# AGENDA FOR THE <br> BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE DATE OF MEETING: TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2018 <br> TIME OF MEETING: 7:00PM <br> LOCATION: CHENERY MIDDLE SCHOOL, LARGE COMMUNITY ROOM 95 WASHINGTON STREET, BELMONT, MA 02478 

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of previous meetings
3. Comments from Belmont residents
4. Update on Project costs (Tom Gatzunis)
5. Funding the Project (Floyd Carman)
6. Costs for K-8 schools (John Phelan)
7. Preliminary Site Design Updates (Brooke Trivas)
8. Future Building Committee meetings (Bill Lovallo)
9. New business
10. End meeting

# Agenda Item \#1 

## Call To Order

## Agenda Item \#2

## Minutes of previous meetings

# BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING \#33 

January 9, 2018

## BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL

7:00 PM
BHS Building Committee Members Attending:

Chair Lovallo; Members: Adam Dash, Tom Caputo, Bob McLaughlin, John Phelan, Chris Messer, Dan Richards, Pat Brusch, Emma Thurston, Diane Miller, and Jamie Shea BHSBC Members Absent: Phyllis Marshall, Joe DeStefano, Joel Mooney

Board of Selectmen Attending: Chair Jim Williams and Adam Dash Board of Selectmen Absent: Mark Paolillo

School Committee Attending: Chair Lisa Fiore, Susan Burgess-Cox, Catherine Bowen, Thomas Caputo, Andrea Prestwich, and Murat Bicer

The meeting was a joint meeting with the School Committee and Board of Selectmen in which the Belmont High School Building Committee was presented an overview of the District Grade Configuration work that the School Department has been undertaking.

## 1. Call to Order

The Belmont High School Building Committee meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chair Lovallo. A count of attendees totaled 73 in addition to the Building Committee, School Committee, and Board of Selectmen.

## 2. Presentation of Grade Configuration Options by School Department

Superintendent John Phelan presented the School Department work on district configuration studies. Mr. Phelan explained how the High School configuration affects the entire K-12 district and the School Department has been examining what those possible impacts will be.

Mr. Phelan explained the possible District grade configurations that fall into 5 categories:

1. Option 1: K-4, 5-8, 9-12 (existing conditions)
2. Option 2: K-4, 5-7, 8-12 (8, 9-12)
3. Option 3: K-4, 5-7, 8-12 (8-9, 10-12)
4. Option 4: K-3, 4-6, 7-12 (7-8, 9-12)
5. Option 5: K-3, 4-6, 7-12 (7-9, 10-12)

Mr. Phelan briefly reviewed the work that was done with visioning, surveys, meetings, etc. Much of this work was previously presented at the December 9th meeting. Mr. Phelan then sited some of the research that the School Department has read regarding grade configurations and number of moves from K-12. Several articles spoke to the impact to students socially and academically. Mr. Phelan noted that there was no consistency in the actual grade groupings. Rather, the articles generally stated that as much as a school move has an impact on students, the greater impact is the environment that is created for those students. This can have more of an impact on the students than the move itself.

Mr. Phelan noted that the School Department has reviewed the grade configuration options through the lens of educational appropriateness, space needs (both short term and long term), financial costs to Town (both short term and long term), and timeline to meet the District's challenges. Mr. Phelan noted that at this time, the preferred configuration has consistently been 7-12, although no decisions have been made and the School Department continues to discuss all three options.

Mr. Phelan then answered questions from the School Committee and the public regarding this presentation.

## 3. Presentation of Lower School Space Options by School Department

Mr. Phelan explained that the School Department retained the Design firm of SMMA to perform studies on the remaining District schools (the 4 elementary schools and the middle school) to provide recommendations for properly accommodating the students that do not get located at the new High School. He noted that they have examined the schools, met with principals and staff, and explored options in the district for building adjustments to meet the growing student enrollment.

The assumptions used included:

- 360 students in each grade level
- no modular classrooms
- all schools accommodating art, music, physical education, special education, EL's and LABBB

Each elementary school will contain a maker/innovation space to support the planned learning path at the upper levels. Chenery and Wellington will retain their Community rooms.

