



May 2, 2024

Jennifer Flynn
Senior Project Coordinator
Massachusetts School Building Authority
40 Broad St | Suite 500 | Boston, MA

Re: Town of Dedham
Oakdale Elementary School Project
Preferred Schematic Report Submission

Dear Jennifer:

Please accept the enclosed documents as constituting the Preferred Schematic Report for the above referenced project. This submission was prepared by Jonathan Levi Architects, Inc. in conjunction with Vertex.

The District has reviewed and approved the Report for submission to the MSBA in accordance with Article 8.1.1 of the OPM contract. This approval is reflected in the Local Actions and Approvals letter included in this report.

We have reviewed these documents for conformance and completeness with the MSBA requirements for a Preferred Schematic Report. In general, our review has found these documents to be in conformance with MSBA requirements.

Please note that this review does not address the technical quality or sufficiency of the design and, in accordance with Article 2.6 of the OPM contract, should not be construed as an assumption of the Designer's responsibilities or duties.

Very truly yours,

Jon Lemieux
Project Director
Vertex

Cc: John Tocci, Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee, Chair
Ms. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools
Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects, Inc.

OAKDALE

Preferred Schematic Report - REVISED

Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, Massachusetts



REVISED - May 2, 2024



266 beacon street
boston ma 02116
tel 617 437 9458
fax 617 437 1965
www.leviarc.com

OAKDALE

REVISED Preferred Schematic Report

Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, Massachusetts

Owner

Dedham, Massachusetts

Client

Dedham, Massachusetts

Architect

Jonathan Levi Architects LLC

OPM

Vertex

May 2, 2024 REVISED

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview of Process	25
1.2 Summary of Project Schedule	36
1.3 Summary of Existing Conditions	37
1.4 Summary of Alternatives	38
1.5 Summary of Preferred Solution	40
1.6 MSBA PSR Review and District Response	41

2 Existing Conditions

2.1 Historic	85
2.2 Survey/Geotech/Geo-environmental	91
2.3 Hazardous Materials	239

3 Evaluation of Alternatives

3.1 Site	297
3.2 Potential Impact	302
3.3 Conceptual Drawings	305
3.4 Structural Systems	321
3.5 Utilities	327
3.6 Building Systems	329
3.7 Total Project Budget and Cost Estimate	361
3.8 Permitting Requirements	381
3.9 Schedule	382
3.10 Preliminary Design Pricing	383

4 Preferred Solution

4.1 Educational Program	385
4.2 Space Summary	503
4.3 Space Summary Variations	517
4.4 Sustainability Documents	521
4.5 Preferred Solution – Site	527
4.6 Preferred Solution – Building Plans	529
4.7 Local Funding	533
4.8 Budget Statement	533
4.9 Project Schedule	537

5 Local Actions and Approvals

5.1 Local Actions and Approval Certification	543
5.2 SBC Meeting Minutes	555

6 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee

6.1 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Presentation	783
---	-----

PREFERRED SCHEMATIC REPORT

1 Introduction

Overview and Background

The 2020 Dedham Public Schools Facility Master Plan is a methodical process of planning and upgrading schools in the Dedham community. Throughout the 1980's the Dedham Public Schools closed four of its eight elementary schools and consolidated its declining enrollment at the remaining four schools. As the millennium came to a close, Dedham's aging school infrastructure was in clear need of an overhaul.

- December 2000 - the Town of Dedham established a School Building Rehabilitation Committee to study and recommend improvements to the aging structures that houses the town's students.
- 2003 - the district completed its first comprehensive 25 year School Facilities Master Plan, and the planning required to complete that initial document has continued to guide our thinking.
- 2006 - A new Dedham Middle School for Grades 6-8 opened.
- 2008 - An updated Facilities Master Plan completed.
- 2012 - A new Avery Elementary School opened.
- 2013 - An updated Facilities Master Plan completed.
- 2019 - A new Early Childhood Education Center opened.
- February 2020 - The current Facilities Master Plan update completed.

The 2020 Facilities Master Plan update provides a comprehensive review of the districts remaining outdated school buildings still in use (Oakdale, Greenlodge, and Riverdale Elementary Schools and Dedham High School). The report recommends immediate replacement of the 1902 Oakdale Elementary School. This building has been in constant use as an elementary school for more than 115 years and despite significant maintenance investment it is no longer adequate educational space to meet the needs of students in the 21st century.

Subsequently, the MSBA was engaged to conduct an analysis and prepare an enrollment projection that was completed in January 2022. As a result, (3) enrollment types were recommended to be investigated in the Feasibility Study for the new Oakdale Elementary School.

- Oakdale School – 235 students
- Oakdale + Riverdale Schools – 450 students
- Oakdale + Greenlodge Schools – 550 students

Enrollment Modification

UPDATE - The Preferred Schematic Report for the Oakdale school was submitted to the MSBA 8/31/2023 and approved 10/25/2023 based on the enrollment options above. Through the detailed PSR process, the School Committee voted unanimously on 6/7/23 for an Oakdale + Greenlodge 550 students school. The SBRC on 6/26/23 voted unanimously for the Oakdale site. The 8/31/23 PSR concluded with

MSBA deliverables including scaled plans, site development, along with MEP, Structure, and Utility coordination for the following configuration.

- Oakdale + Greenlodge 550 students at Oakdale site.

The project subsequently moved into the Schematic Design phase further developing this enrollment configuration the Oakdale site. The Design team met with teachers, administrators, staff, custodial and kitchen staff to further refine the program, and study design options of how this materializes at this site.

On December 1, 2023 the MSBA provided responses to questions prompted by the Town of Dedham regarding a change in projected student enrollment. Given the responses provided, at the meeting on December 19, 2023 the SBRC voted to not submit the Schematic Design in process and engage the MSBA in a re-evaluation of the enrollment options.

On January 31, 2024 the MSBA issued a letter documenting a re-calculation of the enrollment projections and revised the enrollment options to the list below.

- Oakdale School - 360 students
- Oakdale + Riverdale Schools - 560 students
- Oakdale + Greenlodge - 665 students

On February 28, 2024 the MSBA issued a letter to return to the PSR phase to study new enrollment options identified. This REVISED Preferred Schematic Report documents the enrollment number change throughout the process.

The MSBA table outline of options to be re-evaluated is below.

**Dedham, Oakdale Elementary Schools
Final Evaluation of Alternatives**

Enrollment Options	Enrollment for grades 1-5 at the Oakdale ES (360 Students)	Grade 1-5 enrollment in a consolidated Oakdale and Riverdale ES (560 students)		Grade 1-5 enrollment in a consolidated Oakdale and <u>Greenlodge</u> ES (665 students)	
		<i>Oakdale ES</i>	<i>Riverdale ES</i>	<i>Oakdale ES</i>	<i>Greenlodge ES</i>
Base Repair (Code Upgrade)	Yes		Yes		Yes
Addition/Renovation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Construction	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Documents from the MSBA follow:

11/28/23	MSBA approval of previous PSR with enrollment of 550 students
12/1/23	MSBA letter to Dedham
1/31/24	MSBA enrollment letter
2/28/24	MSBA recategorization letter

Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chairman, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

John K. McCarthy
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

November 28, 2023

Mr. Leon Goodwin, Town Manager
Town of Dedham
Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026

Re: Town of Dedham, Oakdale Elementary School

Dear Mr. Goodwin:

On October 25, 2023, the Massachusetts School Building Authority's Board of Directors voted to approve the Town of Dedham's Preferred Schematic for the Oakdale Elementary School project. Based on this approval, enclosed is a Design Enrollment Certification for 550 students in grades 1-5 for your review and execution. The enclosed Design Enrollment Certification will replace the previous Study Enrollment Certification, which was signed by the Town of Dedham February 2, 2022 and submitted to the MSBA.

Please sign and return the attached certification within 21 calendar days to document the Town of Dedham's agreement on the design enrollment for the Oakdale Elementary School project.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Christina Forde (Christina.Forde@MassSchoolBuildings.org).

Sincerely,



Michael McGurl
Director of Capital Planning

Cc: Legislative Delegation
James A. MacDonald, Chair, Dedham Select Board
Victor Hebert, Chair, Dedham School Committee
Nan Murphy, Superintendent, Dedham Public Schools
John Tocci, Chair, Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee
Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities, Town of Dedham
Matt Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance, Dedham Public Schools
Jon Lemieux, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC

Page 2

November 28, 2023

Dedham Design Enrollment Letter

Steve Theran, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC

Anissa Ellis, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC

Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects

Philip Gray, Jonathan Levi Architects

Carol Harris, Jonathan Levi Architects

File: 10.2 Letters (Region 4)

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY

**TOWN OF DEDHAM
OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

DESIGN ENROLLMENT CERTIFICATION

As a result of a collaborative analysis with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (the "MSBA") of enrollment projections and space capacity needs for the proposed project at the Oakdale Elementary School, the Town of Dedham hereby acknowledges and agrees that the design of the proposed project at the Oakdale Elementary School shall be based on a consolidated enrollment of no more than 550 students in grades 1-5 from the Oakdale Elementary and Greenlodge Elementary Schools. The Town of Dedham further acknowledges and agrees that pursuant to 963 CMR 2.00 *et seq.*, the MSBA shall determine the square feet per student space allowance and total square footage for an elementary school serving 550 students in grades 1-5 that consolidates the Oakdale Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary Schools. The Town of Dedham acknowledges and agrees that it has no right or entitlement to any particular design enrollment, square feet per student space allowance, or total square footage and that it has no right or entitlement to a design enrollment any greater than 550 students for the consolidation of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary School, and further acknowledges and agrees that it shall not bring any claim or action, legal or equitable, against the MSBA, or any of its officers or employees, for the purpose of obtaining an increase in the design enrollment at the Oakdale Elementary School that it has acknowledged and agreed to herein. The Town of Dedham further acknowledges and agrees that, among other things, the design enrollment, square feet per student space allowance, and total square footage of the Oakdale Elementary School shall be subject to the approval of the MSBA's Board and that the final approval of a proposed project at the Oakdale Elementary School shall be within the sole discretion of the MSBA's Board.

The undersigned, for themselves and the Town of Dedham, hereby certify that they have read and understand the contents of this Design Enrollment Certification and that each of the above statements is true, complete and accurate. The undersigned also hereby certify that they have been duly authorized by the appropriate governmental body to execute this Certification on behalf of the Town of Dedham and to bind the Town of Dedham to its terms.

Chief Executive Officer

Duly Authorized Representative of School Committee

Date

Date

Superintendent of Schools

Date



Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chair, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

December 1, 2023

Mr. John Tocci, Chair
Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee
Town of Dedham
Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026

Re: Town of Dedham, Oakdale Elementary School

Dear Mr. Tocci:

Thank you for your email dated November 22, 2023, in which you as the Chair of the Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee (“SBRC”) request the Massachusetts School Building Authority (“MSBA”) provide written responses to three questions so that the SBRC may publish the answers to the citizenry of Dedham.

As you note, the MSBA has received a letter and two emails with questions from the Dedham Community which have been forwarded to your attention. In response to your inquiry, the MSBA is providing written responses to your stated questions and has also incorporated responses to the other community questions as well.

Question 1 – Email dated 11/22/23 from John Tocci:

If Dedham wanted to build a bigger standalone Oakdale – for example, a 20-classroom school for at least 360 students -- would the MSBA fund their portion of a 235 enrollment and allow the District to pay the financial difference for the additional enrollment? Said another way, if the cost of a 235-student school was \$70 Million and the cost of a 20 classroom, 360 student school was \$90 Million; and the town fully paid for the differential between the two (\$20 Million), would the MSBA still reimburse the town the approved costs of the \$70 Million, 235 student school?

MSBA Response to Question 1:

A critical early component in completing the feasibility study and schematic design phases begins with an appropriate study or design enrollment that positions the District to efficiently meet space capacity needs throughout potential future enrollment variations. As part of completing Eligibility Period and being invited into Feasibility Study by the MSBA Board of Directors, the District provided information and met with the MSBA to arrive at agreed upon study enrollments.

The MSBA uses a data driven enrollment projection methodology based on the widely accepted modified grade-to-grade cohort survival methodology (the “enrollment methodology”). The MSBA’s enrollment methodology generates a baseline enrollment projection as discussed during the December 20, 2021, enrollment meeting, and as further described on the MSBA’s website found under the ‘Building With Us’, ‘MSBA Enrollment Methodology’ section.

The MSBA received the District’s completed on-line enrollment questionnaire on September 29, 2021, which included housing permit and housing development information. The District received a projection package ahead of attending a virtual enrollment meeting with the MSBA on December 20, 2021, during which the MSBA presented the projection information and the District shared believed impacts to student enrollment. This process informed the MSBA’s enrollment projections captured in the MSBA’s January 31, 2022, letter. The District’s signed study enrollment certification dated February 2, 2022, is on file with the MSBA.

As noted in the signed study enrollment certification, the Town has acknowledged that “it has no right or entitlement to any design enrollment any greater than any of the enrollments noted above” (see study enrollments in certification). The MSBA’s enrollment process considers multiple factors and resources as indicated on our website [here](#). Based on an agreed upon design enrollment, the MSBA collaborates with each district to aggressively pursue strategies to **create right-sized facilities**, that are more affordable to construct and less costly to operate and maintain. The MSBA does not participate in projects that are constructed to serve an enrollment higher than the agreed upon enrollment.

The October 31, 2023, letter from multiple Dedham residents supplies information that the signatories believe is new and should be reviewed. If the District believes that there is new or different information beyond what has already been provided to the MSBA by the District during the enrollment process and the District would like the MSBA to review this information, then the District should provide a written communication signed by the Chief Elected Official, the School Committee Chair and the Superintendent requesting that the MSBA consider reevaluating the enrollment and the District should supply this new or different information.

Questions 2 and 3 – Email dated 11/22/23 from John Tocci:

2. If either the Dedham Town Meeting vote or townwide debt exclusion vote were to fail in the spring of 2024 (after presumed approval by the MSBA of Schematic Design), would Dedham be able to get an extension for the purpose of considering and changing the construction location (thereby necessitating new design) without falling out of the MSBA process?

3. If either the Dedham Town Meeting vote or townwide debt exclusion vote were to fail in the spring of 2024 (after presumed approval by the MSBA of Schematic Design), would Dedham be able to ask for a different enrollment option, either reverting to the 235 standalone school previously approved by the MSBA (but not chosen by the District) or a larger standalone Oakdale – for example a 20 classroom school -- without falling out of the MSBA process?

MSBA Response to Questions 2 and 3:

No. Once the District submits its Schematic Design and the MSBA votes to approve the Schematic Design Submission, the District has 120 days to seek local approval for the approved project. In the event that a school district fails to approve funding for the approved project within the 120-day deadline, by no later than 10 business days following the failed vote, the school district must submit to the MSBA a plan that: 1) presents the vote results, 2) explains the school district's understanding of the reason(s) for the failed vote, and 3) sets forth the school district's plan to remedy the failed vote and a suggested timeline for such a remedy.

Please note that any proposed remedy would apply only to the project as approved by the MSBA Board of Directors and would not include proposing any alternatives, such as the location of the project and/or the enrollment for the project. The MSBA does not consider requests to study an alternative project after the Board has approved the project. The MSBA's failed vote policy is available on our website [here](#).

We hope that these clarifications are helpful and that it will enable you to address the existing and any future questions that may arise from your community. We appreciate that the District has been maintaining a website providing project information and would encourage you to update your Frequently Asked Questions section as needed based on this information as well as the progress of your project.

Sincerely,



Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director

Cc: Legislative Delegation
Dennis J. Teehan, Jr., Vice-Chair, Dedham Select Board
Victor Hebert, Chair, Dedham School Committee
Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities, Town of Dedham
Nan Murphy, Superintendent, Dedham Public Schools
Matt Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance, Dedham Public Schools
Jon Lemieux, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Steve Theran, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Anissa Ellis, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects
Philip Gray, Jonathan Levi Architects
Carol Harris, Jonathan Levi Architects
File: 10.2 Letters (Region 4)



Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chair, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

January 31, 2024

Mr. Leon Goodwin, Town Manager
Town of Dedham
Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026

Re: Town of Dedham, Oakdale Elementary School

Dear Mr. Goodwin:

I would like to thank representatives of the Town of Dedham (the “District”) for continuing to work with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (the “MSBA”) towards the most educationally appropriate and cost-effective solution for the Oakdale Elementary School project (the “Proposed Project”) and for meeting with staff on January 26, 2024, to review updated enrollment projections and methodologies informed by updated information from the District. As discussed, this enrollment letter replaces the MSBA enrollment letter issued to the District dated January 31, 2022, and the attached enrollment certification replaces the enrollment certification on file with the MSBA dated February 2, 2022. The next critical step is for the MSBA and the District to agree on a study enrollment for the Proposed Project.

The MSBA works with local communities to create affordable, sustainable, and energy efficient schools across Massachusetts. A critical early component in achieving these objectives begins with an appropriate design enrollment that positions the District to efficiently meet space capacity needs throughout potential future enrollment variations.

The MSBA uses a data driven enrollment projection methodology based on the widely accepted modified grade-to-grade cohort survival methodology (the “enrollment methodology”). The MSBA’s enrollment methodology generates a baseline enrollment projection as discussed during the January 26, 2024, enrollment meeting, and as further described on the MSBA’s website found under the ‘Building With Us’, ‘MSBA Enrollment Methodology’ section.

Based on information supplied by the District, data from sources such as the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (“DESE”) and Department of Public Health, and discussion with the District, the MSBA has been able to create an enrollment projection for the Oakdale Elementary School project, as follows.

The Oakdale Elementary School currently serves a portion of the District’s grade 1-5 enrollment. The MSBA understands that the District would like its feasibility study to also examine options that explore consolidation with the Greenlodge Elementary School or the Riverdale Elementary School, both of which also serve the District’s grade 1-5 enrollment. Based on the information provided by the District in its Statement of Interest and prior to its invitation to Eligibility Period, the MSBA will not evaluate any additional grade levels for the potential eligibility of space beyond grades 1-5 or the inclusion of Pre-K in the Proposed Project. Accordingly, this analysis will be focused on the enrollment projections for grade 1-5 enrollment.

The table below illustrates the District’s K-12 enrollment during the most recent ten-year period, including enrollment for the 2023-24 school year as reported by DESE.

