

Doherty Memorial High School Project

School Building Committee (SBC) Meeting Minutes

Feasibility Study

Preliminary Design Proposal (PDP) Vote

Meeting Date and Time:

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2019

TIME 6:30PM – 8:00PM

Introductions

Mr. Moosey made introductions welcoming all who came and explained that the reason for the meeting was for the School Building Committee to vote on the Preliminary Design Proposal being presented. He noted this process was a summary of needs for the school. He introduced the project team and handed the presentation over to Ms. Crockett of Lamoureux and Pagano (LPA).

Project team members and School Building Committee representatives in attendance include:

School Building Committee:

All members attended (see sign-in sheet attached)

City of Worcester, Department of Public Works & Parks (DPW&P)

K. Russell Adams, Assistant Commissioner

City of Worcester, School Department (WPS)

Maureen Binienda, Superintendent of Schools

Jim Bedard, Director of Environmental Management and Capital Projects

Sally Maloney, Principal Doherty Memorial High School

Lamoureux Pagano Associates, Architect (LPA)

Katie Crockett, President, LPA

Robert Para, Jr, Project Architect

Rick Lamoureux

Christina Bazelmans

Christopher M. Lee

Matt Brassard, Nitsch Engineering

Tishman Construction Corp. of MA, Owner's Project Manager (TCCMA)

Eugene Caruso

Project Update

Ms. Crockett noted there had been five public meetings including visioning sessions and thanked all those who participated in them. She said this project has been a collective effort working with WPS and Doherty Memorial High School staff to provide the best solution for the new school.

She identified three tasks that include a code upgrade of the existing building, addition/renovation of the existing building and an option for new construction on the existing site that are being presented as part of the required MSBA submission for the PDP. She also noted two additional alternate sites included in the process, Foley Stadium and Chandler Magnet. She noted this is part of Module 3, of a multi-phased MSBA process. There is approximately 1 year of design anticipated with construction to start in the summer of 2021 and occupancy in the fall of 2024.

Ms. Crockett identified that the existing building is actually half the size of what is required and has limited space for school programs including SPED, ETA and many others. The new building is expected to be in the range of 420,000 SF to provide for core facilities, career and tech programs, adequate space for ETA, includes area for three additional Chapter 74 programs and an Advanced Academy for biotech.

Site Evaluations

Mr. Para of LPA noted there are two components being evaluated for the project including the athletic/sports/site requirements and the educational programs. There are 250 existing parking spaces and a new school would need approximately 400 spaces. The existing building is approximately 170,000 SF and the new building is close to 420,000 SF. He noted that none of the three sites are ideal to achieve all program requirements. The process started with identifying 10 acre plus sites in the district and then was narrowed down to a half dozen sites. After further review three sites were shortlisted including the existing Doherty site, Foley Stadium and Chandler Magnet.

EXISTING DOHERTY SITE

This is approximately a 20 acre site with 13 acres developed. The existing building is 170,000 sf and bound by a park on three sides with Highland Street access and is central to the district.

Code Upgrade: Mr. Para noted the existing building systems are beyond their life span and upgrades would be numerous including windows, ADA access, MEP systems, etc. He also said it would require a multi-year process and requires modular classrooms during the work. This option is not intended to be pursued.

Addition/Renovation: This option would require modular classroom units and add another year to the schedule. There is an opportunity to create a shorter route from the existing school to Foley Stadium. This is a comparative analysis and is not intended to be pursued.

New construction on existing site: There is no swing space for students and they will remain in the existing school during construction. The City anticipates constructing a 4 story building on the existing fields and back parking lot. The new design would include underground parking with playing fields above. The new school is scheduled to open in the fall of 2024, continuing demolition of the existing building and construct parking and new fields. During construction the school loses the use of the fields and a lot of parking.

FOLEY STADIUM

This is approximately a 14 acre site and is across the street from Beaver Brook Park within flood plain. The park is heavily scheduled with games. The existing stadium is built on piles. This is a flat site with soil over swampy conditions and coal ash. The new building would require sizable foundations and the stadium would need to be relocated. This site could accommodate 1 playing field and some of the required parking.

CHANDLER MAGNET SITE

This is approximately a 22 acre site bound with residential housing on three sides and adjacent to Worcester State University. The existing building was constructed in the 1950's and has undergone upgrades to the windows and bathrooms. There is another \$7 Million in upgrades identified for the building. The Bilingual and Dual Language programs are located at this school and if this site were selected, the programs and students would remain together, at another location.

Existing Site: Utilizing the existing site would introduce a long stretched building design, including cutting of woodlands for the fields and many challenges due to the steep grade of the site. This option is not recommended to pursue in the PDP.

Existing Site with Additional Land: Obtaining a corner of the WSU lot, owned by LLC at the Presidents house would allow for a 4 story building to be constructed. Additional area of the May Street properties would provide area for a football field and track plus another practice field.

In closing Mr. Para noted that all three sites pose traffic impacts on the neighborhoods. Soils in particular are a concern at Foley. All site options at this point are a comparative study and require further review.

Site Matrix

Ms. Crockett presented the criteria for evaluation of the sites in a matrix format and noted the highest attainable score would be 185. Two sites achieved a ranking in the 130 range and have the most potential to meet the program requirements. Further review will be done to see how to fit the building and program onto undersized sites. She emphasized that the MSBA requires the three options to be submitted (Code upgrades, addition/renovation and New Construction on existing site). The project team has also included two additional alternate sites for further review (Foley Stadium and Chandler with additional land).