Classroom population is to be based on the room sizes and uses MSBA guidelines which limits classroom sizes to 23 students (with appropriate space) except for K which is limited to 18. These numbers are in line with the Belmont class size guidelines.

Considering those factors when one examines the entire district, the schools become "rightsized" which Mr. Phelan explains is the adjustment necessary to meet the target criteria. Existing schools will then see a reduction in student capacity from today's number requiring more classrooms to be added to the District. The net total number of students in K-8 requiring new space accommodating is 704 -- with 318 students requiring new space at the Chenery School and 386 at the four elementary schools.

Mr. Phelan then explained that SMMA examined all 5 Options for the HS project (explained previously) and offered solutions for space needs in the remaining 5 buildings. A 6th option was added, which was a new elementary school, however Mr. Phelan noted that there is currently no space available in Belmont to construct a new elementary school. He explained that the 6th option would allow K-5 in the elementary schools, 6-8 in the middle school, and 9-12 in the high school.

Mr. Phelan then summarized each solution by option. Some areas require light renovation, which can include minor changes such as modifying interior classroom setups. Some areas require comprehensive renovations, which involve moving walls and MEP systems, possible additions to cafeteria and gym, and upgrades for ADA. A summary of the solutions followed:

Option 1:

- renovations in Burbank along with an addition

Option 1:

- renovations in Burbank along with an addition
- renovations in Butler along with an addition
- no work in Wellington, renovation in Winn Brook
- renovations in Chenery along with addition
- total project cost is $\$ 54-\$ 66 \mathrm{M}$

Option 2/3 (A):

- renovations in Burbank along with an addition
- renovations in Butler along with an addition
- no work in Wellington
- renovation in Winn Brook
- no work in Chenery
- total project cost is $\$ 39.5-\$ 47.5 \mathrm{M}$

Option 2/3 (B):

- renovations in Burbank

Option 2/3 (B):

- renovations in Burbank
- renovations in Butler
- no work in Wellington
- renovation in Winn Brook along with addition
- no work in Chenery
- total project cost is $\$ 41-\$ 48.5 \mathrm{M}$

Option 4/5:

- renovations in Burbank
- renovations in Butler
- no work in Wellington
- renovation in Winn Brook
- renovations in Chenery
- total project cost is $\$ 18-\$ 25.5 \mathrm{M}$

Option 6:

Option 6:

- renovations in Burbank
- renovations in Butler
- no work in Wellington
- renovation in Winn Brook
- renovations in Chenery
- construction of a new school
- total project cost is $\$ 72-\$ 82.5 \mathrm{M}$

Mr. Phelan noted that there is currently no vehicle for moving any of these projects forward. There is no committee formed, no funding in place for design, and there are other projects currently in the Belmont pipeline. Therefore, the reality is that these solutions outlined above will not come to fruition until well after the HS is complete. He also noted that for Option 4/5, the solution to accommodate the anticipated students in the current buildings, with no requirement for capital projects, seems possible given that the schools will all see a reduction in population and the needed adjustments can be reduced and/or phased in the future.

Mr. Phelan then answered questions from the School Committee and the public regarding this presentation.

## 4. Discussion of School Impact

Mr. Phelan asked principals of four of the District's six schools to comment on the challenges they see currently in their school, the opportunities that the "right sizing" of their school will bring, and their opinion of the configuration options being proposed. The following principals provided comments:

Dr. Tricia Clifford, Burbank Principal
Janet Carey, Winn Brook Principal
Dan Richards, Belmont High School Principal
Michael McAllister, Chenery Middle School Principal

Mr. Phelan then answered questions from the School Committee and the public regarding this presentation.
5. Related Meeting Documents

1. Presentation Slides on District Configuration prepared by School Department
2. Presentation Slides on Grade Configuration Study prepared by SMMA
3. End Meeting

The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m. by Mr. McLaughlin

## Agenda Item \#3

## Comments from Belmont residents

## Agenda Item \#4

## Update on Project costs (Tom Gatzunis)

BELMONT HS - CONCEPT COST SUMMARY - PDP
DAEDALUS PROJECTS INC.