School Year	K	1-5	6-8	9-12	Total
2014-2015	194	1,093	680	700	2,667
2015-2016	182	1,069	666	718	2,635
2016-2017	187	1,041	631	739	2,598
2017-2018	173	1,051	603	734	2,561
2018-2019	201	993	647	748	2,589
2019-2020	229	982	674	716	2,601
2020-2021	202	933	659	682	2,476
2021-2022	224	962	572	694	2,452
2022-2023	201	993	540	710	2,444
2023-2024	240	1,081	543	726	2,590

The total grade 1-5 enrollment as reported by DESE for the 2023-2024 school year was 1,081 students, which reflects a decrease of 12 students (-1.1%) from the grade 1-5 enrollment reported for the 2014-2015 school year, which was the maximum grade 1-5 enrollment reported in the preceding ten years. Additionally, the current year’s grade 1-5 enrollment reflects an increase of 61 students (+6.0%) from the average grade 1-5 enrollment reported during the preceding ten-year period. The MSBA understands that the District is proposing a study enrollment option of 460 students in grades 1-5, which varies depending upon the solution that is selected for the Proposed Project.

With respect to future enrollments, the MSBA’s base enrollment projection indicates the District’s grade 1-5 enrollment will stabilize then trend slightly upward near the end of the review period. In accordance with the MSBA’s Enrollment Methodology, the baseline enrollment is calculated using the ten-year average of projected enrollments. As such, the average grade 1-5 base enrollment projection through the 2033-2034 school year is 1,110 students.

As a result of a sensitivity analysis performed by the MSBA on this base enrollment projection and further discussion with the District, the following adjustment has been made to the base enrollment projection:

- Out-of-District Enrollment
 - In order to adjust for fluctuations to the out-of-district enrollment patterns of the District's residents over time, the MSBA has made an additional adjustment to the base enrollment projection.
 - In order to make this adjustment, the MSBA adjusted the grade-to-grade survival ratios for grade 1-5 enrollment by a total of 3.3% throughout a four-year period in the projection.
 - This adjustment added students to the base grade 1-5 enrollment as compared to the projection without this adjustment, as follows:
 - Oakdale Elementary School: 10 students
 - Oakdale Elementary School - Greenlodge Elementary School consolidation: 15 students
 - Oakdale Elementary School - Riverdale Elementary School consolidation: 15 students

Development

- Based on the discussions between the District and the MSBA regarding new housing developments and the supplemental development information provided by the District, the MSBA enrollment model has been adjusted to use the five-year 75th percentile cohort survival rate for 2025 and 2026, rather than the five-year average cohort survival rate, which is utilized throughout the base enrollment forecast.
- This adjustment added students to the base grade 1-5 enrollment, as compared to the projection without this adjustment, as follows:
 - Oakdale Elementary School: 20 students
 - Oakdale Elementary School - Greenlodge Elementary School consolidation: 30 students
 - Oakdale Elementary School - Riverdale Elementary School consolidation: 25 students

In order to recommend an enrollment for an appropriately sized Oakdale Elementary School project, the MSBA analyzed use of the District's grade 1-5 elementary schools using "school use" information as provided by the District. The following schools were included in the MSBA's analysis because they also serve grade 1-5 enrollment: the Avery Elementary School, the Greenlodge Elementary School, and the Riverdale Elementary School (the "non-project schools"). A total of 40 general classrooms, exclusive of Special Education, Art, Music, or "other" spaces were identified and multiplied by 23, resulting in space for 920 students in the grade 1-5 non-project schools, identified above. The MSBA understands that there may be a possibility for any school district to have fluctuations in their future enrollment. Therefore, a 15% buffer has been included resulting in an assumed 782 student enrollment in the non-project

schools, which is rounded to the nearest five students, for a total of 780 students serving grade 1-5 enrollment.

The exercise above was repeated to support the District's interest in studying options that consider the consolidation of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary School. The following non-project schools were included: the Avery Elementary School and the Riverdale Elementary School, resulting in a total of 25 general classrooms, yielding space for 575 students in the non-project schools. Providing a 15% buffer yields an assumed 489 student enrollment in the non-project schools, which is rounded to the nearest five students, for a total of 490 students serving grade 1-5 enrollment.

The exercise above was repeated again to support the District's interest in studying options that consider the consolidation of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Riverdale Elementary School. The following non-project schools were included: the Avery Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary School, resulting in a total of 30 general classrooms, yielding space for 690 students in the non-project schools. Providing a 15% buffer yields an assumed 586 student enrollment in the non-project schools, which is rounded to the nearest five students, for a total of 585 serving grade 1-5 enrollment.

As a result of the analysis on the average base enrollment projection, the adjustment to the base projection described above, historical enrollment trends of the District, and the review of school use as described above, the MSBA recommends the following study enrollment options for the Oakdale Elementary School project:

- Oakdale Elementary School: 360 students serving grades 1-5 enrollment (1,140 students – 780 spaces in non-project schools)
- Oakdale Elementary School and Riverdale Elementary School: 560 students serving grades 1-5 enrollment (1,145 students – 585 spaces in non-project schools)
- Oakdale Elementary School and Greenlodge Elementary School: 665 students serving grades 1-5 (1,155 students – 490 spaces in non-project schools)

Please note that this recommendation for multiple study enrollments does not represent an affirmation by the MSBA for approval and/or funding of any of these options and are intended only to provide a framework to inform the feasibility study, to be conducted as a means of determining the most cost effective and educationally sound solution to be agreed upon by the District and the MSBA.


If the Preferred Schematic is based on the consolidation of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary School, or the consolidation of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Riverdale Elementary School, the District will be required to document in the Preferred Schematic Report the proposed future use or disposition of any existing spaces vacated or otherwise reprogrammed by this potential project and provide a description of the changes needed to the vacated schools and sites to accommodate the proposed use; including conceptual budgets, and schedules.

Further, the MSBA will require a written plan from the District describing the process for determining local support for the consolidated Preferred Schematic and associated redistricting as a result of the consolidation, as well as the potential work required to prepare the vacated school buildings for the proposed use, as applicable, once the proposed Oakdale Elementary School project opens.

The MSBA believes that this study enrollment recommendation will position the District to efficiently meet space capacity needs throughout future enrollment variations. Please sign and return the attached certification by February 8, 2024, to confirm agreement on this study enrollment. If the District feels that this study enrollment does not meet the needs of the District, please respond to this letter via e-mail to Jennifer Flynn at your earliest convenience.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jennifer.Flynn@MassSchoolBuildings.org) at 617-720-4466.

Sincerely,



Michael McGurl
Director of Capital Planning

Cc: Legislative Delegation
Dennis J. Teehan, Jr., Vice Chair, Dedham Select Board
Victor Hebert, Chair, Dedham School Committee
John Tocci, Chair, Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee
Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities, Town of Dedham
Nan Murphy, Superintendent, Dedham Public Schools
Matt Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance, Dedham Public Schools
File: 10.2 Letters (Region 4)



Massachusetts School Building Authority

Deborah B. Goldberg
Chair, State Treasurer

James A. MacDonald
Chief Executive Officer

Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director / Deputy CEO

February 28, 2024

Mr. Leon Goodwin, Town Manager
Town of Dedham
Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026

Re: Town of Dedham, Oakdale Elementary School

Dear Mr. Goodwin:

I am pleased to report that the Board of the Massachusetts School Building Authority (the “MSBA”) has voted to re-categorize the Statement of Interest for the Oakdale Elementary School in the Town of Dedham (the “Town”) from the Feasibility Study category to the Eligibility Period category, to allow the Town and the MSBA to re-evaluate the enrollment projections originally established during Eligibility Period, and to return the Statement of Interest to Feasibility Study, so the Town may commence with a new Feasibility Study utilizing the updated study enrollment options reflected in the enrollment letter and certification dated January 31, 2024.

The vote by the MSBA’s Board rescinds the October 25, 2023, Board approval of the Preferred Schematic for the replacement of the Oakdale Elementary School and the Greenlodge Elementary School with a new consolidated facility to serve 550 students in grades 1-5 on the existing Oakdale Elementary School site.

Please note that the authorization to approve the Town of Dedham to return to the Feasibility Study category includes a reimbursement exclusion provision regarding the eligibility of costs associated with the second Feasibility Study. As the MSBA has reimbursed the Town for the approved, eligible cost of the first Feasibility Study, the MSBA will not reimburse the Town for duplicative costs associated with a second Feasibility Study.

We will be contacting you soon to discuss these next steps in more detail, but in the meantime, I wanted to share with you the Board’s approval to re-categorize the Statement of Interest for the Oakdale Elementary School in the Town of Dedham from the Feasibility Study category to the Eligibility Period category, to allow the Town and the MSBA to re-evaluate the enrollment projections originally established during Eligibility Period, and return the Statement of Interest to Feasibility Study, so the Town may commence with a new Feasibility Study utilizing the updated study enrollment options.


I look forward to continuing to work with you throughout the MSBA’s grant program process. As always, feel free to contact me or my staff at (617) 720-4466 should you have any questions.

Page 2

February 28, 2024


Dedham, Oakdale Elementary School Re-categorization Board Action Letter

Sincerely,



Mary L. Pichetti
Executive Director

Cc: Legislative Delegation
Victor Hebert, Chair, Dedham School Committee
Nan Murphy, Superintendent, Dedham Public Schools
John Tocci, Chair, Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee
Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities, Town of Dedham
Matt Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance, Dedham Public Schools
Jon Lemieux, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Steve Theran, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Anissa Ellis, Owner's Project Manager, The Vertex Companies, LLC
Jonathan Levi, Jonathan Levi Architects
Philip Gray, Jonathan Levi Architects
Carol Harris, Jonathan Levi Architects
File: 10.2 Letters (Region 4)



Oakdale

Greenlodge

Riverdale

Capen

Striar

Capen-Striar

Paul Park

Dolan Center

Whitcomb Woods

Rustcraft Road

1.1 Overview of Process

During the 2023 PDP process, a multitude of sites were carefully considered and analyzed as potential school building locations concluding with 5 sites to proceed into the PSR for further consideration.

- Oakdale
- Greenlodge
- Riverdale
- Capen
- Striar


After the issuance of the PDP in March 2023, the SBRC voted unanimously to remove the Striar site from further consideration by the town on April 26, 2023. Comments included safety concerns associated with restricted access to the site, wetlands restrictions, and the fact that the property is not controlled by the School Department all could delay or derail the project if selected.




Option A - Oakdale



Option B - Greenlodge



Option C - Riverdale



Option D - Capen



Option E - Striar



Option E - Striar

Striar site removed from consideration
4/26/23

On June 7, 2023 during the original 8/31/23 PSR, the Dedham School Committee unanimously voted to move forward with a combined 550 Oakdale-Greenlodge student enrollment option for the Oakdale School Project. The 550 enrollment option inherently removed the Riverdale site from further consideration since it would not host a Oakdale only nor Oakdale-Greenlodge option on its site.

UPDATE - The MSBA in the January 31, 2024 letter revised the enrollment options for review. The Riverdale site is included in the considerations documented in this revised report.

Ultimately, on March 20, 2024 the School Committee unanimously voted for an 360 student 'Oakdale only' enrollment removing the Riverdale site again from consideration.



Riverdale Site removed from consideration 6/7/23 then
Revisited for re-consideration 1/31/24

On June 21, 2023, the SBRC unanimously voted to remove the Greenlodge site from consideration. Sloped site, wetlands and extensive ledge make Greenlodge a challenging site to build on with limited usable space.

UPDATE - The MSBA in the January 31, 2024 letter revised the enrollment options for review. The Greenlodge site is included in the considerations documented in this revised report.

Ultimately, on March 20, 2024 the School Committee unanimously voted for an 360 student 'Oakdale only' enrollment removing the Greenlodge site again from consideration.



Greenlodge Site removed from consideration 6/21/23 then
Revisited for re-consideration 1/31/24

On June 26, 2023 the SBRC by unanimous vote removed the Capen site from further consideration citing traffic concerns and steep topography.



Capen Site removed from consideration 6/26/23

Sites were test fit for various building configurations. Using different massings for a school, Useable Open Space "UOS" and construction phasing were considered.


Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation




Preliminary Concept Studies



Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation




Preliminary Concept Studies



Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies




Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village'
New Construction




On June 26, 2023 by SBRC unanimous vote, the Oakdale site was selected. The Oakdale site is advantageous for many reasons. A relatively flat site, owned by the school district, with large open areas for construction, optimal for solar orientation, centrally located, accessible by car and foot, ample space for site access and circulation, and free from wetlands and flood restrictions.

UPDATE - The MSBA in the January 31, 2024 letter revised the enrollment options for review. The Riverdale and Greenlodge sites are included in the considerations documented in this revised report.

Ultimately, on March 25, 2024 the SBRC confirms the Oakdale site selection again by unanimous vote.



Oakdale Site confirmed again on 3/25/24.





1.2 Summary of Project Schedule

The Oakdale School Project has been delayed approximately 6-8 months. The Dedham School District requested the MSBA review the original enrollments provided due to changes in the NESDEQ 10 year enrollment projects they received in the Fall of 2023. Once the MSBA Reviewed all the new information they then provided updated enrollments for the three school options and approved those updates at the February 28, 2024 board meeting, the District was put back into the feasibility phase of the project. The total project schedule has been updated to show the new feasibility, Schematic Design, Design Development, Construction, and Close Out phases. The goal is to submit the Schematic Design to the MSBA on August 29, 2024 with an anticipated MSBA approval at the October 30, 2024 board meeting. The Town will then have the project presented at the Fall Town Meeting and Fall ballot votes. The exact schedule of votes is still under discussion with the Town Manager and Town Clerk. Should the project pass both the Town Meeting vote and the Town Election vote, the team will work on Design Development and Construction Documents through Fall of 2025 with anticipation of starting construction on the new school in Late Winter/Early Spring 2026 and opening its doors the following Fall for the 2027-2028 School Year. The schedule provided herein provides greater detail.

1.3 Summary of Existing Conditions

Extensive existing conditions reports were included in the 2023 PDP for the Oakdale, Riverdale, and Greenlodge sites.

UPDATE - On March 25, 2024 the SBRC confirmed the Oakdale site selection by unanimous vote. Updated Existing Conditions documentation since the prior 8/31/23 PSR are included in this revised report.

Additional information pertaining to the Oakdale site, including updates since the prior PSR submission, is included in Section 2.

- Historic (not designated)
- Site Survey (updated 10/25/23)
- Geotech (updated 9/26/23)
- Geoenvironmental (updated 10/19/23)
- Hazardous Materials




1.4 Summary of Alternatives


UPDATE - The MSBA in the January 31, 2024 letter revised the enrollment options for review and included Riverdale and Greenlodge sites in the options for consideration.

On on March 25, 2024 the SBRC confirmed the Oakdale site selection by unanimous vote. In a study of massing types, five alternatives are carefully considered.

- 0 Code Renovation
- A Academic Courtyard
- B Common Core Welcome
- C Addition/Renovation



A Academic Courtyard



B Common Core Welcome

Options A, B and D build new 2-3 story construction on the open field portion of the site allowing for the existing school to remain open during construction. Option C Add/Reno retains the 1902 brick building and builds 2 story academic wings to the north and south. Some phasing for the 1902 building renovation is required.

Option 0 does not satisfy the spacial requirements identified in the Space Summary since the existing school at 53,524sf is only about 1/2 the area required for even the smallest 360 student enrollment identified in Section 4.2 of this report..

C Add/Reno



D Core Cluster



1.5 Summary of Preferred Solution

On August 7, 2023 SBRC votes unanimously for Option D Core Cluster as the Preferred Design.

The new construction preferred solution builds on the District's Educational Program by creating an exciting cluster of interactive core spaces in the center of the building, respects the site boundaries and adjacent properties, maximizes green space, minimizes student impact during construction and mindful of costs.

UPDATE - The Option D 'Core Cluster' is updated to the revised Preferred Solution representing the revisions documented in this report. On April 29, 2024 the SBRC votes unanimously for the updated Option D configuration.

3/20/24 School Committee unanimous vote for 360 student enrollment

3/25/24 SBRC unanimous vote for Oakdale site

Preferred Solution: Oakdale site - 360 students 91,100gsf



UPDATE - D Core Cluster

1.6 MSBA PSR Review and District Response

The MSBA issued comments on the Preliminary Design Report on May 26, 2023. Comments were carefully reviewed by the Architect, OPM, and Town of Dedham and responses provided. The full MSBA PSR Comment and District Response document follows.

ATTACHMENT A
MODULE 3 – PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM REVIEW COMMENTS

District: Town of Dedham
School: Oakdale Elementary School
Owner’s Project Manager: The Vertex Companies, LLC (Formally known as: Compass Project Management Inc.)
Designer Firm: Jonathan Levi Architects LLC
Submittal Due Date: April 4, 2023
Submittal Received Date: March 31, 2023
Review Date: March 31, 2023 – May 18, 2023
Reviewed by: V. Dagkalakou, C. Forde, C. Alles, J. Jumpe

Note: The Dedham School Committee unanimously voted at its June 7, 2023 meeting to move forward with the combined 550 student enrollment option for the Oakdale School Project. The 235 and 450 student enrollment options have been formally removed from further consideration by the town, so the following response comments address the approved 550 enrollment portions of the PDP submission only.

Minutes from the 6/7/23 Dedham School Committee meeting are attached.

In addition, the Striar site was formally removed from further consideration by unanimous vote by the SBRC on 4/26/23 due to safety concerns associated with restricted access to the site, wetlands restrictions, and the fact that the property is not controlled by the School Department and it could delay or derail the project if selected.

The School Building Rehabilitation Committee is scheduled to formally vote on a single recommended site on June 21, 2023.

MSBA REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments¹ on the Preliminary Design Program (“PDP”) submittal are issued pursuant to a review of the project submittal document for the proposed project presented as a part of the Feasibility Study submission in accordance with the MSBA Module 3 Guidelines.

