OPM) Report

### A. Project Schedule

(See below: Meetings/Events.)

- The schedule was reviewed.
- Working groups were often scheduled at the convenience of outside personnel (experts, utility representatives, consultants, engineers, etc.)
- It was hoped the TSBC would vote the preferred location/option at the September 25, 2017 meeting, to allow as much design time as possible. The meeting would also focus on two environmental programs: Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) versus Collaborative High Performance Schools (CHPS) (see below: Actions).

- Mechanical systems, as well as whether to choose the procurement or lump sum financial process would be discussed in October.
- The OPM preferred a December 15th joint TSBC, Tisbury School Committee (TSC) and Tisbury Board of Selectmen meeting for a final decision to set the budget in time to submit the required ten days before the January 3, 2018 Schematic Design deadline, (for a mid-February Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Board vote).
  - Feasibility phase billing was tracking appropriately to-date, with the OPM at about 51%, Architect about 52%, and other charges at 51% (total \$279,756 billed with \$114,664 in MSBA reimbursement).
  - The website was updated again today.
  - The Architects and OPM had been listening to repeated Town feedback to lower the cost of the project. The most effective way would be to reduce the size of the building by advocating strongly for smaller (850 sq. ft.) classrooms. Prin. Custer agreed that although not ideal this was considerably larger than the current classrooms, as well as in keeping with the smaller class size and allowance of two classes per grade. (Other possibilities included joint use of the computer lab.) Mr. Marks felt a case could be made based on enrollment working with Principal Custer and educational consultant Mr. David Stevens of New Vista (see 12/14/16 Minutes p.2). If successful this would reduce square footage by 5% saving well over \$1,000,000. Unfortunately this was reimbursable space, but it was better not to spend the money than to lose the 41%. Mr. Marks emphasized that this would not be an easy sell to the MSBA (see 7/17/17 Minutes p.5).
- This was a reasonable compromise in addressing strong feelings in Town to support the school even among those that did not agree with all the TSBC decisions. Prin. Custer reminded the public that one of the reasons the Tisbury School was accepted into the MSBA program was that the school lacked essential spaces.
- Other comments emphasized the need to multiply small spaces to accommodate growing mandates for individualized programming and a suggestion that some of the savings be spent on green technology, appearance, etc.

## VII. Invoices

- WORK OUTLINED ON THE FOLLOWING INVOICES HAD BEEN PERFORMED:
- INVOICE 16-14-06 FROM TUROWSKI 2 DATED 7/7/17 FOR \$45,943.01; AND
- VINEYARD GAZETTE ADVERTISING INVOICE FOR 7/17/17 FORUM FOR \$168.

## Adjournment

- ON A MOTION DULY MADE BY MR. CHAPDELAIN AND SECONDED BY MS. DOBLE THE TISBURY SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 7:04PM: 12 AYES, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSTENTIONS.

## Appendix A: Meetings/Events:

- **TSBC – (TBD) 5:00PM, 2nd & 4th Mondays, at the Tisbury School**
- **Exterior Work Group – 3:30PM, Monday, September 18, 2017 at the Tisbury School**
- **Maintenance Work Group – 3:30PM, Monday, September 18, 2017**
- **Materials & Outdoor Work Groups – (TBD) 3:30PM, Monday, September 18, 2017**
- **Public Forum – 6:00PM, Monday, September 18, 2017 at the Tisbury School**

continued >

**Appendix A: Meetings/Events (cont.):**

- **TSBC – 5:00PM, Monday September 25, 2017, at the Tisbury School**
- **TSBC Sustainability Subcommittee, 9:30AM-12:00N, Tuesday September 26, 2017**
- **Joint TSC/BOS – 5:00PM, Tuesday September 26, 2017 at Town Hall**
- **School Tour – 7:00AM Ferry, Thursday, September 28, 2017**
- **Security Work Group – 10:00AM Monday, October 2, 2017**
- **TSC – 8:30AM, Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the Tisbury School**
- **TSBC – 5:00PM, Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at the Tisbury School**
- **TSBC – 5:00PM, Monday October 23, 2017 at the Tisbury School**

**Appendix B: Actions**

- All – *please* read material on two complex subjects needing decisions:
  - LEEDs vs. CHPS environmental programs for 9/25/17 meeting.
  - procurement vs. lump sum finances for October meeting.
- Mr. Marks – send TSBC:
  - cost per sq. ft. budget breakdown,
  - temporary bubble for gym space.
- All – email questions to Chair McAndrews.
- School field trip – wear sensible, closed-toe, strong shoes.

**Appendix C: Documents on File:**

- Updated with Revised Agenda 9/11/17
- Sign In Sheet 9/11/17
- Tisbury SBC Working Group Sign Up Sheet (3 p.)
- McAndrews email re: 9/11/17 TSBC Meeting Information to Review 9/10/17
- Doble memo re: Community Goals Related to the New School Design (2 p.) 9/9/17
- Building Committee Presentation for: Tisbury Elementary School September 11, 2017 (22 p.)
- Tisbury School Project OPM Report September 11, 2017 (2 p.)

Minutes respectfully submitted by Office On Call/Marni Lipke.

*Minutes approved by the TSBC 9/25/17*