October 2017
Board Meeting


|  |  | Date Board Approved | Oet-12 | Oct-13 | Jul-13 | Jam-14 | UL14 | Jul-14 | Jun-15 | Jan-16 | Jan-16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District |  |  | Grater Lowell | Winchester | Berkshire Hills | North Middlasox** | Holbrook | Plymouth | Pitusfiold | Billerica | Minuteman Regional |
| School Name |  |  | Graater Lowell RTHS | Winchester High School | Monument Mountain Regional HS | Regional High School | Holbrook Jf./Sr. High School | Plymouth South High School | Taconic High School | Billerica Memorial Hs | Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical HS |
| Construction Type |  |  | Repair | AddReno | AddReno | New | New | New | New | New | New |
| $\underset{\text { Constretion Type }}{\text { Enrollment }}$ |  |  | 1,990 | 1,370 | 570 | 870 | 1,095 | 1,005 | 920 | 1.610 | 628 |
| Assumed Start of Construction |  |  | 505,766 | 309,42 | 137.380 | 180.530 | 217,353 | 248,081 | 246.520 | 325.191 | 257,745 |
|  |  |  | Mar-14 | Jun-14 | Nov-14 | May-15 | Nov-15 | Jun-15 | Jan-16 | Feb-17 | Aug-17 |
| OPM |  |  | Joslin, Lesser \& Associates, Inc. | Skanska USA Bullding, inc. | Strategic Building Solutions, LLC | Heery intemational, inc. | SMMA | Ted Gentry Associates | Skanska | kV Associates, ine. | Skanska |
| Designer |  |  | KBA Architects | Symmes Maini \& McKec Associates | Smma | Symmes Maini \& McKee Associates | Flansburg Assoclates | A3 Architects LLC | Drummy Rosanne Anderson, <br> Inc. | Perkins+Will | Kaestle Boos Associate, Inc. |
| Cost Estimator |  |  | Atlantic Construction \& Management | AM Fogarty, Inc. | PM8C | AM. Fogarty, Inc. | Pmac | usc | Gilbane | Pmsc | PMsac |
|  |  |  | Tomal Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | S583645 | S2,250,980 | 51,065,264 | 53,560.892 | S2.531,769 | S3,993,470 | 32,491,962 | ${ }^{53,519,889}$ | S6,018,571 |
| 8  <br> 8 810 <br> 820  | Shell | S | 510.186 .500 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {S14,024,734 }}^{5525574}$ | ${ }_{\text {S16,057.582 }}^{56504027}$ | S19,43, 5 ,62 | \$18,77,964 | S29,602,383 | S20.3917866 |
|  |  | Suparaincire | $\frac{5403420}{}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\frac{38,465.685}{5771537}}$ |  |  |
|  | 32010 | Exteriof Walls | 51882,165 | 58,665,814 | 5278,948 | 53,966,375 | 55,023,603 | 55,862,988 | 36,373,942 | 58,625,095 | 38,246,516 |
|  | ${ }^{182020}$ | Extenor Windows | $\frac{52239285}{5272600}$ |  | $\frac{51,30,517}{5157096}$ | $\frac{51728357}{5187402}$ | $\frac{52025355}{598200}$ |  | $\frac{111838939}{5157760}$ | ${ }_{5553,3,374}^{513,820}$ |  |
| ${ }^{6}{ }^{830}$ |  | Roofng | 55089030 | 52,911,208 | 54,166,946 | 53,087,326 | \$2406,387 | \$2,008,759 | 32,596,642 | 52,590,192 | 53,470,455 |
|  | Interiors |  | S4,530,440 | \$13,429,638 | S5,003,669 | 58,987,130 | \$10,410,725 | \$12,961,512 | \$12,416,341 | \$16,793,857 | \$13,748,466 |
| - | Services |  | S19,286,748 | \$25,929,654 | \$11,339,242 | \$14, 568,297 | S19,130,764 | \$22,000,045 | \$23,297,917 | \$29.610,287 | \$25.631,184 |