3.1 PRELIMINARY DESIGN PROGRAM

Overview of the Preliminary Design Program Submittal	Complete	Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Not Provided; <i>Refer to comments following each section</i>	Receipt of District’s Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
OPM Certification of Completeness and Conformity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Table of Contents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.1 Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.1.2 Educational Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.3 Initial Space Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.4 Evaluation of Existing Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.5 Site Development Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.6 Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.7 Local Actions and Approvals Certification(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.1.8 Appendices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Summary of the Facility Deficiencies and Current S.O.I.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Date of invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study and MSBA Board Action Letter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Executed Design Enrollment Certification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Narrative of the Capital Budget Statement and Target Budget	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Project Directory with contact information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Updated Project Schedule	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

3) The District will be required to execute a Design Enrollment Certification based on its Preferred Schematic. The MSBA will prepare a certification to be forwarded for signature upon approval by the MSBA Board of Directors for its Preferred Schematic. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District acknowledges this requirement.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.2 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Provide a summary and description of the existing educational program, and the new or expanded educational vision, specifications, process, teaching philosophy statement, as well as the District's curriculum goals and objectives of the program. Include description of the following items:

Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham MA
PDP Review Comment Response

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Grade and School Configuration Policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Class Size Policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	School Scheduling Method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Teaching Methodology and Structure				
	a) Administrative and Academic Organization/Structure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Curriculum Delivery Methods and Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) English Language Arts/Literacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Mathematics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Social Studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) World Languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Academic Support Programming Spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Student Guidance and Support Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Teacher Planning and Professional Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Pre-kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Kindergarten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Lunch Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Technology Instruction Policies and Program Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Media Center/Library	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Visual Arts Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Performing Arts Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Physical Education Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Special Education Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Vocation and Technology Programs				
	a) Non-Chapter 74 Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Chapter 74 Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Transportation Policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Functional and Spatial Relationships	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Security and Visual Access Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

In response to these review comments address the items below. As part of the District's Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") include (2) copies of the updated educational program, (1) redlined copy and (1) clean copy. The updated educational program must address the comments

below, include District updates, provide a Designer response for each component of the educational program, and align with the District's Preferred Schematic. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged and agreed

Additionally, the MSBA understands that there will be a transition to a new Superintendent in July 2023. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the new Superintendent will review the updated educational plan requested above and confirm agreement with the proposed educational plan prior to resubmittal to the MSBA. Please describe how input from the new Superintendent will be incorporated into the District's educational program to inform the District's Preferred Schematic.

Response: The incoming Superintendent has been kept abreast of all developments concerning this project. She will be fully briefed on the project's progress to date after July 1 and will have the opportunity to review the District's Educational Plan and provide input in the weeks preceding the District's PSR submission in late August. The incoming Superintendent will also be involved in all proceedings of the School Committee and the local School Building Rehabilitation Committee.

2) The information provided states that the District intends to maintain class sizes between 16-18 students in grades one through five. Please note and acknowledge that MSBA guidelines are based on 23 students per classroom.

Response: The District acknowledges that its intent to maintain current class sizes averaging 18 students differs from the MSBA guidelines of 23 students per classroom.

3) The educational program does not indicate if there are planned changes to the school's current scheduling method. In response to these review comments, provide additional information that demonstrates how the current school schedule will accommodate the District's proposed educational program goals.

The "Daily Instructional Time Allocation (Min) in Grades 1-5" schedule provided at the bottom of page 7 appears to demonstrate skill development in separate disciplines rather than developed into a project-based learning approach. In response to these review comments, please describe how the proposed scheduling will incorporate a project-based learning approach.

Response: The District, at this time, does not intend to make any adjustments to the school's current scheduling method. The intent of the time allocation table is to demonstrate the quantity of time allocated to specific content during the school day/year. It does not dictate the scheduling, pedagogy, or methodology by which the content is delivered and engaged with. In simpler terms, the content area breakdown of time in no way impedes the integration of content to enhance learning in a project-based environment.

Additionally, in response to these review comments, please describe the District's commitment to project-based learning.

Response: The District's commitment to project-based learning was established in 2017. At that time the District implemented a major restructuring of human resources to ensure that professional systems and structures were in place to support the adoption of new curriculum models across all content areas particularly at the elementary and middle schools levels. Following the restructuring of human resources, comprehensive professional development and instructional coaching were put in place to support the implementation of new core curriculum programs in reading, writing, science, and later social studies. Establishing a consistent curriculum and trajectory of learning experiences for all students across the District was an important step towards project-based learning models. These structural supports for professional and student learning are key to project-based learning initiatives as they set the stage for educators who have consistent curriculum materials and students who have consistent exposure to skills and concepts across content areas to begin considering how the disparate content areas can be integrated into a meaningful, coherent project-based experience for students. The pandemic had a significant impact on our progress towards project-based learning opportunities that the District is in the process of revitalizing at this time.

4b) In response to these review comments, provide specific examples of items that are examined and/or meant by: "look at student work", "rich multi-faceted sources of performance data", and "student assessments".

Response: Looking at student work (LASW) is an assessment and calibration methodology that engages educators in the process of collaboratively reviewing student work samples. LASW is used for many purposes including but not limited to (1) identifying what students have learned, (2) identifying what students still need to learn, (3) determining the efficacy of different pedagogical practices, (4) determining the efficacy of learning experiences and lessons, and (5) calibrating educator's ratings and evaluations of student work/learning. During LASW sessions educators might (1) review student writing samples from across a class or grade level to collectively evaluate the efficacy of a non-fiction writing unit, (2) score a small sample of math assessments to calibrate their scoring and ensure continuity of feedback and performance ratings, and (3) review quantitative data from a recent administration of standardized test.

4e-f) Based on the time dedicated to Science, History, and Social Studies (from page 7 of the District's educational program) there appears to be limited time allocated for hands-on, student-based investigation which requires greater amounts of time to support actual investigative activities performed by students themselves with realia, media, and/or other accessible resources. In response to the review comments, please describe how the proposed schedule will allow for hands-on, student-based investigations.

Response: The Daily Instructional Time Allocation table on page 7 of the District's educational program establishes minimum expectations for time on learning. It does not dictate scheduling,

methodology, or pedagogy. Students who are engaged in an inquiry-based series of lessons as part of our science curriculum may engage in that work far beyond the minimum time expectations because these learning experiences integrate reading about the phenomenon they are studying and writing about their observations of scientific concepts/principles. Content is integrated to enhance student learning but the District ensures that there is a shared understanding about the importance of time on learning and minimum expectations for it.

4g) In response to these review comments, please clarify whether the District has considered beginning the World Language program in its elementary schools.

Response: The District has considered this over the years and the implementation of such a program is cost prohibitive at this point in time.

4h) In response to these review comments, provide a description of the District's current and proposed 'Academic Support Programming Spaces' and clarify if there are any proposed changes to the District's academic support or provide a statement that no changes are being proposed.

Response: The District is not proposing substantive changes to its Academic Support Programming.

Additionally, in response to these review comments, please describe the District's plan to include staff and students in potential involvement and encouragement of ideas for the facility upgrades or changes that could enhance their program and promote greater integration with the other programs and students that will be in the proposed facility, if any.

Response: As the design process proceeds the District will engage various stakeholder groups, including staff and students, in a comprehensive process to gather input to inform program enhancements made possible by a new facility.

5) In response to these review comments, provide additional information regarding the District's plan to provide professional development opportunities to prepare for a newly designed facility, which will incorporate project-based learning. This should include how the District is preparing to effectively utilize the renovated or new facility, current and planned preparations before and after the opening of the proposed project. Also, please describe whether the District has considered providing additional professional and curricular development opportunities outside the regular school year that would enable teachers to have extended times to prepare for changes in the curriculum and structure as a result of the proposed project.

Response: The District has and continues to invest in the professional learning of educators and instructional support staff. As the process proceeds towards a final design and, potentially, a construction timeline and anticipated opening date, the District will ensure that appropriate professional learning is planned and implemented to support educators in adapting instructional practices to fully leverage the opportunities presented by the new facility.

In response to these review comments, please consider having instructional coaches, and professional development activities work more with recognition and support for the development and use of project-based programs to include all areas of the curriculum (science, history and social sciences, visual arts, performing arts, physical education, and health) and engage all faculty members in promoting literacy and numeracy.

Response: Agreed. Please see Item 3 comment response above

9) The MSBA suggests the District consider providing assisted listening technology in each classroom, as well as general use throughout educational spaces within the proposed project for hearing impaired accessibility. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District acknowledges and appreciates this consideration.

Additionally, please provide the following information:

- *Describe the District's plan for students to use their technology devices at home, if any.*
- *If yes, describe whether the District has a regular program to ensure that all students have access to internet at home.*
- *Additionally, please describe any arrangements that are in place to ensure all the devices are properly licensed to use the software required by the curriculum.*
- *Describe the numbers and types of staff that are/will be provided to support the described technology program.*
- *Describe the professional development programs that have been in place or are planned to enable faculty and staff to utilize the technology infrastructure that is described/proposed.*

Response: The District has no plans at this time to move the existing 1:1 model to a take home model. The District's policies and procedures relating to the adoption and procurement of software/hardware ensure that all technology is properly licensed for its intended use in the District. The District has had a 1:1 model in place for many years and our educators have a high degree of knowledge and skill as it relates to the use of technology in the classroom and clinic. As new technologies become available and are adopted or updated the District ensures that training and professional learning are provided to support effective deployment and use of the technology.

11) In response to these review comments, please describe how the District will incorporate the visual arts program with the development of communication and mathematical skills as an integral part of a robust project-based learning curriculum approach.

Response: Visual and Performing Arts are a central component of the educational experience of the Dedham Public Schools. The new facility for an enrollment configuration of 550 students presents new and exciting opportunities to extend the benefits of these programs to students

and to center them in the project-based learning model. At present, the District's enrollment and space/facilities configurations present structural barriers to the effective integration of the performing and visual arts into a robust project based learning model. Educators in the visual and performing arts program are shared amongst the District's elementary schools and, as such, lack a true home base of operation. This creates a situation in which these professionals are provided with fewer opportunities to meet with grade level educators to prepare and plan project-based learning opportunities.

In addition to this structural barrier, the District is regularly forced to relocate or displace visual and performing arts classrooms to manage fluctuations in enrollments. The existing Oakdale and Greenlodge facilities lack adequate, accessible spaces to open new sections and, as a result, are forced to displace the art and music programs that occupy classrooms. Educators who lack a dedicated space for teaching and learning are not able to fully engage children in project-based learning opportunities. Removing these structural barriers is a critical step in ensuring that the District's professionals are able to collaborate, plan, and implement effective project based learning opportunities.

Additionally, please note art storage should include secure and appropriately ventilated space for toxic and hazardous materials as well as an accessible file of safety data sheets ("SDS"). Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged and agreed.

12) In response to these review comments, please describe how the District will incorporate the performing arts program as an integral part of a robust project-based learning curriculum approach. Also, describe professional development or regular collaborative/planning time with their general classroom colleagues to ensure that the work in this area is fully incorporated into the project-based model.

Response: Please see review comment 11 response above.

14) The information provided on page 3 of the District's educational program states: "42% of Dedham's students fall into the high needs category established by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education." The associated bar graph referred to as "Figure 1: DSP Selected Student Populations" provided on page 3 of the District's educational program totals 110% rather than 100%. In response to these review comments, please review the bar chart and provide the number of students for each of the selected student populations identified.

Response: The bar graph on page 3 does not total 100% because of the fact that DPS students can be represented in multiple categories. For example a 6 year old first grader who is identified as low income and an English Language Learner would be counted and represented in the percentage of English Language Learners and in the percentage of low income students.

18) In response to these review comments, please confirm that first-responding emergency representatives will be consulted in the planning process and associated requirements will be

incorporated into the Preferred Schematic.

Response: Confirmed.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.3 INITIAL SPACE SUMMARY

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Space summary; one per approved design enrollment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Floor plans of the existing facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Narrative description of reasons for all variances (if any) between proposed net and gross areas as compared to MSBA guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

1) The MSBA has performed a preliminary review of the space summaries for new construction for the three study enrollment options and offers the following:

- **Study Enrollment Options:**
 - *Enrollment 1: 235 students in grades 1-5*
Note: The 235 Student enrollment option has been formally removed from further consideration by the School Committee
 - *Enrollment 2: 450 students in grades 1-5*
Note: The 450 Student enrollment option has been formally removed from further consideration by the School Committee
 - *Enrollment 3: 550 students in grades 1-5*
- **Core Academic** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 6,600 net square feet (“nsf”) for Enrollment 1; by 9,650 nsf for Enrollment 2; and by 9,470 nsf for Enrollment 3. Based on the information provided, the following spaces will be proposed for the District to deliver its educational program:*

Core Academic Spaces	Enrollment 1: Grades 1-5 for 235 students			Enrollment 2: Grades 1-5 for 450 students			Enrollment 3: Grades 1-5 for 550 students		
	Proposed No. Rooms	MSBA Guidelines No. Rooms	Variance	Proposed No. Rooms	MSBA Guidelines No. Rooms	Variance	Proposed No. Rooms	MSBA Guidelines No. Rooms	Variance
General Classrooms	15	9	+6	25	17	+8	30	21	+9
Teacher Planning	15	0	+15	25	0	+25	30	0	+30
Classroom Breakout – Grades 1-2	3	0	+3	5	0	+5	6	0	+6
Classroom Breakout – Grades 3-5	3	0	+3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Classroom Breakout	-	-	-	5	0	+5	-	-	-
Cohort Commons	-	-	-	1	0	+1	3	0	+3
STE Room – Grade 3-6	1	0	+1	1	0	+1	1	0	+1
STE Storage	1	0	+1	1	0	+1	1	0	+1

The District is proposing the following spaces:

- **General Classrooms** – The District is proposing (15) 900 nsf General Classrooms, totaling 13,500 nsf for Enrollment 1, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by (6) classrooms and 4,950 nsf. For Enrollment 2, the District is proposing (25) 900 nsf General Classrooms totaling 22,500 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by (8) classrooms and 6,350 nsf. For Enrollment 3, the District is proposing (30) 900 nsf General Classrooms totaling 27,000 nsf which exceeds the MSBA guidelines by (9) classrooms and 7,050 nsf. Based on the grade configuration and number of classrooms required for each grade, the MSBA does not object to the proposed number of General Classrooms for each enrollment option. In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:
 - As the project further develops, please note and acknowledge that 900 nsf is the minimum size for all newly constructed General Classrooms in an elementary school.

Response: Acknowledged and agreed.

- Confirm that the proposed project will provide a minimum of two sinks in each General Classroom for grades 1-5. Please refer to the attached memo regarding MSBA’s Staff Recommendation for 2018 STE Area Guidelines.

Response: Confirmed.

- **Teacher Planning** – The District is proposing (15) 50 nsf Teacher Planning areas, totaling 750 nsf for Enrollment 1; (25) 50 nsf Teacher Planning areas, totaling 1,250 nsf for Enrollment 2; and (30) 50 nsf Teacher Planning

areas, totaling 1,500 nsf for Enrollment 3, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. In response to these review comments, provide additional information that describes the scheduling, staffing, and overall utilization of these spaces.

Response: The Dedham School Committee voted unanimously at its June 7th, 2023 meeting to eliminate Enrollments 1 and 2 from consideration for the PSR. As such, Enrollment 3 (550) will inform the District's response. Teacher planning areas will be directly adjacent to classroom spaces and situated in between classrooms creating shared planning spaces for educators. The 30 spaces at 50 nsf are, in reality, 15 spaces at 100 nsf. These teacher planning areas will be shared by two or more classroom teachers and for parts of the day are directly scheduled for educator planning via the school's master schedule and will be used flexibly for planning and preparation throughout the remainder of the school day for activities including but not limited to co-planning learning opportunities, consultation with related service providers, SPED breakout and ELL breakout.

- ***Classroom Breakout – Grades 1-2 – The District is proposing (3) 300 nsf Classroom Breakout areas totaling 900 nsf for Enrollment 1; (5) 300 nsf Classroom Breakout areas totaling 1,500 nsf for Enrollment 2; and (6) 300 nsf Classroom Breakout areas totaling, 1,800 nsf for Enrollment 3, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines each enrollment option. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:***
 - *Describe the anticipated adjacencies.*
 - *Describe the scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas.*
 - *Describe how these areas will be supervised and staffed.*
 - *Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.*
 - *Describe why these activities are better suited in a separate area rather than in a larger General Classroom.*

Response: The Dedham School Committee voted unanimously at its June 7th, 2023 meeting to eliminate Enrollments 1 and 2 from consideration for the PSR. As such, Enrollment 3 (550) will inform the District's response.

These (6) 300nsf Because Grade 1 and 2 students do not yet have autonomy outside the classroom, these breakout spaces will be directly adjacent to and between two adjoining classrooms. Like Teacher Planning spaces, the scheduling of these classroom breakout spaces will blend a routine schedule with flexible scheduling for educators to use the spaces with students as needs arise throughout the school day. Routine scheduling will include time for academic support groups, special education services, counseling groups, small group content instruction, etc. Flexible scheduling will include activities such as small, ad hoc instructional groups to address student learning needs, student-teacher conferences and meetings, common teacher planning amongst larger groups of grade alike educators, etc.

Supervision of these spaces will be a blend of direct and indirect supervision depending on the circumstance. Educators using the space for the provision of direct services to students will directly supervise children utilizing these spaces. Educators who send a small group of children to use one of the breakout spaces to work on a project together will indirectly supervise the children using the space.

These classroom breakout spaces are critical learning spaces for academic support programming, special education service delivery, and other pedagogical practices that require flexible grouping of students. Provision of these types of services in a smaller, distraction free environment allows students to focus and engage fully in their learning or clinical services. These spaces greatly enhance inclusive practices that keep children near to their home base for learning instead of pulling them away from their peers and teachers for the provision of academic support and special education services in traditional resource room settings. The practice of removing students from the general education setting is exclusionary and creates unnecessary anxiety and stigma for many young children.

- ***Classroom Breakout – Grades 3-5*** – *The District is proposing (3) 400 nsf Classroom Breakout areas totaling 1,200 nsf for Enrollment 1, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. The District is not proposing any Classroom Breakout areas for Enrollment 2 and 3. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:*
 - *Describe the anticipated adjacencies.*
 - *Describe the scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas.*
 - *Describe how these areas will be supervised and staffed.*
 - *Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.*
 - *Describe why these activities are better suited in a separate area rather than in a larger General Classroom.*

Response: Enrollment 1 was eliminated for consideration by the Dedham School Committee on June 7, 2023.

- ***Cohort Commons*** – *The District is proposing (1) 950 nsf Cohort Commons area, for Enrollment 2, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. For Enrollment 3, the District is proposing (3) 950 nsf Cohort Commons areas totaling 2,850 nsf, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. The District is not proposing any Cohort Commons areas for Enrollment 1. In response to these review comments, please provide the following information:*
 - *Describe the anticipated adjacencies.*
 - *Describe the scheduling and utilization of the proposed areas.*
 - *Describe how these areas will be supervised and staffed.*
 - *Provide examples of activities that will occur in these areas.*
 - *Describe why these activities are better suited in a separate area rather*

than in a larger General Classroom.

Response: The Dedham School Committee voted unanimously at its June 7th, 2023 meeting to eliminate Enrollments 1 and 2 from consideration for the PSR. As such, Enrollment 3 (550) will inform the District's response.

