

**Westwood School Committee Agenda
Virtual Meeting Via Zoom
Community Forum
Thursday June 4, 2020
7:00pm**

Present:

Anthony Mullin, Chairperson
Josepha Jowdy, Vice Chairperson
Carol Lewis, Clerk
Maya Plotkin, Committee Member
Charles Donahue, Committee Member

Emily Parks, Superintendent

Meeting called to order 7:00pm

Roll-call attendance:

Mr. Mullin: Present
Mrs. Jowdy: Present
Mrs. Lewis: Present
Mr. Donahue: Present
Mrs. Plotkin: Present

Mr. Mullin recognized the live broadcast and online stream available through Westwood Media Center — and also online at www.westwood.k12.ma.us/live to provide real-time, public access to the activities of the School Committee in accordance with the March 12, 2020 Executive Order of Governor Baker.

Discussion Items (7:05-8:15)

Presentation of Evaluation Criteria for Short-List Options and Recommended Option

Mrs. Plotkin, Chair of the School Building Committee and School Committee member, presented. Besides the School Committee members and Ms. Parks, Chin Lin from Compass, the OPM, Don Walter, Glen Gollrad, and Rob Fitzgerald, Dore & Whittier, the architects, were on the panel.

Where is Westwood in the Process?

- 2015/2016 Master Capital Needs Study: Determined Deerfield, Hanlon, and Sheehan schools all in need of modernization.
- 2017 Statement of Interest: Westwood applied to join Massachusetts School Building Authority program in spring, is accepted in December.

- 2018 Community meetings held. Town meeting appropriated funding for Feasibility Study (which began in February 2019 with MSBA vote). School Building Committee formed.
- 2019/2020 Project manager and design team hired. MSBA approved short-list of options. Final option to be voted by School Building Committee in June and submitted to MSBA in July. MSBA to vote on final option this summer.
- 2020/2021 Schematic Design. MSBA vote on MSBA funding. Town Meeting vote on funding for project.
- 2022 Construction begins in late winter/early spring. Anticipated new school opens in fall 2023.

Educating Community about District Needs

2018

- January 2018
 - Letter to all Westwood residents
 - Appearance on Inside Westwood
- March and April 2018
 - Community Forums and school tours
 - Article in Town newsletter: Inside Westwood
 - Town Meeting vote to fund Feasibility Study
- June 2018
 - Letter to Editor in local newspapers
- December 2018
 - Written update to residents as we concluded the Eligibility Phase and moved into Feasibility Study

Community Input and Visioning

2019-2020

September - June: Twenty-one open School Building Committee meetings

October: Community Forums to review process, meet design team, and discuss project priorities.

January: Community Forum on Education Plan and Visioning Session with Educators and Community Members

March: Community Forum to obtain input on short-listed design options

April: Community Forum on redistricting options

June: Community Forum to present recommended final design option

Options being considered

- Option #1 Hanlon Base repair 315 students,
- Option #6 All new Hanlon 315 students,
- Option #7 All new Hanlon/Deerfield 560 students on Hanlon site,
- Option #10 All new Hanlon/Deerfield 560 students on Hanlon site,
- Option #4 All new Hanlon/ Sheehan 685 students on Hanlon site,
- Option #11 All new Hanlon/Sheehan 685 students on Hanlon site,

- Option #15 All new Hanlon/Sheehan 685 students on Sheehan site.

Ms. Parks, Westwood Superintendent, presented.

Evaluation Criteria Matrix

5 categories, 14 criteria

1. Education
2. Site
3. Town Impact
4. Security, Sustainability, and Construction Impact
5. Cost

Score from 1-5 with 5 the best rating

Evaluation Matrix: Education
Four Subcategories

1. Educational Guidelines
 - How well does this option support and align with the desired educational experiences?
 - How well does the building organization support community and collegiality among students and staff?
 - How well does the alternative “retain the small school” feel?

Option #7 and Option #11, both nicknamed “tree” received the highest scores

2. Growth and Future
 - How well does the building organization support the potential for future growth, building expansion and/or the changes in student needs and educational delivery models over the life of the building (70+ years)

Hanlon site options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score

3. Outdoor learning and connection to Nature
 - How well does the building support outdoor learning opportunities and a strong connection to nature?

Hanlon site options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score

4. Impact to Other Schools
 - How does the design enrollment impact the size of the remaining schools?
 - How well does the project address equitable class size?
 - How well does the project address educational delivery across the district?

Option #7, #10 received the highest score

Overall Education Score
Option #7 received the highest score with 175

Evaluation Matrix: Site

Two subcategories

1. Circulation and Parking

- Proximity of parking to main entrance
- Site supports appropriate number of parking spaces
- Safe, clear, and easily understood circulation route
- Separation of bus, car and pedestrians
- Adequate queuing space
- Safe access into and out of site

Hanlon site options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score

2. Access to Fields and Site Fit

- Access to playfields/playground and outdoor learning
- Scale of building to site:
 - Does the building size proportionate to the site it sits on?

Hanlon site options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score

Overall Site Score

Options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score with 25

Evaluation Matrix: Town Impact

Three Subcategories

1. Redistricting

- To what degree does the project retain neighborhood communities?
- What are the redistricting impacts on busing, considering traveltime and number of students impacted?
- How well does the project meet building utilization goals?

Options #7, #10 received the highest score

2. Traffic

- What is the impact on the neighborhood and town?
- Walkability?
- What is the impact on overall net increase in cars vs. walkers?