| $\frac{010}{020}$ |  | Corverina | $\frac{815000}{51.500595}$ | $\frac{5240000}{53869317}$ | $\frac{551.880}{5140081}$ | $\frac{578,843}{51023161}$ | S182,300 | \$213,159 | 3295,000 | S327,000 | S335.350 |
| ${ }^{020}$ |  | Plumbic | Stife0.685 |  | $\frac{51,490,841}{55076014}$ | $\frac{51,923,161}{56819124}$ | $\frac{53,017,750}{58365990}$ | 53,097719 |  | $\frac{34.310,200}{511.577500}$ | S3,556.828 |
| 040 |  | Fire Procection | \$2286604 | 51,453,858 | S601,005 | 5788,616 | S814,450 | 51,06, 8000 | 51, 3056,931 | S1,622,980 | ${ }_{51,238,678}$ |
| 050 | Furishins \& E Fixededeximement |  | ${ }_{56535367}$ | 572989307 | S4,118,992 | 54978.543, | ${ }_{56750,674}^{50 / 2}$ | \$9,62565 | 39,610,989 |  | ${ }^{59.1655036}$ |
| E |  |  | \$2026,320 | 33,206,606 | 31,966,965 | 53,081,919 | S2480,265 | 32,217,620 | 33,029,004 | 35,872,590 | 35,883,466 |
|  | Buiding Value Ergineering |  | 853 | , 882930 | 26,25,077 | 544.23 .062 | 350.611105 | 860,612309 | 13189 | 98,966 | 473 |
| F | Evilding Subtotal |  | \$2.963,299 | \$6,223,227 | \$1,547,513 | 53,326,174 | \$1,583,140 | \$1,949,100 | 33,257,289 | \$7,046,280 | \$3,209,008 |
| 6 | Spater Cinstuction (iomo |  | \$1,198.568 | 87,033,731 | S2,448,700 | S6.840,392 | S8.212.630 | 58,320,689 | 38,293,359 | \$13,223,137 | 58,784,416 |
| $\bigcirc 10$ | - Ste Presaration |  | \$135812 | \$2,5487718 | \$375400 | S1730.917 | \$1,282844 | \$19137709 | 32,923933 | \$2,322.677 | S2457415 |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{5603340} 5$ | $\frac{53.368 .554}{5764445}$ | $\frac{51.085 .800}{5512300}$ | $\frac{52.702,201}{51891170}$ |  | ${ }^{54,559,260}$ | S3,258,432 | $\frac{57.501,210}{5172900}$ | $\frac{53,62404}{5132397}$ |
| 630 <br> -400 <br> -4 | - Mechaicalulitas |  | S46,000 | \$351,614 | S475,200 | 5326,094 | 5628.880 | \$272,000 | S641,658 | 51,670,150 | 51,381,000 |
|  | Onmer Stio Comstraction |  |  |  |  | \$437989 |  |  | S50000 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | 僺 |  | S40,75,700 | 576,19,888 | 530,621,290 | 554,23,416 | S60,406,875 | 570,82, ${ }^{\text {cos }}$ | $571.613,814$ | S105,667,383 | $\frac{583,666,897}{5.6,4025}$ |
| 2 | ( | Insurance | \$1,419,606 | ${ }_{\text {\% }} 51,640.376$ | 36.007400 | ${ }^{3125883,75}$ | S1,155,222 |  | $\frac{51,171,170}{}$ | \$12435,144 | $\frac{561.572 .592}{51}$ |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ |  | Subbeantactor Bond | S300000 |  | S682, 000 | S564.510 |  | S687,939 | 57115,787 |  | S1,139,006 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {Design } 8 \text { Prichang Contimency }}$ | ¢ | $\frac{58,575.064}{5351000}$ | S3,441,000 | $\frac{56,105.889}{84,140000}$ | ¢5,783.066 | ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{53,544,105}$ | S8,35,257 | \$10.566,738 | $\xrightarrow{58,366.689}$ |
| z |  | Overthead 8 Promil $/$ GMP Fee | \$1,333,139 | 54,480,376 | S695,600 | S1,197,233 | \$2.832526 | \$1,772.052 | 31,, 81, 229 | 53,064,354 | 53,485,700 |
| 2 |  | CMP Contenarcy |  | S2829871 |  |  | 521696 |  | 317878069 | 52700186 | 53.271189 |