Each cohort commons will be directly adjacent to and shared by six (6) classrooms. These cohort commons are the shared community space for grades 3, 4, and 5. Paralleling the scheduling of educator planning and classroom breakout spaces, Cohort Commons will blend routine and flexible scheduling of the space. Routine scheduling may include class/grade level meetings and assemblies and co/extracurricular enrichment activities. Flexibly scheduled uses may include cross grade level project-based learning teams, investigation/experimental space for student teams engaged in project-based learning opportunities, etc.

Supervision of these spaces will be a blend of direct and indirect. Students in grade 3, 4, and 5 are increasingly independent and seek opportunities to engage in work independently. In instances of flexible use for independent or small group project work the spaces will be indirectly supervised by appropriate grade level teachers. Routine events in the Cohort Commons will be directly supervised by grade level educators and related service providers.

Engaging students in class/grade level meetings or cross classroom activities is made possible by having the cohort commons space. This allows for children and educators to gather and work in a space that is separate from the classroom and allows for other learning opportunities or student groupings to function simultaneously without disruption to learning.

- ***Science, Technology, Engineering (“STE”) Rooms for Grades 3-5 – The District is proposing (1) 1,080 nsf STE Rooms for grades 3-5 for Enrollment 1 which exceeds the MSBA guidelines. For Enrollments 2 and 3 the District is proposing (1) 950 nsf STE Rooms for grades 3-5, which exceeds the MSBA guidelines for each enrollment option.***

In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:

- *Please note if the District intends to include an STE Room in the proposed project it must be a minimum of 1,080 nsf.*

Response: The nsf for the STE Room will be revised to the MSBA standard size in the PSR Space Summary

- *Provide additional information that describes how the proposed STE Rooms space will be scheduled and staffed, and the educational activities that would be scheduled for the proposed spaces that could not be delivered in the general classrooms.*

Response: The STE room space will be routinely scheduled for classroom instruction delivered and supervised by grade level classroom teachers. These hands on, inquiry-based learning opportunities are better served in a dedicated STE space that can accommodate the use of various materials and instructional practices that align with and enhance the inquiry/project-based nature of the district's existing STE curriculum. The dedicated STE spaces allow for experimentation and inquiry to be set up and prepared for prior to lessons in a way that cannot be accomplished or accommodated in a general classroom setting.

- *Please note the MSBA's STE Guidelines (attached) require all elementary school general classrooms have a minimum of (2) sinks to facilitate STE exploration and project-based learning within the classrooms. One sink must be accessible, and one must be deep and wide to accommodate buckets or containers. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged and agreed

- *STE Storage – The District is proposing (1) 120 nsf STE Storage area associated with the (1) STE Room for each enrollment option.*
- *Special Education – The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 250 nsf for Enrollment 1; 1,420 nsf for Enrollment 2; and by 1,360 nsf for Enrollment 3. In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:*
 - *The District is proposing (2) 900 nsf Self-Contained Special Education Classrooms for Enrollment 1 and 2; and (3) 900 nsf Self-Contained Special Education classrooms for Enrollment 3. As the project further develops, please note and acknowledge that 900 nsf is the minimum size for all newly constructed Sub-Separate or Self-Contained Special Education Classrooms in an elementary school.*

Response: Acknowledged and agreed

- *Please note that the Special Education program is subject to approval by the*

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (“DESE”). The District should provide the required information required with the Schematic Design submittal. Formal approval of the District’s proposed Special Education program by the DESE is a prerequisite for executing a Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged and understood

- **Art & Music** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category aligns with the MSBA guidelines for Enrollment 1. However, the overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 1,200 nsf for Enrollment 2 and by 50 nsf for Enrollment 3. The MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines. Please note and acknowledge that square footage exceeding MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement.*

Response: The District notes and acknowledges the MSBA’s request and feedback.

- **Health and Physical Education** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category aligns with the MSBA guidelines for each study enrollment option. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Media Center** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category is below the MSBA guidelines by 420 nsf for Enrollment 1, exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 2,005 nsf for Enrollment 2, and aligns with MSBA guidelines for Enrollment 3. In response to these review comments please review and respond to the following items:*
 - *For Enrollment 1, confirm the square footage proposed in this category is sufficient to meet the needs of the District’s educational program.*

Response: The Dedham School Committee voted unanimously at its June 7th, 2023 meeting to eliminate Enrollments 1 and 2 from consideration for the PSR.

- *For Enrollment 2, please note the MSBA encourages the District and its consultants to continue to seek opportunities to increase efficiencies and align with MSBA guidelines. Additionally, please note and acknowledge that square footage exceeding MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement.*

Response: The Dedham School Committee voted unanimously at its June 7th, 2023 meeting to eliminate Enrollments 1 and 2 from consideration for the PSR.

- **Dining & Food Service** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds*

the MSBA guidelines by 450 nsf for Enrollment 1; by 750 nsf for Enrollment 2, and by 900 nsf for Enrollment 3. The square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines is associated with the proposed Quiet Dining area for each enrollment option. Please note the MSBA does not object to this additional square footage being included as part of the proposed project; however, square footage exceeding MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.

Response: The District acknowledges that additional square footage beyond MSBA guidelines will not be considered eligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Medical** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category aligns with the MSBA guidelines for Enrollment 1 and exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 90 nsf for Enrollment 2 and 3. Please note that all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

Response: The District acknowledges that additional square footage beyond MSBA guidelines will not be considered eligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Administration & Guidance** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category exceeds the MSBA guidelines by 420 nsf for Enrollment 1; by 465 nsf for Enrollment 2, and by 415 nsf for Enrollment 3. Please note that all square footage exceeding the MSBA guidelines will be considered ineligible for reimbursement. Please acknowledge.*

Response: The District acknowledges that additional square footage beyond MSBA guidelines will not be considered eligible for MSBA reimbursement.

- **Custodial & Maintenance** – *The overall proposed square footage for this category aligns with the MSBA guidelines for each enrollment option. No further preliminary comments.*
- **Building Grossing Factor** – *Please note that in a new construction scenario, the proposed grossing factor may not exceed 1.50. The space summaries provided for new construction in which MSBA based its review include a proposed grossing factor of 1.54 for Enrollment 1 and 1.51 for Enrollment 2. However, if an addition/renovation option is selected as the Preferred Schematic, the MSBA may consider a variation to 1.50 in areas of the building that are to be renovated, and only after a thorough understanding of the Preferred Schematic layout and the extent of renovation within the areas to remain. Here, the MSBA has provided review of the proposed square footage associated with a new construction option for context.*

Response: Acknowledged and understood

If the District's Preferred Schematic is an addition/ renovation project, provide floor plans, including room labels, that clearly identify existing walls to remain, walls to be demolished, and areas of new construction and indicate the percentage of the programmatic space that will remain the same after the proposed project is completed in order for the MSBA to offer more detailed direction on potential eligibility of spaces as part of the review comments of the District's PSR submittal. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged and understood

3) Not provided. In response to these review comments please provide a narrative that describes the reasons for all variances between proposed net and gross areas as compared to MSBA guidelines.

Response:

General Classrooms:

30 General Classrooms are proposed instead of the MSBA standard 21 in order to accommodate the Dedham standard number of 18 students / classroom. Per the MSBA comments on the Core Academic Spaces above, it is our understanding that the MSBA does not object to the proposed number of General Classrooms.

Typical Classrooms have been reduced from 950 nsf to 900 nsf due to inclusion of shared 100 sf teacher planning spaces (50 sf per classroom, for a total of 950 sf / classroom). This strategy allows greater flexibility within each classroom by eliminating the need for a fixed teacher desk, while simultaneously promoting greater collaboration between classroom teachers.

Cohort Commons

3 Cohort commons are proposed, 1 for each grouping of 6 classrooms for grades 3, 4, and 5. Each to serve multiple functions including:

- Collaboration and project-based learning space for students outside of the classroom;
- Increase sense of community and "belonging" within the cohort by provide dedicated common space to each cohort;
- Exhibition space for project-based learning activities; when students see their work displayed, they are demonstrably part of the community and culture of the cohort.

STE Room:

This room will be adjusted to meet MSBA standards

Special Education

Consistent with MSBA guidelines, 4 Self-Contained SPED Classrooms are proposed. 3 are undifferentiated, and 1 is to be outfitted to accommodate medically fragile students. As with all General Classrooms, these 4 Classrooms have been reduced from 950 nsf to

900 nsf due to include of shared 100 sf teacher planning spaces (50 sf per classroom, for a total of 950 sf / classroom). This strategy allows greater flexibility within each classroom by eliminating the need for a fixed teacher desk, while simultaneously promoting greater collaboration between classroom teachers. Making the SPED classrooms as identical to general ed classrooms as possible helps to reduce stigma for students who use the SPED classrooms

The Medically Fragile classroom has a 100 sf bathroom ((larger than the 60 sf MSBA standard) to allow room for a Hoyer lift. The other 3 SPED classrooms do not have bathrooms, in order to allow them to be identical with Gen Ed classrooms, and be interchangeable with other classrooms should the need arise in the future.

In conformance with the unified school’s Educational Program, the space summary proposes a 950 sf OT/PT Room, an IEP Conference Room, a 150 sf Psychiatrist Office, and a 150 sf Guidance Office.

Art and Music

In lieu of 2 art classrooms at 1,000 sf, each with a 150 sf art workroom, the program proposes that one of the Art Room and Workrooms be a 1,200 sf Maker Space. This will allow greater flexibility for project-based learning. For safety, the Maker Space is proposed to be 1,200 sf, which is 50 sf larger than the combined 1,150 sf Art & Workroom it will replace.

Quiet Dining

Consistent with current practice, a 900 sf quiet dining room has been added for the benefit of children who may (or may not) have special needs, to help them self-regulate and otherwise not be overwhelmed by the levels of noise and activity that are inevitable in a Grade 1-5 elementary school.

Lactation Room

A 120 sf Lactation Room has been added as required by Dedham’s union contract

We believe that the incorporation of these strategies into the program will not only result in a very successful school for 550 kids in grades 1-5, but will also be flexible enough to accommodate future changes to our educational methods and needs, so that the building will be successful for decades to come.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.4 EVALUATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

Provide the following Items	Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

1	Confirmation of legal title to the property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Determination that the property is available for development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Existing historically significant features and any related effect on the project design and/or schedule.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Determination of any development restrictions that may apply.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Initial Evaluation of building code compliance for the existing facility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Initial Evaluation of Architectural Access Board rules and regulations and their application to a potential project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Preliminary evaluation of significant structural, environmental, geotechnical, or other physical conditions that may impact the cost and evaluations of alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Determination for need and schedule for soils exploration and geotechnical evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Environmental site assessments minimally consisting of a Phase I: Initial Site Investigation performed by a licensed site professional.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Assessment of the school for the presence of hazardous materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Previous existing building and/or site reports, studies, drawings, etc. provided by the district, if any.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

3) Please note that a Project Notification Form (“PNF”) must be submitted to the Massachusetts Historic Commission (“MHC”) and MHC approval is required prior to construction bids, regardless of whether the local historic commission has determined that the properties associated with this potential project are not listed on any historic registers. The District should keep the MSBA informed of any decisions and/or proposed actions and should confirm that the proposed project is in conformance with Massachusetts General Law 950, CRM 71.00. In response to these review comments, please provide the timeline associated with filing a PNF with the MHC for review and approval.

Response: The project team will file a PNF with the Massachusetts Historic Commission as part of the Schematic Design for the project. The team will keep the MSBA informed of any determinations by the MHC.

4) In response to these review comments, please provide review and respond to the following items:

- *Confirm whether any of the options being further evaluated in the District's PSR submittal will require an Article 97 land disposition or land acquisition by eminent domain.*

Response: None of the properties being further evaluated will require an Article 97 land acquisition. All properties still being evaluated are under the purview of the Dedham School Department.

- *Please ensure that future versions of the project schedule will include dates of anticipated approvals and key steps to gaining full ownership, control, and exclusive use of the proposed site(s), if any.*

Response: We will update the schedule with information as required.

- *Refer to Project Advisory 45 on MSBA's website for additional information related to MSBA requirement for land use.*

Response: The project team will review this Project Advisory.

- *Please note and acknowledge that information associated with future use and/or demolition of other school facilities must be provided in the District's PSR submittal associated with the potential consolidation of students into a single proposed project.*

Response: Acknowledged.

5) The information provided indicates a hydrant flow test is required to determine municipal water supply characteristics. In response to these review comments, please provide the timeline for conducting the hydrant flow test.

Response: The flow test will be scheduled immediately after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection.

5,6) Please note that although the 2015 International Building Code ("IBC") and 2018 International Energy Conservation Code ("IECC") are in effect as the basis for the current 9th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code, a 10th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code based on the 2021 IBC and 2021 IECC (including any MA amendments) is currently scheduled to take effect in the summer of 2023. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged.

7) The information provided in this submittal includes a Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report Feasibility Study Phase for the proposed Town of Dedham's Early Childhood Education Center. This report was prepared by Professional Service Industries, Inc. for KBA Architects on December 1, 2014. The report includes a preliminary evaluation of the following five sites: the Oakdale Elementary School site, Greenlodge Elementary School site, Riverdale Elementary School site, Dexter School site, and Capen Early Childhood Center School site. However, please note Dexter School site is not being considered by the District as part of the Oakdale Elementary School project. In response to these review comments, the Designer should confirm in writing that they have reviewed this information and agree with the findings.

Response: Acknowledged. This information has been reviewed, and the findings are not in dispute. It is anticipated that additional geotechnical / geoenvironmental study may take place after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection, depending upon the site chosen.

Additionally, the information provided states:

“The next phase of study should include subsurface explorations to further define specific subsurface conditions”.

In response to these review comments, please provide additional information that describes how the design team intends to mitigate site development constraints due to the existing soil conditions. Additionally, please provide information associated with the existing conditions of the Striar parcel site.

Response: It is anticipated that additional geotechnical / geoenvironmental study may take place after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection, depending upon the site chosen, and whether the design team's geotechnical and geoenvironmental engineers believe that additional investigation is warranted. It should be noted that the Striar site was formally removed from further consideration by unanimous vote by the SBRC on 4/26/23

8) In response to these review comments, please clarify if additional testing and investigations are required to further understand geotechnical conditions to inform the design and components of the scope and budget. Please confirm that testing will be performed in order to inform the proposed budget at schematic design.

Response: It is anticipated that additional geotechnical / geoenvironmental study may take place after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection, depending upon the site chosen.

9) Please note and acknowledge that costs associated with the removal of fuel storage tanks and associated contaminated soils are considered ineligible for reimbursement.

Response: Acknowledged.

10) *The project team should be aware of the current policies associated with MSBA’s participation in the abatement and removal of hazardous materials. However, please note and acknowledge that all costs associated with the removal of flooring materials and ceiling tiles containing asbestos are considered ineligible for reimbursement.*

Response: Acknowledged.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.5 SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	A narrative describing project requirements related to site development to be considered during the preliminary and final evaluation of alternatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Existing site plan(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

The information provided indicates that the District preliminarily evaluated the following (9) site options for potential development. The following (5) site options denoted with an asterisk () are the options that the District further evaluated as part of the Evaluation of Alternatives:*

- **Option A*:** Oakdale Elementary School site.
- **Option B*:** Greenlodge Elementary School site.
- **Option C*:** Riverdale Elementary School site.
- **Option D*:** Capen Early Childhood Center School site.
- **Option E*:** Striar parcel.
- **Option F:** Paul Park site. *The information provided indicates this site was removed from further consideration because the District determined that the site was too small to accommodate any of the enrollment configurations and it is also located in a densely populated area where traffic and pedestrian congestions would prove problematic.*
- **Option G:** Dolan Center site. *The information provided indicates this site was removed from further consideration due to complexities of converting the current use of the site from recreation to school department operations.*

- *Option H: Whitcomb Woods site. The information provided indicates this site was removed from further consideration because a large portion of the site is wetlands and it is subject to conservation covenants as it is listed as being a land trust.*
- *Option I: Rustcraft Fields/Road site. The information provided indicates this site was removed from further consideration due to a large portion of the site being covered by wetlands and it is a heavily used fields/parks and recreation property.*

1) *In response to these review comments, please review and respond to the following items:*

- *Describe how the site constraints for each site option have impacted the design options explored in the Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives section.*

Response: There are 3 sites associated with the selected Oakdale / Greenlodge Enrollment Option of 550 Students. All have good street access.

Oakdale Site:

There are few site constraints associated with this site. It is relatively large and flat. As such, the primary site considerations which informed the preliminary design options were the zoning setbacks, respect for neighboring residences, safe access for all modes of transportation, and emergency vehicle access. In addition, the need for the existing school to be occupied during construction defined what area of the site was off limits for the new school.

Greenlodge Site:

A sloped site, wetlands, and extensive ledge make Greenlodge challenging to build on. It has less usable open space than Oakdale. Therefore, in addition to the standard site considerations listed above for Oakdale, the preliminary design options were developed to reasonably avoid ledge removal and utilize the flat area of the site. As with Oakdale, the need for the existing school to be occupied during construction defined what area of the site was off limits for the new school.

Capen Site:

A 30' slope separates 2 relatively flat areas. Therefore, in addition to the standard site considerations listed above for Oakdale, design options have been developed to reasonably avoid ledge removal, and utilize the flat area of the site. Unlike Oakdale and Greenlodge sites, there is not an existing school that needs to be occupied during construction, so the entire site could be considered for the new school's location.

- *As part of the District's PSR submittal, describe how the number of onsite parking spaces for staff and visitors will be determined. Describe whether parking will be determined by school needs, after-hours athletic/performance needs, and/or local zoning requirements.*

Response: The number of onsite parking spaces will be a function of school needs and local zoning requirements. With the School Committee's decision to pursue Enrollment 3, the District can now begin to consider staffing patterns and anticipated on-site parking demand to accommodate permanent and itinerant staff. This determination will be made

in close collaboration with the OPM, SBRC, and local zoning board and inspectors.

In addition, provide a timeline associated with the required permits, filings, and reviews discussed in this section. Please acknowledge.

Acknowledged. A timeline for associated permits, filings, and reviews will be included in the PSR submission.

- *As part of the District's PSR submittal, provide building/site section(s) that illustrates how the Preferred Schematic sits on the site and how the proposed location impacts access and circulation. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged and agreed

2) In response to these review comments, provide the following for all existing school sites that will be explored further:

- *Circulation diagrams that identify the existing:*
 - *Bus and parent drop-off/pick-up locations;*
 - *Vehicular and pedestrian circulation; and*
 - *Emergency vehicle access.*

Response: Detailed diagrams will be provided in the PSR after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection.

