

# CMS FACILITIES PLANNING

---

COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE CONCORD SCHOOL COMMITTEE

JUNE 13, 2017





# AGENDA

---

- Introduction
- Facilities Planning Committee: Members, Charge, & Process
- Why Are We Here
- Finegold Alexander Architects Report
- Timeline
- Wrap-up and Discussion

# INTRODUCTION

---



Thank you to the members of the  
CMS Facilities Planning Committee!

# FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE: MEMBERS



- 
- **Heather Bout** (Chair) - SC, CMS Parent
  - **Matt Andersen-Miller**, (Vice Chair) - Willard Parent, Architecture, Sustainability
  - **Diana Rigby** - Superintendent
  - **John Flaherty** - Finance & Operations
  - **Brian Schlegel** - Facilities Manager
  - **Drew Rosenshine** - CMS Principal
  - **Karin Baker** - CMS Teacher
  - **Tom Dalicandro** - CMS Teacher
  - **Maria McDermott** - CMS Teacher
  - **Wally Johnston** - SC
  - **Chris Whelan** - Town Manager
  - **Lauryn Gorli** - Alcott Parent, Construction Management
  - **Eve Isenberg** - CMS Parent, Architecture, City Planning, Public Funding
  - **Chris Popov** - Thoreau Alumni Parent, Legal
  - **Matthew Root** - Willard Parent, Building Performance



# FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE: CHARGE

---

- **Phase I: Preparations** ✓ 
  - Seat committee; hire firm to conduct facilities study.
  
- **Phase II: Conceptual Master Planning** ✓ 
  - Evaluate existing facility capabilities and needs.
  - Estimate cost to maintain current buildings for 10 years.
  - Compare options and related costs to significantly transform facilities, both through renovation/expansion and new building.
  - Recommend preferred option(s) and present to School Committee by November, 2017.
  
- **Phase III: Develop Plans and Strategies**
  - Develop preferred option(s) into detailed plans, including phasing, cost models, financing options, and potential MSBA involvement.
  - Present to School Committee by November, 2018.



# FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE: PROCESS

---

- Met monthly October, November, February-June.
- Compared Proposals from Architectural Firms; chose Finegold Alexander Architects to study the existing conditions of the two buildings.
- Held public forums with staff and community members to collect feedback on visions and needs of the CMS campus of the future.
- Worked with Finegold Alexander to understand their recommendations and refine proposed plans.
- Presenting Phase II report to School Committee 5 months early!



# WHY ARE WE HERE

---

1. Deteriorated Condition of Peabody and Sanborn Buildings
2. Two Campus Configuration is Inefficient and Expensive
3. Current Situation Creates Struggle for the School Community



# DETERIORATED CONDITION OF PEABODY AND SANBORN BUILDINGS

---

- Both buildings are run down and depressing.
- Ventilation and heating equipment are original to the building and are inefficient.
- The roofs of both buildings must be replaced.
- Both buildings still use their original 1960s electric system.
- The buildings do not have mechanical cooling for the classrooms and common spaces. In the warmer months the classrooms and common areas are the same temperature and humidity as the outdoor air.
- Hazardous materials such as asbestos, mercury and PCBs are in both buildings.
- Neither building has a fire suppression system.
- Security system need replacement.
- Plumbing and kitchen facilities are inadequate.
- Concrete is flaking off the Peabody building revealing reinforcement bars which is a symptom of the final stages of concrete failure.
- Peabody septic system is likely non compliant with Title V.
- *Existing building layout cannot serve modern educational technology or teaching methods and cannot provide for learning experiences of the future.*





# TWO CAMPUS CONFIGURATION IS INEFFICIENT AND EXPENSIVE

---

- **Two buildings require redundant administration, classroom equipment and supplies, and two Assistant Principals.**
- **Sanborn and Peabody are a mile apart requiring 22 teachers and 20 buses to drive back and forth between schools multiple times per day.**
- **Faculty collaboration is severely compromised by the split.**
- **One coping method for scheduling classes and sharing teachers across the separation is to change the time at one school by seven minutes. This is unsustainable.**
- **Student class schedules are negatively impacted by sharing teachers across the two buildings.**
- ***Each year we are spending more than \$500,000 additional funds to operate the two buildings.***



# CURRENT SITUATION CREATES STRUGGLE FOR THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

---

- The Peabody building is in worse condition than the Sanborn building creating anxiety for the students who feel unfairly segregated.
- The Peabody building was built as an open floor plan elementary school with makeshift partitions, no auditorium, no cafeteria, a small gym and without doors on many teaching spaces. It was meant to serve younger students whose needs are different than those of the middle school level, causing further anxiety for students and teachers.
- Teachers find they must prepare two spaces instead of one, sometimes leaving supplies needed in one building in the other and facing the choice of being late for class or unprepared.
- Every six years the need for expansion at Sanborn has been alleviated with a modular unit which looks temporary. Three “mods” have been built so far.
- Students report thinking twice about joining after-school clubs to avoid staying longer in the unpleasant school buildings.
- All after-school clubs and activities are at Sanborn so that Peabody students must be bussed to Sanborn daily compounding feelings of inequality.
- *CMS community members are not proud of their school.*



# QUESTIONS FOR FINEGOLD ALEXANDER

---

1. In order to remain in the current buildings for 10 years, what would it take to ensure an appropriate educational environment?
2. What are options and estimated costs for a significant renovation/ expansion project?
3. What are options and estimated costs for a new building project?

# FINEGOLD ALEXANDER ARCHITECTS PRESENTATION

---



**CONCORD  
MIDDLE SCHOOL  
FACILITY STUDY**

June 13, 2017

Finegold Alexander Architects





# CONCLUSION

---

We need one facility for Concord Middle School which meets national and common core standards and will serve our students in the future as well as today. We want to unify the school in one building that will have lower operating costs and will boost school community morale.



# TIMELINE

---

- October 19, 2016 – CMS Facilities Planning Committee Created
- April 7, 2017 – Statement of Interest (SOI) Submitted to MSBA
- June 13, 2017 – Presentation to Concord School Committee
- TBD – Based on response from MSBA, execute Feasibility Study of preferred building option
- TBD – Request Town Meeting approval to move forward with building plans

# DISCUSSION

---



# Questions and Comments!