|  | Construction | Subletal | 350,648,220 | \$977,155,475 | S39,228,690 | S66.814,783 | 576,186,539 | 801,089,16 | \$91,377,882 | 5134,43, ${ }^{\text {, }}$, | \$110.507,223 |
| 2 | Escalation to | Cossturioion Midi.Paint | \$2,517,411 | 33,780,135 | S2,341,300 | 82,014,943 |  | \$2,675,943 | 36,379,491 | S6, 360,043 | S8.693.669 |
|  | Total Construction Cost Cost per Square Foot |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 510,935,610 \\ & \substack{5327} \\ & \hline 530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 541.569 .930 \\ & 5303 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{568,823,726 \\ 5331}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 579,835,240 \\ & 6356] \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \substack{597,757.373 \\ 53997} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5140,73,848 \\ & 5433 \\ & \hline 53 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 519,200,892 \\ & 5462 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 3183,012 |  |  | \$404,800 | 34,398,483 | \$495,000 |  | S6.516,200 |
|  |  |  |  | \$500,000 |  |  | \$600,000 |  | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | S420,000 |
|  |  |  | S2.668.282 |  | ${ }_{5}^{53,139,000}$ | ${ }_{5}^{53,468.9966}$ | \$4.012.002 | 54,188.253 | S3,484,613 | S7,160,111 | S5.000.000 |
| Desinner |  |  |  | ${ }_{5}^{53,642,500}$ | \$42.520,650 | S4,096, 860 | \%33,125,756 | 53,030,333 | \$3,537,370 | \$55.004,848 | S4,17, |
| OPM\& other Profossional servicas |  |  | \$1.00, .000 | \$4,932,000 | \$1,468,000 | \$3,132000 | 53.942000 | \$3,741,000 | 34,098,050 | S5.071,500 | \$1,507.200 |
| Legal Fees |  |  |  | 3100.000 | S11.000 | $\frac{521,000}{501500}$ | \$120.000 | S150.000 | S30,000 | S100.000 |  |
|  |  |  | $\frac{5275000}{560000}$ | $\frac{53,220.000}{5605.593}$ | $\frac{\text { SS06,000 }}{51,50.000}$ | $\frac{5961.1008}{5691797}$ | \$990,000 | $\frac{5270,000}{5550,83}$ | $\frac{5250,000}{51,161.539}$ | $\frac{51,2,50,000}{51,314,42}$ | $\frac{52035,396}{51,192.009}$ |
| Total Project Budget ${ }^{\text {W }}$ |  |  | 865,310,211 | \$129,923,146 | S65,667,640 | 889,084,977 | \$102,967,198 | \$107,800,000 | \$121,294,929 | 5175,997,289 | \$151,43,.630 |
|  |  |  |  | 3183,012 |  |  | S404,800 | S4,38,483 | S495,000 |  | S6,516,200 |
|  |  |  |  | [07493 | S3,831,650 | S27706989 | 53,213660 | $\frac{53,656.602}{512019}$ |  |  | S3807.991 |
| Basis for Total Facilities Grant Reimbursement Rate Maximum Facilities Grant |  |  |  | [26.07.343 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $76.84 \%$ $\$ 550,088,316$ | 42.92\% \$44,493,27 | $\begin{gathered} 551,835,990 \\ 48.52 \% \\ \$ 25,150,823 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 66,430,980$$\$ 40,210,027$ | 69.12\% $\$ 55,751,400$ | $\begin{array}{r} 53,36 \% \\ \mathbf{S 4 6}, 867,514 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80.00 \% \\ 574.202,433 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 129,422,515 \\ 5.59 \% \\ 573,977,991 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 101,019,130 \\ 44.7 \% \\ \$ 45,206,061 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