- *Also, provide diagram(s) and a narrative that describes how a physically challenged individual currently accesses the existing building.*

Response: Detailed diagrams and narrative will be provided in the PSR after the 6/21/23 SBRC vote on the final site selection.

- *As part of the District's PSR submittal, please provide circulation diagrams for all options explored as part of the Final Evaluation of Alternatives.*

Response: These will be provided.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.6 PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Analysis of school district student school assignment practices and available space in other schools in the district	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Tuition agreement with adjacent school districts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Rental or acquisition of existing buildings that could be made available for school use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Code Upgrade option that includes repair of systems and/or scope required for purposes of code compliance; with no modification of existing spaces or their function	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Renovation(s) and/or addition(s) of varying degrees to the existing building(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Construction of new building and the evaluation of potential locations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	List of 3 distinct alternatives (including at least 1 renovation and/or addition option) are recommended for further development and evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

4) *The information provided indicates that the District did not include any Code Upgrade options for the three existing schools included as part of this feasibility study (Oakdale Elementary School, Greenlodge Elementary School, and the Riverdale Elementary School). Please note the District will be required to include a Code Upgrade option for each existing school as part of the PSR submittal for cost comparison purposes. These options should include additional information that identifies the capacity of the existing schools associated with a repair option that does not propose any new construction square footage. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged

7) *As part of the Preliminary Evaluation of Alternatives, the District explored the following (16) options. Please note, this submittal did not conclude with the options the District intends to further develop in the PSR submittal.*

- **Option 1:** *Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 235 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$69.4 million.*

- **Option 2:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 450 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$90.2 million.
- **Option 3:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$103.2 million.
- **Option 4:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 235 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$61.6 million.
- **Option 5:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 450 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$81.9 million.
- **Option 6:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the existing Oakdale Elementary School; with an estimated total project cost of \$94.7 million.
- **Option 7:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the Greenlodge Elementary School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$109.4 million.
- **Option 8:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the Greenlodge Elementary School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$97.7 million.
- **Option 9:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 450 students at the Riverdale Elementary School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$91.3 million.
- **Option 10:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 450 students at the Riverdale Elementary School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$81.4 million.
- **Option 11:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 235 students at the Capen School; with an estimated total project cost of \$69.1 million.
- **Option 12:** Addition/Renovation for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the Capen School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$103.5 million.
- **Option 13:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 235 students at the Capen School; with an estimated total project cost of \$62.8 million.
- **Option 14:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the Capen School site; with an estimated total project cost of \$97.3 million.
- **Option 15:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 235 students at the Striar site; with an estimated total project cost of \$63.1 million.
- **Option 16:** New Construction for grades 1-5 with an enrollment of 550 students at the Striar site; with an estimated total project cost of \$98.4million.

As part of the District's response to these review comments, please provide the options the

District intends to further evaluate as part of its PSR submittal, and provide detailed narratives that describe why options and sites were eliminated from further consideration.

Response:

The SBRC will vote on the single recommended site on 6/21/23. The minutes from that upcoming meeting will be provided to the MSBA as soon as they are available.

To date, sites evaluated and rejected by the SBRC include:

Paul Park: This site is the smallest of those considered and will not accommodate any enrollment size along with necessary site amenities on a par with other schools in the district.

Dolan Center: As a unique valued recreational asset with river frontage and recent parks and rec. investment cannot be replaced in kind. It is an unlikely candidate for a land swap.

Whitcomb Woods: This property is listed as being in a land trust. It also has wetlands issues which appear to limit useable area.

Rustcraft Road: This town-wide recreational center would represent difficulties in process and approvals for a land swap. It is also remote.

Capen - Striar Combined: Concern about access to Striar from Capen given wetland and drainage conditions, and long walk through woods with very young students as a safety concern.

Striar: Safety concerns and the fact that the property is not controlled by the School Department could delay project.

Riverdale: The site of the active Riverdale Elementary School is obviously not an appropriate location for a new Oakdale Greenlodge school

To ensure that the District's feasibility study is sufficiently comprehensive in scope the District must include Code Upgrade Options for each of the three existing schools included as part of this feasibility study (Oakdale Elementary School, Greenlodge Elementary School, and the Riverdale Elementary School) that describes repairs and upgrades required to conform with code. The final evaluation of alternatives shall include at least one viable option for each of the three enrollment options identified in the study enrollment certification, and for the District's preferred enrollment option at least one renovation and/or addition option that maximizes the use of the existing facility. Please acknowledge.

Response: Acknowledged

Additionally, as part of the District's PSR submittal please provide the following information:

- *Floor plan diagrams that include a key/legend for clarity that showcase all the spaces with adjacencies to further understand the connections of the proposed spaces.*

Response: These will be provided

- *Ensure that further detail is provided in the subsequent phases of the project that clearly describes and illustrates the separation, safety provisions, and possible construction laydown areas that will be applied during construction on the occupied site. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged

- *Please continue to use the same naming convention of options. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.7 LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVAL

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Signed Local Actions and Approvals Certification: (original)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Certified copies of the School Building Committee meeting notes showing specific submittal approval vote language and voting results, and a list of associated School Building Committee meeting dates, agenda, attendees and description of the presentation materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

- 2) *Please provide a certified copy of the meeting minutes when available. Please acknowledge.*

Response: Acknowledged. Copies of certified minutes will be provided.

No further review comments for this section.

3.1.8 APPENDICES

Provide the following Items		Complete; <i>No response required</i>	Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Not Provided; <i>District's response required</i>	Receipt of District's Response; <i>To be filled out by MSBA Staff</i>
1	Current Statement of Interest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	MSBA Board Action Letter including the invitation to conduct a Feasibility Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Design Enrollment Certification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MSBA Review Comments:

3) *Please see comment above in Section 3.1.1, Item 3.*

No further review comments for this section.

Additional Comments:

- *Please note that as part of the upcoming Preferred Schematic submittal process, districts and their consultants are required to provide a summary overview of the proposed project to the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (the “FAS”). In preparation, the MSBA requests that the District submit a complete PowerPoint of the FAS presentation with the PSR submittal. For your reference, the guidance memorandum for preparing an FAS presentation is attached.*

Response: We look forward to that meeting

- *The MSBA issues project advisories from time to time, as informational updates for Districts, Owner's Project Managers, and Designers in an effort to facilitate the efficient and effective administration of proposed projects currently pending review by the MSBA. The advisories can be found on the MSBA's website. In response to these review comments, please confirm that the District's consultants have reviewed all project advisories and they have been incorporated into the proposed project as applicable.*

Response: Confirmed

Regarding Past Projects:

- *MSBA records do not indicate previous grants associated with the Oakdale Elementary School, Riverdale Elementary School, or the Greenlodge Elementary School.*

End

**Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
June 7, 2023**

*******DRAFT*******

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert
Stephen Acosta
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant
Cailen McCormick
Christopher Polito
Tara Duncan (absent)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Dr. Ian Kelly, Interim Superintendent
Matthew Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Heather Smith, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (absent)

Meeting Location:

Dedham Middle School Auditorium

School Committee Meeting commenced at 6:30 p.m.

Executive Session – Exemption 3 – To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation

Motion was made to move to Executive Session and return to public session after Executive Session. Motion was approved by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Ms. McCormick was absent from the vote.)

Return to Regular Session (7:00 p.m.)

Pledge of Allegiance

Open Meeting

Mr. Victor Hebert, Chair, called the meeting to order.

RECOGNITIONS

Dr. Linda Kobierski, PK-8 STEM Curriculum Coordinator came to the podium to introduce the winners of the Science Fair and the New England Math League (NEML) awards.

Awards were grouped as follows:

Science Fair awards Grades 3-5

NEML High Scorer awards Grades 4-5

NEML High Scorer awards Grades 6-8.

- Science Fair Award Winners

The Elementary Science Fair included 118 students sharing 60 exhibits that were presented in the Greenlodge gym. Each project was judged using scientific discovery parameters. Judges were chosen from university and industry leaders.

Dr. Kobierski displayed slides with the names and titles of the 2023 Science Fair award winners. Names of the winners were called from each grade (3-5) and grouped by • All Star Scientist • High Honors • Special Recognitions. Each student lined up on stage as their name was called.

- New England Math League High Scorers (Grades 4-8)

Dr. Kobierski explained that each year students participate in the NE Math League (NEML) nationwide problem-solving competition. The students are asked questions that reflect different levels of math expertise.

This year, 213 students from grades 4-8 participated in the NEML and 84 students qualified as high scorers. The competition included eight different counties.

DPS Grade 6-8 rankings:

- Grade 6 ranged 11th across 41 schools,
- Grade 7 ranked 14th out of 47 schools.
- Grade 8 ranked 17th out of 48 schools.
- Grades 6 and Grade 7 ranked 3rd and 4th in the region out of 8 surrounding districts.

Grade 4-5 rankings will be reported at the next School Committee meeting.

NEML Elementary High Scorers (Grades 4-5)

Names of the winners of the competition from Grades 4-5 were announced. Awardees lined up on the stage as their names were called.

NEML Middle School High Scorers (Grade 6-8)

Names of the winners of the competition from Grades 6-8 were announced. Awardees lined up on the stage as their names were called.

- ECEC Retirement Recognitions

Principal Taylor from ECEC came to podium to recognize four long term employees who are retiring this year

- Cheryl Scarsciotti
- Janice O'Connor
- Laurie McGuire
- Sharon Harrington

Ms. Briggs expressed her gratitude to the retirees for working with the youngest learners for so long.

Mr. Hebert expressed how difficult it will be to replace their knowledge and expertise.

Dr. Kelly said that the results we see tonight with our 4th to 8th grades are a tribute to the education experienced by our youngest learners.

- Christine Stec Rockstar Award & Spring Grants – Dedham Education Foundation

April Wilmar, President of the Dedham Education Foundation came to the podium to announce their Spring annual grant recipients. Ms. Wilmar explained that the Dedham Education Foundation raises funds that are converted to grants for specific projects.

Teachers submit grants to the Foundation, applications are reviewed by a board and then candidates are chosen based on the merit of their application.

The Spring grants cycle included the following five grants:

1. Avery School SEL
2. Avery/High School lunch group
3. High School STEM
4. ECEC STEM
5. Oakdale and Avery STEM

Ms. Wilmar reported that over \$38K was distributed for DPS funding this 2023-24 year.

April Wilmar reported that this year a new grant was created to honor Christine Stec. Ms. Stec was an Oakdale 4th grade teacher who passed away recently from cancer. This grant will allow her legacy to live on.

Ms. Wilmar announced that the winner of the inaugural Christine Stec Rockstar Award is Brianna Campo. Ms. Campo was chosen out of 40 nominees. Brianna was part of the 4th grade team who worked closely with Christine Stec. Ms. Wilmar read quotes from the nominations about Ms. Campo's merits and accomplishments. Ms. Campo came to the podium to express her thanks to everyone for their support. Ms. Wilmar said the final group of nominees will receive certificates that will include quotes from their nomination letters.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ryan O'Toole Lincoln St. asked if the School Committee could ensure that the community receives more specifics on the impact the new building will have on neighbors so decisions can be made with community input.

Dedham Public Schools Interim Superintendent's Update


Teaching and Learning



Superintendent's Academic Dinner. On Monday May 22nd we held the District's annual Superintendent's Academic Top 30 Dinner. This was a wonderful opportunity to honor members of the class of 2023 who have demonstrated the very highest levels of academic achievement over their time at DHS.

Class of 2023 Commencement. This Saturday we celebrated the 170 members of the graduating class of 2023 at our annual commencement ceremony. While it was chilly and a little damp, the morning was full of the honor and celebration that our graduates have earned over many years of hard work. Congratulations again to the class of 2023.

Inquiry Journeys Update (Elementary History/Social Sciences). This year's Inquiry Journeys pilot is wrapping up. Feedback from families, students, and teachers has been outstanding and, as a result, implementation of Inquiry Journeys will continue and expand into next school year. 29 teachers have requested to participate! Featured below are a few "kindness rocks" from Ms. Fay's students in 2F. The inquiry question that guided the particular unit that Ms. Kieffner and Ms. Fay taught was: "How do people work together to help their communities?" After learning a great deal about needs and wants, students identified a need in the community and developed an action plan to address the need. As a class, they decided to create "kindness rocks" to spread joy and kindness throughout the school. Students created prototypes on paper before painting their rocks and completed a planning and reflection sheet.



Grade 8 Trip to Washington, D.C. Last Wednesday-Friday, 138 eighth grade students and 16 chaperones traveled to Washington, D.C. This marked a great return for this important field trip after a 3 year hiatus due to COVID. In addition, this is the first year that students were able to see civics in action while also having a year of civics education within the history department. On the trip, students visited all of the important DC highlights: multiple Smithsonian Museums including American History, Natural History, the recently renovated Air and Space, and the Museum of African American History and Culture. In addition, students learned about and visited the various memorials including the Lincoln, Jefferson, FDR, Korean War and Vietnam War. One of the annual highlights is the dinner and dance boat cruise down the Potomac River during sunset! At our visit to Arlington National Cemetery, Dedham had the honor of performing a [wreath laying](#) at the site of Ruth Bader Ginsburg. At the Capitol, Senator Ed Markey took time out of his schedule to meet our students and discuss their educational opportunities here in Massachusetts. And we also had an impromptu meeting with Throughout the trip, DMS students embodied our "3 R's" - being respectful, responsible, and resilient. In fact, multiple fellow travelers and our bus drivers commented on how respectful our students were throughout the trip. And while the travel home may have been challenging due to weather, our students exemplified resilience at the airport and were even happy for the delays

as it extended the trip! We look forward to continuing this tradition for DMS 8th graders.



Visual and Performing Arts



William B. Gould Memorial Dedication. Several DHS band students along with seven 5th graders performed the National Anthem at the William B. Gould Statue Unveiling Ceremony, Sunday, May 29, under the direction of Heather Kirby.

Spring Concerts at DHS and DMS. DHS and DMS presented their Spring Concerts on May 16 and 23, respectively. Each concert featured the chorus, concert band, and jazz band. The high school also featured a string ensemble, in partnership with the Dedham School of Music. Choral directors were Andrew Wray (DMS) and Heather Kirby (DHS), band directors were Kevin Martins (DMS) and Heather Kirby (DHS), jazz band director was Joseph Borsellino, III (DMS & DHS) and string ensemble director was Zoe Chau. Nearly 200 musicians performed in all!

DPS Art Show. On May 25, 2023 that DPS PK- Grade 12 Art show was hosted at the Dedham Middle School. This was by far one of the most well attended art shows in recent memory. There were over 1,000 pieces of student works on display. Thank you to the visual art teachers: Kristin Prata, Sarah Altone, Sarah Olivieri, Bridget O’Leary, Courtney Sousa, Joanna Mears, Amy Vega and Miranda Jang.



Athletics

Track. Senior Catherine Sargent won the MIAA Division 5 Shot Put State Title with a school record throw of 42 feet. In the discus she won the MIAA Division 5 State Title & was the MIAA Meet of Champions Winner. She was named the Tri Valley League Girls Track MVP

MIAA Tournaments:

Softball won a MIAA Div 3 First Round game vs Bishop Stang and are still awaiting their next opponent.

Boys Tennis won a MIAA Div 3 First Round Match vs Hanover before falling to Bedford.

Baseball won a MIAA Div 3 Prelim Game vs Essex North Shore before falling to Weston.

Girls Lacrosse fell to Swampscott in a MIAA Div 3 First Round game.

Girls Tennis Fell to Belchertown in a MIAA Div 3 First Round Match.

Community Engagement

Unified Game Day at ECEC. The ECEC held its first, of hopefully many, Special Olympics Unified Game Days on Thursday, May 25th. The unified athletes have been working with their staff coaches during this school year to learn many skills such as throwing, batting, running, jumping, and most importantly, teamwork!! The students had an opportunity to showcase all they have learned at the Game Day with their classmates, families, staff members, and members of the DHS Unified Basketball Team cheering them on. They ran, they galloped, they threw, and they completed an obstacle course that morning, and all athletes received a medal in a very special ceremony at the conclusion of the games. A huge shout out to Lauren Lydon, ECEC Physical Therapist and Marie Madden, ECEC PE/Wellness teacher for their enthusiasm in organizing and



facilitating such a wonderful event.

Visit to ECEC. On Tuesday, May 30th, the ECEC hosted a visiting team of educators from the Boston Renaissance Charter School. They contacted us with the hopes of learning about our inclusion practices in preschool and kindergarten as they seek to shift their practices in early childhood special education service delivery. The group had a chance to talk to members of our teams and observe 5 of our classrooms.

Management and Operations

DHS Turf Field Replacement. The procurement for the turf field installation firm was completed in May. The firm Field Turf supplied the lowest responsible and responsive bid for completion of the project. Work will begin this week with project staff onsite for a project kick-off meeting, and to provide a project schedule and to start work in removing the old field turf carpet. A more detailed schedule will be available in the weeks ahead. Please note that parking along Recreation Road and at the top of the track/football field will be used for storage of materials for this project.

Summer Capital Projects. A number of capital projects are currently in process for work over the summer. The high school kitchen freezer replacement project has the freezer boxes

ordered, and the assessment of the current electrical systems for possible upgrade is underway. The middle school safety vestibule bid came in near the most recent projection. The initial projected schedule has the vestibule work on site starting in late June with projected completion in mid October. The replacement of the Greenlodge fire panel has received updated quotes and the replacement work is scheduled to begin in early July. The district has more projects that will be discussed after a new Director of Facilities is hired.

COMMENTS on Interim Superintendent's Update

Mr. Polito noted the Art Show that was held last week. He also asked for an update about the interactive exhibit about the Roman Trials. It was reported that the exhibit will be held next week at Town Hall and added to the calendar.

Dr. Flynn Gallant commented on the success of the unified games held at the ECEC. It's special to have High School students supporting the younger kids. She commended Kim Taylor and her teams.

Ms. McCormick asked about the impact of the Turf Field replacement on the summer programming. Dr. Kelly said it will only affect parking and transportation issues. He feels that the functioning of programs will not be affected, but he said they will discuss any issues with the construction contractor.

Mr. Acosta commended the graduation speaker at high school commencement.

Reports/Updates/Requests

- School Improvement Plan Discussion & Vote

Mr. Hebert asked for comments on the School Improvement Plan. He noted that discussion about the plan occurred at the last School Committee meeting.