Option #6 received a score of 5, Options #7 and #10 received a score of 4

Ms. Plotkin presented.

3. Community use

- To what extent does the alternative provide benefits to the community such as sports fields, community space, and gym space?

Options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score

Overall Town Impact Score

Options #7, #10 received highest score with 95 points

Evaluation Matrix: Security, Sustainability and Construction Impact

1. Security

- How well does the building support a clear separation of public and private zones?
- How well does it support a controlled and limited public area for after-hours use?
- How well does the front door and administration support a direct sightline to parking and the site entry?

Options #6,#7,#10,#11,#15 received the highest score

2. Sustainability

- How well does the building and site support the sustainability goals?
- How well does the building organization and position on site support academic classrooms with a north/south solar orientation?

All new buildings, Options #6, #7, #10, #11, #15 received the highest score

3. Logistic and Construction Impact

- What is the impact to the students, parents, and faculty during construction?
- How difficult is the phasing/site logistics?
- What is the impact to neighbors and neighborhood during construction?

No 5's were given in this category

Options #6, #7, #10, #11 received a score of 4

Overall Security, Sustainability and Construction Impact Score

Options #6, #7, #10, #11 received the highest score with 70 points

Evaluation Matrix: Cost

Three Subcategories

1. Overall cost

- What option has the least cost impact to the town?

Option #1 received the highest score of 5. The least expensive project would receive the 5.

Ms. Plotkin explained that the costs listed on the slide were for relative purposes only for comparison. These are not the final cost numbers. Only 15% of the project's design has been completed so far; that leaves another 85% that needs to be completed. A true, actual number, along with the MSBA reimbursement, will be accurate when presented at Town Meeting.

2. Net cost to Town for all Three Schools

- Overall net capital cost to the town to address all three schools: Deerfield, Hanlon, and Sheehan (considering cost to benefit)
- Overall fiscal benefit of Massachusetts School Building Authority partnership

Options #4, #11, #15 received a score of 4.5. Options #7 & #10 received a score of 3.5.

Ms. Plotkin explained a ½-point was deducted off each score because the town would need to pay for the third school not included in the MSBA project.

3. Busing and Operational Costs

- Overall transportation and operating cost impact to the district, both for the project and remaining schools

Options #7, & #10 received the highest score

Overall Cost Score

Options #4 & #11 received the highest score with 98 points

Ms. Parks presented

Evaluation Criteria: Final Matrix

Option #7 received the highest score with 458 points.

Option #10 received 443 points, Option #11 received 403 points, Option #6 received 370 points, Option #4 received 323 points, Option #15 received 315 points, and Option #1 received 183 points.

Recommended Option

Option #7

- New construction
- Hanlon/Deerfield consolidation (560 students)
- Located at Hanlon site
- Informal design name: "Tree"

If the recommendation is approved by the School Building Committee on June 19, 2020:

What happens to Sheehan?

- February 2020: The School Committee allocated funds (\$30K) to commission a design study of the remaining school.
- June 2020: The study will commence as soon as the School Building Committee approves a final project option
- Spring 2021: Using the results of the design study, the School Committee will recommend either an addition/renovation to Sheehan or construction of a new building

- The timeline for moving forward will be further developed as the economic environment becomes clear and we better understand community response to the design study

What Happens to Deerfield?

- If the School Committee recommends new construction for the Sheehan, than the District will likely return control of Deerfield back to the town.
- If the School Committee recommends an addition/renovation to Sheehan, then the District will likely retain Deerfield to serve as temporary classrooms/swing space while Sheehan is being renovated. When the swing space is no longer needed, control of Deerfield will revert to the Town.
- The Select Board will be asked to create a committee to examine the potential town uses for the vacated school, if/when control reverts to the Town.

Next steps

June 11: School Committee: Enrollment/Redistricting Vote
June 12: School Building Committee: Sustainability Decisions
June 19: School Building Committee: Preferred Option and PSR Vote
July 2020: School Building Committee submits the PSR to the MSBA
Summer 2020: MSBA vote to approve PSR
Summer 2020: School Building Project enters Schematic Design Phase

Q & A

Residents James Kane and Jennifer Flanders asked a similar question. Considering the COVID crisis, is there a possibility the town may vote yes on the project but the state reimbursement ends up being less than anticipated leaving the town with a higher dollar amount it is responsible for?

MSBA is funded by a percentage of the State sales tax. The MSBA allocates funds for accepted projects as they have the funds. Years '20, '21 approved money is already received and allocated, so don't anticipate any significant change to the percentage Westwood would receive. At the 2021 Town Meeting, we will have the correct number the MSBA is committed to reimburse.

Resident Bill McLaughlin asked if the Select Board is willing to put the third school as a priority before any other municipal building projects. He feels that the children of Westwood should be a priority.

The School Committee is unable to speak for the Select Board, but hopes the town will vote to fund the third building.

Tony Mullin wanted to ask question he has seen on social media. How final are these designs that go along with the site? The designs are 15% complete. When the schematic design phase begins, really get the final details. Location of things on site really won't change, the other details will be looked at again.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Ms. Plotkin. Seconded by Ms. Jowdy.

Official Vote:

Mr. Donahue: Aye
Ms. Jowdy: Aye
Ms. Lewis: Aye
Ms. Plotkin: Aye
Mr. Mullin: Aye

Vote: 5-0

Result: Approved

Meeting Adjourned at 8:15pm

List of Documents and Exhibits Used at Meeting:

- Community Forum: Building Project Evaluation and Final Recommendation slideshow, dated June 4, 2020