-. Tothal Propect E Bugget Value includes the cost of AAternates.
 Board Meeting



## Agenda Item \#5

## Funding the Project (Floyd Carman)

BELMONT HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT

|  | TOTAL COST CATEGORIES (RANGE) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | High |
| Project Cost $100 \%$ | $\$ 248.4 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 313.2 \mathrm{M}$ |
| MSBA Reimbursement | 64.6 M | 81.4 M |
| Belmont Cost $\mathbf{7 4 \%}$ | $\$ 183.8 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 231.8 \mathrm{M}$ |
|  |  |  |


| TOTAL FINANCING COST (RANGE) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $4 \%$ Interest, 30 Year Amortization, Level Payment |  |  |  |
|  | Low |  |  | High |
| Principal | $\$ 183.8 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 231.8 \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |
| Interest $4 \%$ | 135.1 M | 170.3 M |  |  |
| TOTAL | $\$ 318.9 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 402.1 \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  | YOUR REAL ESTATE PROPERTY TAX EFFECT |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Per 100 k Assessed Value | Low | High |
|  | $\$ 146.00$ | $\$ 184.00$ |
| Cost Per $\$ 1.0 \mathrm{M}$ Average Assessed Value | $\$ 1,460.00$ | $\$ 1,840.00$ |

## Agenda Item \#6

## Costs for K-8 schools (John Phelan)

## Summary of Potential K-8 Costs for Right- Sizing Schools

| Option 1 - New High School 9-12; Middle and Elementary schools need additions |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Elementary \& Middle School Total | $\$ 54-\$ 66 \mathrm{M}$ |


| Option 2 \& 3-New High School 8-12, Chenery becomes grades 5-7, Elementary K-4's need additions |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| A) Elementary \& Middle School Total | $\$ 39.5-\$ 47.5 \mathrm{M}$ |
|  |  |
| B) Elementary \& Middle School Total | $\$ 41-\$ 48.5 \mathrm{M}$ |

Option 4 \& 5 - New High School 7-12, Chenery becomes grades 4-6, Elementary K-3's are right sized
Elementary \& Middle School Total
\$18-\$25.5M

| Option 6 - New High School 9-12; Chenery becomes grades 6-8; Construct a new Elementary School |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Elementary \& Middle School Total | $\$ 68.5-\$ 75.5 \mathrm{M}$Includes revised amount for <br> Chenery from $1 / 9 / 18$ <br> presentation from $\$ 3.5-\$ 7 \mathrm{M}$ to <br> $\$ 0$. |

## Agenda Item \#7

## Preliminary Site Design Updates

 (Brooke Trivas)
## Agenda Item \#8

## Future Building Committee meetings (Bill Lovallo)

# Agenda Item \#9 

New business

## PERKINS + WILL

Belmont High School / Evaluation Matrix

OPTIONS
2.1 Major Renovation, Minor Addition
2.3 Major Addition, West Addition
2.4 Major Addition, South Addition
3.1 New Construction, West of BHSPositive impact ( 3 points)Neutral (2 points)Negative impact (1 point)

## Compliance Factors

1. Ed Program Compliance - how effective/efficient can this design be at meeting the Ed Program
2. Traffic/ Site Circulation - how well can the design accommodate good traffic and circulation solutions on site
3. Parking - does the design provide a good solution for distributed parking with successful adjacencies to building and fields
4. Neighborhood Impact/ Shadows - how does the physical massing affect the neighborhood
5. Design Flexibility - how accommodating is the design in providing flexibility for changes in use over time
6. Site Access - how accommodating can the site design be when addressing neighborhood traffic issues
7. Phasing Complexity - how challenging will phasing be for construction
8. Fields Accommodation - how well does the site design accommodate the needs of the outside athletic programs
9. Duration Schedule - how much impact does phasing have on the construction schedule for this design
10. Impact to Students Phasing - How does the design solution reduce the impact on student/staff due to construction phasing
11. Sustainability - how accommodating will the design be to achieving high energy efficiency and low operating costs relative to baseline occupancy requirements
12. Civic Benefits - how beneficial to civic uses is this design
13. Permit/ Zoning - how will the process of permitting and zoning approvals be affected by the site/ building design
14. Rail Impact - how will the train noise be perceived inside the building

# Agenda Item \#10 

## End meeting