Motion was made to approve the 2023-25 School Improvement Plan. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

- Discussion & Possible Vote of Enrollment Configuration for New Elementary Building

[Mr. Polito recused himself from the discussion about the Oakdale project due to conflict of interest.]

Dr. Kelly said the School Committee requested him to state his opinion on enrollment. He said his recommendation includes the site choice along with the enrollment recommendation because they are intrinsically linked.

Dr. Kelly's recommendation is for a 550 student enrollment with Oakdale/Greenlodge combination located at the Capen site.

Benefits of the Oakdale/Greenlodge combination:

- Will not disrupt education and preserve outdoor space.
- Larger schools give better chances for flexible groupings. Teachers can be better matched with students.
- Curriculum consistency and continuity because fewer buildings to coordinate across.

- Better preparation for Middle School student adjustment because students will have exposure to department structure.
- Maximizes the number of students who will be able to benefit from new facility
- More professionals under one roof, helps to preserve institutional knowledge and provide more expertise.

Equity Considerations

- Majority of economically disadvantaged students in Dedham are currently located at Riverdale and Avery.
- The combination of Oakdale/Greenlodge allows us to build more equitability.
- Maps were displayed that showed the concentrations of economically disadvantaged areas and the distribution of ELL students.
- The creation of three zones instead of four zones will redistribute equity needs.
- A slide showed the number of students who would be re-zoned. The numbers equal 25% of the overall student population but it is an impact that cannot be avoided in the pursuit of the overall goal of more equitable distribution of ELL and economically disadvantaged students.
- Fiscal considerations slide was shown with MSBA eligible costs vs. Town costs for each site/plan option. Dr. Kelly feels that the recommended plan makes fiscal sense because it maximizes the MSBA reimbursement and energy conservation savings.

Educational top priorities reflected in Community Survey

1. Maintain current class size
2. Access to modern facility
3. Preparation for Middle School
4. Professional learning and collaboration.

Fiscal top priorities reflected in Community Survey:

1. Maximization state funding
2. Sustainable design
3. Understanding potential costs.

Dr. Kelly noted that Option 4 – Oakdale/Greenlodge combination with 550 enrollment, maximizes costs.

Enrollment configuration priorities from Community Survey

- The 550 enrollment choice was preferred
- The 235 enrollment choice was the least favorable.

Site preferences from survey:

- Oakdale #1
- Greenlodge #2
- Capen #3.

Dr. Kelly commented that he feels that the Capen site is best educationally for our students. He showed a table created from survey data that reported ratings by neighborhood.

SCHOOL COMMITTEE COMMENTS about site and enrollment recommendation.

Ms. McCormick commended the SBRC on the community outreach. She asked why it is advantageous to expose EL students to different linguistic populations and experiences.

Dr. Stetson replied that it is important for children to be exposed to different communities and experiences to ensure equal opportunity. It encourages the building of background knowledge and discourse with peers.

Dr. Kelly replied that it's important that the schools reflect the same composition as our community.

Dr. Flynn Gallant commented that there are clear divides in our community. She hopes that the redistricting will help to stimulate equity within the greater community.

Ms. Briggs asked about walkability and transportation.

Dr. Kelly affirmed that this issue has been considered, but more discussion is needed on the subject. One data point was provided that included the current door to door average distance for all individuals is .82 miles. Option 4 increases that average by 1/4 of a mile. Mr. Wells said that the impact on transportation costs is not really fully known yet.

Dr. Kelly confirmed that tonight's discussion is about enrollment, but it's difficult to separate site from enrollment. The enrollment is the purview of the School Committee/Administration and the site decision is the purview of the SBRC.

Ms. McCormick reiterated the magnitude of the decision and said she appreciated the incorporation of the survey results into the final decision.

Mr. Acosta said he is in support of the 550 enrollment plan. The plan allows the most students to take advantage of the newest resources. MSBA funding needs to be optimized now because it may not continue in the future.

Ms. Briggs said when the Town Meeting re-voted the budget, it was clear that they wanted us to find ways to cut costs and carefully evaluate our fiscal choices moving forward. The School Committee needs to continue to make decisions informed by the community.

Mr. Hebert said that the School Committee works in conjunction with the SBRC. He implored the public to reach out to the SBRC or School Committee with questions going forward about the Oakdale Project.

Motion was made to accept the 550 student enrollment plan as recommended tonight by the Interim Superintendent. Motion was approved by a vote of 5-0. (Mr. Polito abstained from the vote due to conflict of interest.)

Subcommittee Assignments – Discussion & Vote

Mr. Acosta asked for clarification on the number of members that were assigned to the Park and Rec and Fields Subcommittees. Ms. Briggs said that it was agreed that one of the designees from the Parks and Rec working group would be chosen to attend the Fields Subcommittee.

Motion was made to approve the subcommittee assignments as presented. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

• Subcommittee Updates

o Budget

Mr. Polito asked about fee increases that were approved to offset the budget. Mr. Wells confirmed that they will be recommending an increase to bus fees and to High School and Middle School technology and sports fees. Also recommending a 10% across the board increase for building rental fees. There have been no increases to building rental fees since 2007. Mr. Wells said the new fee structure will be added to the website and is also available in the folder.

o Communications

This Subcommittee was dissolved.

o Curriculum Advisory

Ms. McCormick said the Curriculum Advisory Subcommittee met last night for the final meeting of the year. She said there are vacancies to fill next year. She also reported that the members got a preview of the new DPS website from Sarah Errickson. The new website will be rolled out in August 2023.

o Policy

No updates

o SBRC

Update provided earlier in the meeting.

o Traffic Circulation

This Subcommittee was dissolved.

o Negotiations

No updates.

o Parks & Recreation

No updates

o Financial Policy

Mr. Polito reported that the Financial Policy subcommittee met with the Select Board and Finance Department and the goal is to have a report from the School Committee by October 2023 for approval.

Donation

Mr. Wells announced that the Endicott Greenhouse donated \$500 to each elementary school grade in Dedham to support agricultural initiatives.

Motion was made to accept the Endicott Greenhouse donation of \$500 to the DPS. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

2 Existing Conditions

2.1 Historic

The 1902 Oakdale School building is not listed on any historic register of the Commonwealth nor National Register.

- email from Town of Dedham Historic Districts commission
- UPDATE - MHC determination dated 8/24/23



----- Forwarded message -----

From: salyman@verizon.net <salyman@verizon.net>

Date: Mon, Jul 24, 2023 at 3:12 PM

Subject: Re: Dedham Historical Commission/Oakdale

To: Phillip Gray <pgray@leviarc.com>

Philip,

Per our telephone conversation this afternoon, I am confirming to you that to the best of my knowledge The 1902 Oakdale School building in Dedham, MA is not listed on any historic register of either the Commonwealth listing or the National Register.

If any use to you, attached please find a copy of a brief history I wrote for use on an earlier Dedham Building tour.

Thank you,

**Stanton A. Lyman, A.I.A. Chairman,
Town of Dedham Historic Districts Commission and Historical Commission
(781) 326-2707**

RECEIVED

AUG 24 2023

950 CMR: OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

MASS. HIST. COMM

RC 73686

APPENDIX A

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
220 MORRISSEY BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MASS. 02125
617-727-8470, FAX: 617-727-5128

PROJECT NOTIFICATION FORM

Project Name: Oakdale Elementary School

Location / Address: 147 Cedar Street

City / Town: Dedham

Project Proponent

Name: Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools, Dedham Public Schools

Address: 100 Whiting Ave

City/Town/Zip/Telephone: Dedham, MA 02026

Agency license or funding for the project (list all licenses, permits, approvals, grants or other entitlements being sought from state and federal agencies).

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Type of License or funding (specify)</u>
Massachusetts School Building Authority	Project Funding - ±47.21% of eligible costs
City of Dedham	Project Funding - Remaining cost of project
Dedham Building Inspector	Approval of proposed site plan
Dedham Planning Board	Approval of proposed site plan
Dedham DPW	Approval of site plan and wastewater design
Dedham Board of Health Inspector	Approval of food service operation
Dedham Fire Department	Approval of site and building plans
Dedham Building Department	Building permit

5/31/96 (Effective 7/1/93) - corrected

After review of MHC files and the materials you submitted, it has been determined that this project is unlikely to affect significant historic or archaeological resources.

950 CMR - 276

RC 73686

Elizabeth Sherva 9/19/23
Elizabeth Sherva Date
Preservation Planner
Massachusetts Historical Commission

950 CMR: OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Project Description (narrative):

The Town of Dedham is participating in a Feasibility Study / Schematic Design study with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). The Study is focused on the development of a solution to resolve the educational space needs for the children of the Oakdale and Greenlodge Elementary Schools.

The original Oakdale school building was constructed in 1902 with additions added in 1955 and 1970. The current facility has 53,500 SF and serves approximately 250 students in grades 1-5. A proposed project will potentially involve the renovation, partial demolition, or full demolition of the Oakdale Elementary School. The Feasibility Study is exploring several options that include additions and renovations to the Oakdale Elementary School or construction of a new school on the Oakdale School site.

Should new construction be selected by the Town of Dedham as their preferred solution, the result would be full or partial demolition of the Oakdale Elementary School.

Does the project include demolition? If so, specify nature of demolition and describe the building(s) which are proposed for demolition.

A proposed project will potentially involve the partial demolition or full demolition of the Oakdale Elementary School. Under a renovation project the 1955 and 1970 additions would be demolished, and the existing 1902 building would have building envelope upgrades, including insulation, window systems and complete replacement of the roof. Interior finishes would be replaced, replacement of ceiling systems, updating fixtures and equipment where warranted. Accessibility and MEP/FP code requirements would be addressed including a new elevator and a new sprinkler and fire alarm system. Several interior walls would need to be removed / added to bring classroom size and configuration up to current MSBA standards.

The alternative options explore the construction of a new school on the existing site. This option would propose the demolition of the existing facility in its entirety. A new facility for grades 1-5 would be approximately 103,000 GSF.

Does the project include rehabilitation of any existing buildings? If so, specify nature of rehabilitation and describe the building(s) which are proposed for rehabilitation.

Under the renovation and addition alternative, the 1902 building would undergo major rehabilitation to bring the building up to current codes. These renovations would include the installation of a 4 story elevator, fully automatic fire suppression system (sprinklers), seismic upgrades to existing partition walls and roof, renovations of all areas to assure ADA / MAAB requirements are met, and renovation to heating, plumbing and electrical systems. Because the original building has essentially no insulation on the building envelope, significant renovation to the exterior walls would be required to meet current energy codes.

950 CMR: OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Does the project include new construction? If so, describe (attach plans and elevations if necessary).

The project would include new construction for all options. Under the renovation option, additions to the existing building would be required to provide MSBA standard sized classrooms appropriately organized for 550 students. The new building options would be constructed on the existing site and the existing facility would be partially or totally demolished to provide space on the site for parking, vehicular circulation, outdoor learning areas, and play space.

To the best of your knowledge, are any historic or archaeological properties known to exist within the project's area of potential impact? If so, specify.

No historic or archaeological properties known to exist within the project's area of potential impact

What is the total acreage of the project area?

Woodland 0 acres	<u>Productive Resources:</u>
Wetland 0 acres	Agriculture 0 acres
Floodplain 0 acres	Forestry 0 acres
Open space 6.1 acres	Mining/Extraction 0 acres Developed 6.9 acres
	Total Project Acreage 6.9 acres

What is the acreage of the proposed new construction? 6.9 acres

What is the present land use of the project area?

The existing land use is for elementary school use within a residential zoning district. This land use will not change.

Please attach a copy of the section of the USGS quadrangle map which clearly marks the project location.

USGS quadrangle map(s) attached.

This Project Notification Form has been submitted to the MHC in compliance with 950 CMR 71.00.

950 CMR: OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Signature of Person submitting this form:



Date: 7/20/23

Name: Philip Gray, AIA

Address: 266 Beacon Street

City/Town/Zip: Boston, MA 02116

Telephone: (617) 437-9458

REGULATORY AUTHORITY

950 CMR 71.00: M.G.L. c. 9, §§ 26-27C as amended by St. 1988,
c. 254.

2.2 Survey/Geotech/Geo-environmental

Survey

UPDATE - A survey of the Oakdale site was finalized 10/25/23. This is an update to the "in progress" survey included in the 8/31/23 report.

The final 10/25/23 survey follows.

Geotechnical

UPDATE - Geotech borings took place on September 18 and 21, 2023. Based on conditions encountered at the site, the ground water level at this site is deeper than the boring depths (22') thus proposed building foundations. The organic-rich topsoil encountered in the top 4' is not suitable bearing strata. All footings shall bear on till or compacted structural fill placed on till. Spread or strip footings where the bearing soil layer is at least 4ft below the ground surface is recommended.

Preliminary Geotechnical Data and Engineering Report 9/25/23 follows.


Geoenvironmental

UPDATE - Geotech borings took place on September 18 and 21, 2023. Based on the initial soil sampling, field screening, and laboratory analysis there are no reportable conditions identified and the soil, where sampled, does not exhibit evidence of contamination.

Geo-Environmental Sampling Results Summary 10/19/23 follows.

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

#147 CEDAR STREET
DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS



SCALE: 1"=80'



LOCUS MAP
NO SCALE

SYMBOL LEGEND	
	CB CATCH BASIN
	DM DRAIN MANHOLE
	GG GAS GATE
	HY HYDRANT
	LP LIGHT POLE
	M MANHOLE
	SM SEWER MANHOLE
	S SIGN
	TP TRAVERSE POINT
	UP UTILITY POLE
	WG WATER GATE

LEGEND	
AC	AIR CONDITIONER
AD	AREA DRAIN
BCB	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE BERM
BCC	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE CURB
BCD	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE DRIVE
BCP	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PATCH
BCW	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE WALK
BRW	BRICK RETAINING WALL
BIT CONC	BITUMINOUS CONCRETE
BOL	BOLLARD
CC	CONCRETE CURB
CLF	CHAIN LINK FENCE
CBIP(FD)	CONCRETE BOUND W/IRON PIPE(FOUND)
CNC/CNC	CONCRETE
CPD	CONCRETE PAD
CSW	CONCRETE SIDEWALK
DYL	DOUBLE YELLOW LINE
ELEC	ELECTRIC
ETW	EDGE OF TRAVELED WAY
EP	EDGE OF PAVEMENT
EBOX	ELECTRIC BOX
EM	ELECTRIC METER
GC	GRANITE CURB
GR	GRASS
MRW	MASONRY RETAINING WALL
MN	MAG NAIL
MU	MULCH
OHW	OVERHEAD WIRES
PA	PLANTED AREA
RBP	REBAR W/ PUNCH
RET	RETAINING
RW	RETAINING WALL
SRW	STONE RETAINING WALL
S	SIGN
SB(FD)	STONE BOUND(FOUND)
SBDH(FD)	STONE BOUND DRILL HOLE(FOUND)
SL	STOP LINE
SWL	SINGLE WHITE LINE
SYL	SINGLE YELLOW LINE
SYL, TRANS	TRANSFORMER
TWS	TACTILE WARNING STRIP
TYP	TYPICAL
UG	UNDERGROUND
UGC	UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
UC	UTILITY COVER
UP	UTILITY POLE
XX" CON/C	CONIFEROUS TREE
XX" DEC/D	DECIDUOUS TREE

PARCEL DATA	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL ID:	141/49A
CURRENT OWNER OF RECORD:	INHABITANTS OF THE TOWN OF DEDHAM
DEED REFERENCES:	BK. 894 PG. 514 BK. 1651 PG. 609 (TAKING) BK. 1652 PG. 79 BK. 1657 PG. 44 BK. 2695 PG. 382 (TAKING)
PLAN REFERENCES:	BK. 894 PG. 514 BK. 1651 PG. 609 BK. 2695 PG. 382
AREA:	6.9 ACRES (+/-)

TRAVERSE POINT TABLE				
POINT #	NORTHING	EASTING	ELEVATION	DESCRIPTION
1	2912687.9597	749755.9739	135.30	MN-SET
2	2912246.3651	750105.9306	141.25	MN-SET
3	2912002.6603	749770.9362	143.96	MN-SET
4	2912487.8161	749889.9270	137.02	MN-SET
5	2911891.9658	749330.0605	134.24	MN-SET
7	2912191.8469	749482.3386	142.30	RBP-SET
12	2912353.8803	749694.7653	146.18	MN-SET

PROJECT BENCHMARK "A":
XCUT SET ON SOUTHERLY HYDRANT
BONNET BOLT ON SOUTHEAST CORNER OF
CEDAR ST AND ALPINE ST INTERSECTION
ELEVATION=138.54 (DATUM: NAVD88)

PROJECT BENCHMARK "B":
RAILROAD SPIKE SET IN NORTHERLY
FACE OF UTILITY POLE #4 ON EASTERLY
SIDE OF MADISON ST
ELEVATION=147.65 (DATUM: NAVD88)

PROJECT BENCHMARK "C":
RAILROAD SPIKE SET IN NORTHERLY
FACE OF UTILITY POLE (NO #) ON
EASTERLY SIDE OF MADISON ST
200' SOUTH OF SHIRETOWN RD
ELEVATION=135.25 (DATUM: NAVD88)

- NOTES:**
- THE ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY ARE BASED ON NAVD 88 DATUM AND WERE GENERATED VIA RTK GPS SURVEY MEASUREMENTS MADE USING LEICA GS18 RECEIVERS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SMARTNET NORTH AMERICA RTK NETWORK.
 - THE COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY ARE BASED ON THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM - MAINLAND ZONE 2001 AS REFERENCED TO THE NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (NAD 83). THE COORDINATES WERE GENERATED VIA RTK GPS SURVEY MEASUREMENTS MADE USING LEICA GS18 RECEIVERS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SMARTNET NORTH AMERICA RTK NETWORK.
 - SITE IMPROVEMENTS & TOPOGRAPHY SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED ON AN ON-THE-GROUND INSTRUMENT SURVEY PERFORMED BY WELCH ASSOCIATES LAND SURVEYORS, INC. BETWEEN JULY AND OCTOBER 2023.
 - PROPERTY & STREET LINES SHOWN HEREON ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE/ORIENTATION ONLY. WELCH ASSOCIATES LAND SURVEYORS, INC. HAS NOT PERFORMED A FULL PROPERTY LINE RETRACEMENT AS PART OF THIS SURVEY.
 - CIRCLED LOT NUMBERS ARE TOWN OF DEDHAM ASSESSOR'S LOT IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS.
 - UNDERGROUND UTILITY LOCATIONS AS SHOWN HEREON ARE TAKEN FROM AVAILABLE RECORD AND FIELD INFORMATION AND ARE APPROXIMATE ONLY. SCOPE OF UNDERGROUND UTILITY SURVEY WORK WAS LIMITED TO SEWER & DRAIN LINES AT WEST SIDE OF PROPERTY. CONTACT DIG-SAFE BEFORE PLANNING ANY CONSTRUCTION.
 - INVERTS, PIPE SIZES, AND PIPE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR SANITARY SEWER AND STORM DRAIN SYSTEMS, AS SHOWN HEREON, WERE DETERMINED BY INSPECTION AND MEASUREMENTS PERFORMED AT GROUND SURFACE LEVEL (STRUCTURES WERE NOT PHYSICALLY ENTERED). THE RESULTS OF THE INSPECTIONS AND MEASUREMENTS MAY VARY FROM ACTUAL CONDITIONS AS COULD BE DETERMINED BY EXCAVATION OR USE OF CONFINED SPACE ENTRY PERSONNEL AND/OR EQUIPMENT.
 - THIS PLAN IS COPYRIGHT PROTECTED. IT IS A VIOLATION OF COPYRIGHT LAWS TO EDIT THIS PLAN AND CONTINUE TO REPRESENT IT AS THE ORIGINAL WORK OF WELCH ASSOCIATES LAND SURVEYORS, INC.. IT IS ALSO A VIOLATION OF COPYRIGHT LAWS FOR ANYONE TO REPRESENT THIS PLAN AS THEIR OWN ORIGINAL WORK, WITH OR WITHOUT EDITING.