Budgets have been prepared using MSBA data with project costs in the range of \$275-\$300 million not including land acquisition costs, if any, and a 1.25% multiplier for

fees/soft costs. The five options are being recommended for further study in the vote for the PDP. Another vote will be required by the SBC for the Preferred Schematic Report in December.

Mr. Moosey thanked LPA for the presentation and opened the floor for questions first from the SBC members.

School Building Committee - Comments/Question (C/Q) & Response (R)

- 1) C/Q – For all three options what information will be provided?
R – Base line information, survey, soils, deeds, building layout and budget estimates are part of the next phase.
- 2) C/Q – What athletic impact on sports if the Foley site is chosen?
R – City would need to replace the stadium and fields.
- 3) C/Q – How would Chandler students be impacted?
R – Students would move with the program.
- 4) C/Q – Cost of Foley vs DMHS site?
R – Cost information was provided
- 5) C/Q – City doesn't own additional land at Chandler site.
R – Further review needed in Preferred Schematic Report (PSR).
- 6) C/Q – Feasibility study not available online this past Sat. and Sun?
R – Not sure why that happened, this PDP presentation will be uploaded to web sites.
- 7) C/Q – What is the City Athletic Directors input on these options?
R – David Shea, City Athletic Director provided the program requirements for the PDP.
- 8) C/Q – What environmental issues are there?
R – Environmental assessment has been done, “no alarms” and hazardous materials have been tested and an estimate to abate materials was prepared.
- 9) C/Q – Site security for students during construction.
R – Project team will address in similar fashion to at Nelson Place School and South High school.
- 10) C/Q – Will there be property line surveys of the sites?
R – Yes this will be done in the next phase of the project.
- 11) C/Q – What is the impact on residents?
R – All sites impact the residents and project team will address.
- 12) C/Q – How often will we be updated on the project?
R – Design team will need a few months for further study. November and December meeting dates will be determined.

Public Comments/Question (C/Q) & Response (R)

- 1) C/Q – Chandler traffic is a problem.
R – Reviewing traffic at all sites.
- 2) C/Q – After attending some visioning sessions, how big is the school?
R – We didn't start with any SF in mind. School is designed for 1,670 students and used the MSBA template. Chapter 74 programs require proper space.
- 3) C/Q – We don't want to move programs from Chandler;
- 4) C/Q – Moving programs from Chandler is a social justice issue.
- 5) C/Q – Purchase of additional land at Chandler is approximately \$800,000
- 6) C/Q – Demographic growth is 0.25% how did the student number get determined?
R – MSBA worked with the City to establish enrollment number.
- 7) C/Q – What impact would there be on the Dual language program at Chandler?
R – WPS is working on a plan and the intent is to keep program intact, to be further studied with the PSR.
- 8) C/Q – Where will Doherty students get moved to during construction?
R – The Mayor indicated that no student would be relocated during construction.
- 9) C/Q – The existing Doherty site is only 12 buildable acres and too small for a new school.
- 10) C/Q – Foley site is across for Beaver Brook Park.
- 11) C/Q – Chandler has diverse staff, dual language program, bilingual program and numerous other qualities. It has an active PTO and is like a family and we don't want this to be separated.
- 12) C/Q – We have concern about the size of the school and transportation and parking.
- 13) C/Q – Concern raised about the added cars and impact on Doherty neighbors.
- 14) C/Q – Voting for which site regarding traffic impact and tight sites?
R – Vote is for several options as shown in the PDP.
- 15) C/Q – Students need cars to get to after school activities as they need to travel. They should have a central campus.
- 16) C/Q – Need to keep Chandler Magnet programs together.

R – The Mayor indicated the programs would remain together.

17) C/Q – The Temple at Chandler Street is being considered by WSU for some type of construction work.

18) C/Q – The PSR vote should be held before the elections.

19) C/Q – There should be a campus like setting.

R – City is committed to the Feasibility Study with the MSBA for funding.

20) C/Q – The Park is on historical land.

R – The Doherty deed shows the school is not part of the park.

21) C/Q – Expand the Worcester Vocational High School to include the Chapter 74 programs.

22) C/Q – Foley site can be built on.

23) C/Q – The deed for Doherty gives acres for school use, need to study impact on park.

24) C/Q – What is the timeline for updates?

R – Timeline is being developed.

25) C/Q – There are a lot of generations that will be displaced at Chandler Magnet.

School Building Committee Roll Call Vote

Mr. Moosey, DPW&P Commissioner conducted a roll call vote of the School Building Committee members to submit the Preliminary Design Proposal (PDP) to the MSBA on September 10, 2019. A roll call vote was made for each School Building Committee member and are documented on the attached SBC sign in sheet.

The results of the vote were Twenty-Three (23) votes in favor, no votes against, no abstentions and all members of the committee were present for the vote.

End of meeting.

These summary comments reflect Tishman Construction Corporation of MA's interpretation of the discussions that took place. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention immediately. This summary shall be included as part of the Project record.

Prepared By: Eugene Caruso, Owner's Project Manager, TCCMA

Date: September 10, 2019