OCTOBER 25, 2023
DATE



PAMELA M. WELCH AS AGENT FOR WELCH ASSOCIATES LAND SURVEYORS, INC.
REGISTRATION NUMBER 36129


WELCH Associates Land Surveyors, Inc.
218 North Main Street
West Bridgewater, MA 02379
(508) 580-4696
WWW.WELCHINC.COM

SCALE: AS NOTED

SHEET 1

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
147 CEDAR STREET
DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
(NORFOLK COUNTY)
Prepared for:
JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECT

ACAD FILE: D230702T CAD: JLL DATE: OCTOBER 2023



141/21
N/F
JOSEPH &
LESLIE POULIOT
BK. 21846 PG. 169

141/20
N/F
MARK K. &
LAURIE M. GALLAGHER
BK. 8313 PG. 35

141/19
N/F
MARC R. &
CHRISTINE H. STONIER
BK. 33825 PG. 90

141/18
N/F
JAMES M. &
RUTH A. LOUGHRAN
BK. 37660 PG. 168

OAKDALE
ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL
141/49A


CEDAR STREET

MADISON STREET



ALPINE ST.

QUINCY AVE

WELCH
Associates Land
Surveyors, Inc.
218 North Main Street
West Bridgewater, MA 02379
(508) 580-4696 FAX: (508) 580-4962
WWW.WELCHINC.COM



TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
147 CEDAR STREET
DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
(NORFOLK COUNTY)
Prepared for:
JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECTS
ACAD FILE: D230702T CAD: JLL DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2021



141/25
 N/F
 AINAT KOREN
 TRUST
 BK. 38331 PG. 505

141/26
 N/F
 RYAN M. &
 SHANNON F. O'TOOLE
 BK. 32345 PG. 437

141/24
 N/F
 CAITLIN & TERENCE
 S. CLARKE
 BK. 38251 PG. 300


141/23
 N/F
 THOMAS & MARSHA
 CAWLEY
 BK. 13549 PG. 298

141/22
 N/F
 KIMBERLY B.
 RUTHERFORD
 BK. 17429 PG. 172


141/21
 N/F
 JOSEPH &
 LESLIE POULIOT
 BK. 21846 PG. 169

141/20
 N/F
 MARK K. &
 LAURIE M. GALLAGHER
 BK. 8313 PG. 35

**OAKDALE
 ELEMENTARY
 SCHOOL**
 141/49A



WELCH
Associates Land
Surveyors, Inc.
 218 North Main Street
 West Bridgewater, MA 02379
 (508) 580-4696 FAX. (508) 580-4962
 WWW.WELCHINC.COM



TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
 OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 147 CEDAR STREET
 DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
 (NORFOLK COUNTY)
 Prepared for:
JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECTS
 ACAD FILE: D230702T CAD: JLL DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2023
 SHEET 4 OF 4



141/63
 N/F
 ANNE S. HELLER
 L.C.T. CERT. 196812

141/43
 N/F
 ANDREW & MARISA A.
 PODOLSKI
 L.C.T. CERT. 189886

141/42
 N/F
 SERINA T. RICHARDS
 L.C.T. CERT. 194244

141/29
 N/F
 MICHAEL J. &
 MAUREEN P. GREENWOOD
 BK. 13823 PG. 588

141/28
 N/F
 CHRISTOPHER FLINN
 LIVING TRUST &
 SUSAN FLINN LIVING
 TRUST
 BK. 40730 PG. 446

141/27
 N/F
 JEANNE P.
 ANDERSON
 TRUST - 2017
 BK. 35334 PG. 279

141/150
 N/F
 TOWN OF DEDHAM
 BK. 2695 PG. 382
 (SUBJECT TO EASEMENT
 BK. 28475 PG. 18)

141/26
 N/F
 RYAN M. &
 SHANNON F. O'TOOLE
 BK. 32345 PG. 437

141/25
 N/F
 AINAT KOREN
 TRUST
 BK. 38331 PG. 505

**Preliminary Geotechnical Data and
Engineering Report**

**Oakdale Elementary School
147 Cedar Street
Dedham, MA 02026**



Prepared for

Mr. Philip Gray
Jonathan Levi Architects
266 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02116

Prepared by

Reliance Engineers
30 Yarmouth Road
Wellesley Hills, MA 02481

25 September 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Site Description	1
1.2	Project Description and Proposed Construction.....	2
1.3	Site Geology	2
2.	GEOTECHNICAL FIELD PROGRAM AND LABORATORY TESTS.....	3
2.1	Reliance Engineers Geotechnical Borig	3
2.2	Reliance Engineers Laboratory Testing	4
3.	SITE AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	5
3.1	Existing Site and Adjacent Buildings.....	5
3.2	Flood Zone.....	5
3.3	Subsurface Soil Conditions	5
3.4	Groundwater Conditions.....	6
3.5	Laboratory Test Results.....	6
4.	FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS	7
4.1	Design Groundwater Level and Base Flood Elevation	7
4.2	Preliminary Recommended Engineering Properties for Soil	7
4.3	Depth of Frost.....	7
4.4	Prelim. Recommended Foundation System and Anticipated Settlements ..	8
4.5	Seismic Design Considerations	8
4.6	Preliminary Design Lateral Earth Pressures and Retaining Wall Design ...	8
5.	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS.....	10
5.1	Earthwork, Subgrade Preparation, and Dewatering	10
5.2	Impact on Adjacent Structures	11
5.3	Additional Subsurface Investigations	11
5.4	Field Monitoring During Construction.....	11
6.	CLOSURE	13

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Summary of N-values v. Depth from Current Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation
- Table 2: Summary of N-values v. Elevation from Current Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation
- Table 3: Recommended Preliminary Design Soil Engineering Properties for Foundation Design

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: Project Location Plan (from USGS Norwood Quadrangle, MA, 2021)
- Figure 2: USGS Norwood Sheet, MA, 1958
- Figure 3: USGS Dedham Sheet, MA, 1894
- Figure 4: 1851 Map of the Town of Dedham, MA by Smith and Walling
- Figure 5: Town of Framingham Assessor's Data
- Figure 6: Aerial Photograph of the Project site (from www.bing.com)
- Figure 7: Location of the Proposed Building
- Figure 8: Bedrock Geologic Map of Massachusetts
- Figure 9: Surficial Geologic Map of the Norwood Quadrangle [Stone & DiGiacomo-Cohen, 2018, Scientific Investigations Map 3402]
- Figure 10: Approximate Boring Locations at Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, MA (Field Program: 18 & 21 August 2023)
- Figure 11: Flood Insurance Rate Map (July 7, 2014, Map Numbers 25017C0516F)

LIST OF APPENDICES

- | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| Appendix A | Boring Logs |
| Appendix B | Laboratory Test Results |
| Appendix C | Current Site Topographic Survey |

1. INTRODUCTION

This project involves partial demolition of the existing Oakdale Elementary School building and the construction of a new two to three-story school building within the existing grassed field located at 147 Cedar St, Dedham Massachusetts. The general project location is shown on Figure 1. Reliance Engineers was contracted by Jonathan Levi Architects to perform geotechnical services and provide foundation recommendations for the proposed building in accordance with our proposals dated 13 July 2023.

Based on review of site history, geology, and the current proposed building design, this Reliance Engineers-supervised preliminary field program was performed on the 18th and 21st of August 2023. Eight geotechnical borings (RB-1 to RB-5¹ and RB-7 to RB-9) with SPT sampling were performed under this preliminary geotechnical field investigation program. This report, prepared by Lucy C. Jen, Ph.D., P.E. summarizes our documentation of geotechnical subsurface conditions encountered during the field program, laboratory test results, existing background site information, and our preliminary foundation recommendations² for this project.

1.1 Site Description

USGS topographic maps from 2021, 1958, 1894 are included as Figures 1, 2, and 3 respectively. As shown on these topographic maps, the project site is approximately 1 mile east of Wigwam Pond and about ½ mile northeast of Endicott station in the Town of Dedham, Massachusetts. The topographic maps indicate the existing school is located close to the top of local hills in the Oakdale neighborhood. 1851 Map of the Town of Dedham (Figure 4) shows the area was a wooded, undeveloped area in 1851.

The Town of Dedham Assessor's records show the Oakdale Elementary School is on parcel 100248, which is approximately 6.9 acres (see Figure 5). As shown on recent aerial photograph of the school (Figure 6), Oakdale Elementary School is bounded by residential neighborhoods on all sides, and includes two baseball fields, a playground, and large trees lining the northern perimeter of the parcel.

¹ RB-6 was marked in the field but not drilled due to uncertainty/concerns in the locations of existing underground utilities.

² Environmental site characterization/geoenvironmental engineering issues are beyond the scope of this study and not addressed in this report nor by Reliance Engineers.

1.2 Project Description and Proposed Construction

The original school building has served the Dedham community for close to 120 years. The existing main Oakdale Elementary School Building, facing Cedar Street, is a three-story brick building constructed in 1904 located at the highest point of the original lot at the time of construction. Additions, likely constructed in 1952, were built along Madison Street yielding a total gross area of 62,508 SF. The current topographic survey of the site is included as Appendix C. The grassed area, on the eastern side of the parcel, is relatively flat (sheets 3 and 4 in Appendix C), sloping downwards from northeast (El. 140 to E. 145) to southwest (El. 134 to El. 142). Along Madison Street, the grassed fields are approximately 3 to 4 ft above the street level. Along the western of the northern boundary, the grassed area is 3 to 4 ft lower than the neighboring northern parcels. Based on the exiting grading, previous earthwork, with localized excavation and fill placement, likely took place at the fields/proposed building site.

The current design shows the proposed new building to be located to the west of the existing buildings (see Figure 7) with the proposed new two to three-story building occupying the current grassed field area. No below grade level/basement is anticipated for the proposed new building. The eastern tip of the new building extends to nearly the west face of the one-story addition with the western tip ending near the termination of Monroe St. The proposed ground level slab elevation has not been defined at the time of this report. This geotechnical investigation and evaluation address the foundation needs of the proposed new building located in the existing field as shown in Figure 7.

1.3 Site Geology

The bedrock geologic map (Figure 8) indicates that bedrock below Dedham generally consists of granite (Zdgr, Zwgr). At the Oakdale school site, Cambridge Argillite may be present. Like most of eastern Massachusetts, this area is characterized as highly faulted terrane. A N-S trending fault is mapped on the bedrock geologic map and it bisects in the vicinity of the project site (Figure 8) with unknown sense of fault movement.

The surficial geologic map (Figure 9) indicates the site is underlain by glacial till deposits consisting of sand with silt, little clay, and scattered pebbles, cobbles, and boulders. Some areas of till are more compacted than others due to subglacial deposition.

2. GEOTECHNICAL FIELD PROGRAM AND LABORATORY TESTS

The geotechnical field program to characterize the site is based on the dimensions and orientation of the proposed building footprint. Locations of borings, based on field tape measurements, at the site are shown in Figure 10. Logs from the borings including soil descriptions and photographs are included as Appendix A. Note that RB-6, located close to the existing 1-story 1952 addition, was not drilled due to insufficient information regarding existing underground utilities.

The Reliance Engineers geotechnical field program was conducted on the 18^h and 21st of August 2023. Eight geotechnical borings, (RB-1, RB-2, RB-3, RB-4, RB-5, RB-7, RB-8, RB-9) extending to depths of 21.9', 9', 17', 10.4', 16.5', 8.3', 12', 15.6' respectively, were completed in this two-day program. These eight borings were drilled by Northern Drill Services from Northborough, Massachusetts using a tracked Mobile B-53 rig and 3-1/4" hollow stem auger.

Approximate locations³ of the completed boring are shown on Figure 10. Borings RB-1 and RB-2 are located along the northwestern extent of the proposed building in the grassed area north of the existing baseball infield; the other borings are located with sequentially increasing numbers going counterclockwise around the perimeter of the proposed building footprint, ending at RB-9 back near the northwestern part of the site. Boring RB-6 was marked on the east side of the site but not drilled due to concerns regarding existing subsurface utilities and underground storage tank location.

2.1 Reliance Engineers Geotechnical Borings

All eight borings (RB-1, RB-2, RB-3, RB-4, RB-5, RB-7, RB-8, RB-9) were advanced using hollow stem auger. Standard Penetration Test (SPT) sampling in soil were performed in accordance with ASTM D1586 using a 140-lb automatic hammer with maximum sampling interval of 5 feet. Soil samples were collected, placed in glass jars, and are currently stored in Reliance Engineers' office in Wellesley, Massachusetts. Two bulk samples from RB-2 and RB-5 were collected from auger flights for laboratory testing. Boring logs for the eight borings are included as Appendix A.

³ The approximate locations are based on field measurements (by Reliance Engineers staff) of boring locations relative to fixed landmarks/references at the site.

2.2 Reliance Engineers Laboratory Testing

The wo bulk samples from borings RB-2 and RB-5 were collected and submitted to TerraSense of Totowa, NJ for sieve analysis (ASTM D6913). Results of the sieve analyses are included as Appendix B.

3. SITE AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

3.1 Existing Site and Adjacent Buildings

Figures 6 and 10 show aerial photographs of the project site and the adjacent neighborhoods. The western edge of the proposed new school building is approximately 40-ft from the western property line. The northern edge of the building is about 20-ft from the northern property line. The non-street-adjacent property lines are marked by an existing chain link fence, with large trees (about 60-ft tall) growing along most of the fence. The property slopes downhill, with the street side to the southwest being the lowest side of the property.

3.2 Flood Zone

Figure 11 shows the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map covering this area (massgis.gov). This map indicates that this site is outside special flood hazards areas subject to inundation by the 1% annual chance of flood as well as the 0.2% annual chance of flood area.

3.3 Subsurface Soil Conditions

Boring logs for the eight Reliance Engineers geotechnical borings are included as Appendix A.

Summary of the N-values versus depth from the eight Reliance Engineers borings are tabulated as Table 1. Table 2 includes the same N-values data but tabulated versus elevation and sorted by boring location. The subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations consist of topsoil/fill and glacial till of varying relative density. The top of rock was not encountered at all boring locations; subsequently, rock coring was not performed as part of this investigation. Consistent with the surficial geologic map, the subsurface conditions are relatively homogeneous.

The *topsoil/fill* stratum consists of moist dark brown m-f sand with silt and organics. Topsoil is present for borings located in grassed areas and extends in most borings to about 2-ft depth but reached up to 7-ft at RB-3. The N-values range from 4 to over 20 blows per foot.

Glacial till was encountered below the topsoil/fill for all borings. Till deposits consist of light brown to gray medium to fine sand with various amounts of silt and gravel. The upper till appears to be less dense, with N-values ranging from 37 to over 100 blows per foot. Deeper, denser deposits have SPT blow counts over 200 blows per foot. Photographs of material recovered in the SPT sampler are included on respective boring logs in Appendix A.

Visual-manual descriptions of the soil were made in accordance with ASTM D2488. The relative amount by dry weight of minor components is identified by the following terms in accordance with Note 16 of ASTM D2488:

- Trace – < 5%
- Few – 5 to 10%
- Little – 15 to 25%
- Some – 30 to 45%
- Mostly – > 50%

3.4 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater measurements were not taken at the site as the water table was not encountered during this geotechnical investigation. It is likely that the water table is deeper than 22 ft because the deepest till deposits were found to be dry upon sampling. Given the presence of very dense till, presence of perched water table should be anticipated, especially after rainstorms.

3.5 Laboratory Test Results

Results of geotechnical laboratory tests performed by TerraSense are presented in Appendix B.

The bulk sample from RB-2 (collected 5' to 10' below the ground surface from auger flights) is described as gray silty gravel with sand. The presence of organic materials were noted in this sample likely caused material from shallower stratum.

The bulk sample from RB-5 (collected from 10 to 15' below the ground surface from auger flights) is a gray silt and sand with few gravels.

4. FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The design and construction for the proposed structure should be completed in accordance with the 9th edition of the Massachusetts Building Code. Specific design recommendations for the proposed foundation system are presented below.

4.1 Design Groundwater Level and Base Flood Elevation

Based on conditions encountered at the site, the ground water level at this site is deeper than boring depths thus could not be defined. Based on the FEMA flood map, the site is not at risk of flooding. For design, temporarily perched water table at the top of till is likely due to the impermeable nature of the existing till. Sufficient drainage should be provided to minimize the likelihood of accumulation of groundwater abutting structures due to perched water table.

4.2 Preliminary Recommended Engineering Properties for Soil

Recommended preliminary engineering properties for the topsoil and glacial till strata at the site are summarized in Table 3.

The organic-rich topsoil is not suitable bearing strata therefore no recommended allowable bearing values are given in Table 3. Bottom of topsoil/fill varies across the site but is generally within the top 4 ft. At RB-3, the looser topsoil/fill was found to be more than 7 ft.

All footings shall bear on till or compacted structural fill placed on till. The allowable net bearing pressures for footings bearing on till is 4 TSF for footing widths of 3 to 5 feet. For deeper footings, higher allowable net bearing pressure is likely; however, such an evaluation should be performed individually since the value depends on depth as well as footing location.

For compacted structural fill, meeting material specification and compaction requirement described in Section 5.1, the recommended soil properties are included in Table 3. The allowable net bearing pressure is expected to change and would depend on the material below the compacted structural fill and thickness of the compacted structural fill. Such an evaluation should be performed for individual cases.

4.3 Depth of Frost

All foundations bearing on soil shall be constructed at a minimum depth of 4' feet below the finished ground surface for frost protection.

4.4 Preliminary Recommended Foundation System and Anticipated Settlements

As stated in Section 4.2, the topsoil is not suitable bearing strata. Suitable bearing strata at this site are the glacial till deposits below the topsoil, and if topsoil is encountered at depth, it should be replaced with compacted structural fill (see Section 5.1). Considering that the current ground surface varies between El. 144.5 and El. 138, we recommend that the proposed building be supported on spread or strip footings where the bearing soil layer is at least 4-ft below the ground surface. The footings should be at least 3-ft wide and bear on the natural glacial till with a maximum allowable net bearing pressure of 4 TSF. Interior footings should be founded at least 18 inches below the bottom of the floor slab. The tops of all footings should be at least 6 inches below the bottom of the overlying floor slab. Based on the borings conducted, bedrock was not encountered. The anticipated footing settlement is less than 1-inch.

Utilities

The locations of the proposed utilities are not yet defined. The utility trenching will likely extend into the till stratum. Considerations should be given to minimize perched water table within the utility trenches given the likely low permeability of the existing till.

4.5 Seismic Design Considerations

In accordance with Chapter 20 of ASCE 7-10 “Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures” and subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations, the site is categorized as Site Class C. The SPT N values, soil type, and the location of the water table in the vicinity suggest that bearing materials encountered at the boring location are not susceptible to liquefaction based on Figure 1806.4c of the Massachusetts Building Code.

4.6 Preliminary Design Lateral Earth Pressures and Retaining Wall Design

Design lateral earth pressures for the at-rest and active cases corresponding to the various materials encountered at the site are summarized in Table 3. Drainage system should be installed behind the retaining wall and foundation wall to allow drainage through or around the wall and avoid built up of full and/or differential hydrostatic head behind the wall. Clean-outs, with recommended lateral spacing of 30 feet, should be provided to allow flushing of the retaining wall and foundation wall drainage systems. Continuous crushed stones with minimum cross sections 2-foot width and 1-foot depth extending minimum of 8-in beyond edge of footing can be use as substitute for perimeter drainage pipes adjacent to perimeter strip footings. Trees with potential height of more than 7 feet shall be planted beyond the zone of

influence of the retaining wall defined as horizontal distance from the back side of the wall equal to height above the exposed base of the wall plus 2 ft. If the wall consists of geotextiles or geogrids, the back side of the soil-reinforced wall is defined as the extent of the reinforced soil (i.e. extent of the geotextile or geogrids).

5. CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed project site is located within the existing Oakdale Elementary School in Dedham, Massachusetts. Figures 6 and 10 include aerial photographs of the site as well as the surrounding neighborhoods. The surrounding neighborhood is residential. Prospective contractors for this project must evaluate potential construction and traffic issues associated with their anticipated construction means and methods based on their own knowledge, experience, as well as local regulations in the area. This section provides a summary of important aspects related to the proposed geotechnical construction activities.

5.1 Earthwork, Subgrade Preparation, and Dewatering

The site is located within the Oakdale Elementary School campus in Dedham, Massachusetts. The site is accessible through residential streets off I-95 through the Town of Dedham. All activities at this site shall conform to project, local, and state ordinances governing constructions. The Contractor should note and be familiar with the required notification procedures, administrative orders, sedimentation and erosion control, disposal facilities requirements, traffic controls, and special conditions associated with this site.

This report focuses on geotechnical design issues associated with the proposed construction. Environmental issues are beyond the scope of this report and are not addressed in this report; however, the Contractor is reminded that chemical testing will be required for excavated material and soil spoils that are designated for offsite disposal as well as imported fill to be placed on site. No chemical testing was performed as part of this investigation.

The new foundations shall be footings bearing on the existing till deposits that has been proof-rolled or compacted structural fill placed above native till that has been proof-rolled.

Structural fill material, if used, shall consist of granular inert material that is hard, durable stone and coarse sand, free of excess moisture, frozen lumps, roots, sod, trash, metal, plastic, clay, and other deleterious materials and conforming to the following specifications:

Maximum particle size:

3 inches	100%
Sieve 1/2" (12.5 mm)	50 – 85% passing
Sieve #4 (4.75 mm)	40 – 75% passing
Sieve #50 (300 μm)	8 -28% passing
Material passing #200 sieve (75μm)	5% max.

Materials that break up when alternately frozen and thawed or wetted and dried should not be used. The material shall be placed and compacted in lift thickness not exceeding 8 inches. Material placed in all lifts shall be compacted to at least 95 percent of the maximum density as determined by ASTM 1557 using modified effort. For earthwork construction activities performed during freezing conditions, proper measures should be implemented to minimize penetration of frost in soil beneath foundations and slabs. Geogrids, Mirafi BXG 120 or similar, placed on 16" intervals can be used below areas minimizing differential settlement is desired.

Remnants of abandoned underground structures, such as basement and foundation elements are not anticipated within the new building footprint but may be encountered during the construction of the foundation systems. Existing and abandoned buried utilities can be expected below the proposed building footprint. It is anticipated that removal of these obstructions, if necessary, can be accomplished using conventional heavy earth-moving equipment.

The proposed new foundation is not expected to extend below the general groundwater level but surface runoff should be addressed. For those foundation construction activities to be performed in-the-dry, such as earthwork, if necessary, construction dewatering should be accomplished by the Contractor using methods such as open pumping from sumps, temporary ditches and trenches, and general site grading. All discharge shall comply with the local and state regulations.

5.2 Impact on Adjacent Structures

Given the current building layout under consideration, extent of earthwork, and proximity of neighboring structures, the proposed construction activities may cause minor architectural/cosmetic damage to negligible impact on neighboring structures. Nevertheless, construction-related vibration should be limited and should be monitored. Minimum of five vibration monitoring points are recommended with locations to be determined depending on construction activities. It is recommended that pre-construction surveys be performed for residential buildings abutting the proposed building site. Noise and dust control shall be within City limits as well as limits defined by the Project.

5.3 Additional Subsurface Field Investigations

The current geotechnical field investigation and assessment provide foundation recommendations for the preliminary design of the proposed buildings. Additional borings are recommended as the proposed building design progresses to the final design phase.

5.4 Field Monitoring During Construction

We recommend that Reliance Engineers be retained and involved during foundation construction to provide the following services:

- Provide and review the final plans and specifications to verify that the geotechnical recommendations included in this report are incorporated as intended.
- Review contractor submittals related to foundation design, support of excavation design, and construction.
- Monitor earthwork, surcharge, and other activities associated with the construction of foundation elements.

Our involvement during construction will allow us to (1) document the compliance of the construction with design recommendations, specifications, and building code, (2) identify changes in subsurface conditions different from those described in this report, i.e. prior to the start of the construction, and (3) provide timely design modifications in response to field conditions.

6. CLOSURE

The recommendations presented in this report are based on data obtained from the referenced geotechnical borings and may not capture the exact nature and extent of variations between the completed borings. Reliance Engineers should be notified if subsurface conditions uncovered during construction deviate significantly from the conditions described in this report, and modifications or re-evaluations of the design recommendations may be necessary to reflect the actual field conditions.

This report has been prepared for the proposed Oakdale Elementary School in Dedham as described in Section 1.2. Reliance Engineers should be informed of the final design and location of the foundation elements associated with the building (such as foundation loadings, slab loadings, column configurations, retaining wall design, finished floor elevation, and bus ramp geometry and location) prior to issuing the final bid and contract documents. This will allow us to review the final design, verify if the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are still valid, and make design modifications, if necessary.

TABLES

TABLE 1– Summary of N-values v. Depth from Current Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation

Reliance Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation at Oakdale School, Dedham, MA Performed by Northern Drill Services									
Date Completed	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/21/2023	N/A	8/21/2023	8/21/2023	8/21/2023
BoB (ft)	21' 11"	9'	17'	10' 5"	16' 6"		8' 4"	12'	15' 7"
WT depth (ft)	--	--	--	--	--		--	--	--
WT El (ft)	--	--	--	--	--		--	--	--
Surf El (ft)	139.5	138.5	138	139.5	143		144.5	141.5	140
Depth (ft)	RB-1	RB-2	RB-3	RB-4	RB-5	RB-6	RB-7	RB-8	RB-9
0									
1	13	5	21	32	8		10	16	52
2									
3									
4									
5									
6	37	97	3	38	196		140	72	55
7									
8			54				100/4"		96
9		50/0"					BoB@8'4"		
10		BoB@9'		100/5"					
11	90		47	BoB@10'5"	108			136	131
12								BoB@12'	
13									
14									
15									75/1"
16	80		86		179				BoB@15'7"
17			BoB@17'		BoB@16'6"				
18									
19									
20									
21	119								
22	Bob@21'11"								
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28		Black	Top soil/Fill						
29		Blue	Till						
30									
31									
32									

TABLE 2– Summary of N-values v. Elevation from Current Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation

Reliance Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation at Oakdale School, Dedham, MA Performed by Northern Drill Services									
Date Completed	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/18/2023	8/21/2023	N/A	8/21/2023	8/21/2023	8/21/2023
BoB (ft)	21' 11"	9'	17'	10' 5"	16' 6"		8' 4"	12'	15' 7"
WT depth (ft)	--	--	--	--	--		--	--	--
WT El (ft)	--	--	--	--	--		--	--	--
Surf El (ft)	139.5	138.5	138	139.5	143		144.5	141.5	140
Elevation (ft)	RB-1	RB-2	RB-3	RB-4	RB-5	RB-6	RB-7	RB-8	RB-9
145									
144							10		
143									
142					8				
141								16	
140									
139	13			32			140		52
138		5							
137			21		196		100/4"		
136							BoB@El136.2'	72	
135									
134	37			38					55
133		97							
132			3		108				96
131								136	
130		50/0"	54	100/5"				BoB@El.129.5'	
129	90	BoB@El129.5'		BoB@El129'					131
128									
127			47		179				
126					BoB@El126.5'				
125									75/1"
124	80								BoB@124.4'
123									
122			86						
121			BoB@El121'						
120									
119	119								
118	BoB@El117.6								
117									
116									
115		Black	Top soil/Fill						
114		Dark Blue	Till						
113									

TABLE 3 – Recommended Preliminary Design Soil Engineering Properties for Foundation Design

Engineering Properties	Existing Top Soil	Existing Till	Compacted Structural fill or ¾" crushed stones
Total Unit Weight (γ_t)	115 pcf	130 pcf	130 pcf
Passive Lateral Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_p)	2.88	3.5	3.5
At-rest Lateral Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_0)	0.52	0.44	0.44
Active Lateral Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_a)	0.347	0.28	0.28
Friction Angle (ϕ')	29°	34°	34°
c (psf)	0	0	0
Allowable Net Bearing (for footing widths between 3 and 5 feet)	---	4 TSF	#

Allowable bearing depends on underlying stratum.

FIGURES

Project Site
Oakdale School, 147 Cedar Street, Dedham, MA 02026




FIGURE 1 – Project Location Plan (from USGS Norwood Quadrangle, MA, 2021)






FIGURE 2 - USGS Norwood Sheet, MA, 1958





FIGURE 3 – USGS Dedham Sheet, MA, 1894






FIGURE 4 – 1851 Map of the Town of Dedham, Massachusetts (Smith & Walling)

Building Photo



(<https://images.vgsi.com/photos/DedhamMAPhotos//00\01\43\60.jpg>)

Building Layout



(https://images.vgsi.com/photos/DedhamMAPhotos//Sketches/100248_955)

Building Sub-Areas (sq ft)			Legend
Code	Description	Gross Area	Living Area
BAS	First Floor	31,908	31,908
FUS	Upper Story, Finished	7,800	7,800
SFB	Base, Semi-Finished	7,800	6,240
TQS	Three Quarter Story	7,800	5,850
CAH	Cathedral Ceiling	7,200	0
		62,508	51,798

Property address: 147 Cedar Street
 PID: 100248
 Book/Page: 2695/0382
 Land Acreage: 300564 SF

Building Type: School-Public
 Year Built: 1902
 Living Area: 51,798 SF
 Basement Area: 0

FIGURE 5 -Town of Dedham Assessor's Data (<https://gis.vgsi.com/DedhamMA/Parcel.aspx?pid=100248>)




FIGURE 6 – Aerial Photograph of the Project Site (from www.bing.com)



OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

#147 CEDAR STREET
DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

Proposed New
Building Location




FIGURE 7 – Location of the Proposed Building (8-17-23 Progress Site Plan)





FIGURE 8 – Bedrock Geologic Map of Massachusetts, 1983
[https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_16357.htm]




FIGURE 9 – Surficial Geologic Map of Norwood Quadrangle, Massachusetts, Stone & DiGiacomo-Cohen, 2018, Scientific Investigations Map 3402



FIGURE 10 – Approximate Boring Locations at Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, MA (Field Program: 18 & 21 August 2023) (Note: the locations were field measured by field engineers from Reliance Engineers).




FIGURE 11 – FEMA National Flood Hazard Map

Appendix A

Boring Logs

Project No.	<u>Oakdale School</u>	Project Name	<u>Oakdale School, Dedham</u>	Client	<u>Jonathan Levi Architects</u>
Drilling Contractor	<u>Northern Drill Services</u>	Driller	<u>Tim Tucker</u>	Reliance Field Rep.	<u>L. C. Jen</u>
Start	<u>8/18/2023 10:35am</u>	Finish	<u>8/18/2023 12:15pm</u>	Surface Elevation	<u>El 139.5' ±</u>
Depth to Water	<u>not measured</u>	Date/Time	<u>---</u>	Location	
Drilling Equipment and Procedures	<u>Tracked Mobil Drill B-53</u>				Northwest corner of the site in grassed area. See boring location plan.
Casing Type	<u>3 1/4" hollow stem auger</u>				
Sampler Type	<u>SPT sampler driven using automatic hammer</u>				

 Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
	S-1	1	R = 12"		Moist dark brown f-m sand and little gravel, little roots and organics. [Top Soil]			
		5						
		8						
		6						
5	S-2	8	R = 17"		Dry light brown m-f sand, little gravel, and trace silt. 1" lense of rusty-colored sand at 5.5'. [Till]		auger to 5' at 10:50	5
		16						
		21						
		27						
10	S-3	24	R = 24"		Dry to moist light brown fine sand with little gravel and trace silt. [Till]		auger to 10' at 11:05	10
		44						
		46						
		37						
15	S-4	19	R = 15"		Wet light brown m-f sand, little gravel and trace silt. [Till]		auger to 15' at 11:20	15
		27						
		53						
		40						
20	S-5	15	R = 22"		Wet light brown f sand with little gravel and trace silt. [Till]		auger to 20" at 11:45	20
		64						
		55						
		100/5"						
25					BoB at 21'11".			25

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Start 8/18/2023 10:35am Finish 8/18/2023 12:15pm Surface Elevation EL 139.5' ±

Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
								
								
								
								
								

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
							Set-up @ RB-1	
							Completed RB-1	




Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Start 8/18/2023 9:10am Finish 8/18/2023 10:30am Surface Elevation El 138.5' ±

Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
-------------	-----------	------------------------	---------------	--------------	--	-------------	-------------------------	-------------



Project No.	<u>Oakdale School</u>	Project Name	<u>Oakdale School, Dedham</u>	Client	<u>Jonathan Levi Architects</u>
Drilling Contractor	<u>Northern Drill Services</u>	Driller	<u>Tim Tucker</u>	Reliance Field Rep.	<u>L. C. Jen</u>
Start	<u>8/18/2023 12:30pm</u>	Finish	<u>8/18/2023 1:25pm</u>	Surface Elevation	<u>El 138' ±</u>
Depth to Water	<u>not measured</u>	Date/Time	<u>---</u>	Location	
Drilling Equipment and Procedures	<u>Tracked Mobil Drill B-53</u>				In the right field of the west baseball field. See boring location plan.
Casing Type	<u>3 1/4" hollow stem auger</u>				
Sampler Type	<u>SPT sampler driven using automatic hammer</u>				

 Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
5	S-1	5 12 9 7	R = 1"		Dry dark brown f sand. [Top Soil]			
5	S-2	1 1 2 4	R = 2"		Dry dark brown f sand with trace silt. [Top soil]		auger to 5' at 12:38	5
	S-3	8 9 45 61	R = 14"		Top 8": Dry brown c-m sand with some gravel. [Till] Material placed in Jar A. Bottom 6": Dry white f sand and gravel. Material placed in Jar B.			
10	S-4	22 23 24 28	R = 17"		Wet brown f-m sand and little gravel. [Till]		Auger to 10'	10
15	S-5	23 33 53 52	R = 16"		Wet light brown sand and little gravel. [Till]		auger to 15' at 1:00	15
					BoB at 17'			
20								20
25								25

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects




Start 8/18/2023 12:30pm Finish 8/18/2023 1:25pm Surface Elevation El 138' ±

Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
								
								
								
								

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects



Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
					 <p>RB-3 in progress</p>			
								
							<p>Completed RB-3</p>	




Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects
 Start 8/18/2023 1:30pm Finish 45156.58333 Surface Elevation El 139.5'±
 Checked By: GM

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)	
									
									
									

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects
 Start 8/21/2023 7:20am Finish 8/21/2023 8:30am Surface Elevation El 143' ±
 Checked By: 0

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
0.0 - 2.0	Oakdale RB-5 S1: 0'-2' 1-5-5-15 8/21/23 RLL							0.0 - 2.0
2.0 - 10.0								2.0 - 10.0
10.0 - 12.0	Oakdale RB-5 S3: 10'-12' R22" 7-16-22" 8/21/23							10.0 - 12.0
12.0 - 15.0	Oakdale RB-5 S4: 12'-15' 29-22-10-1 8/21/23 RLL							12.0 - 15.0

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects
 Checked By: 0

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
					 <p>RB-5 in progress</p>			
								
							Completed RB-5	

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Checked By: LCJ

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)	

Completed RB-7

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Start 8/21/2023 8:45am Finish 8/21/2023 10:10am Surface Elevation El 141.5' ±

Checked By: LCJ



Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
-------------	-----------	------------------------	---------------	--------------	--	-------------	-------------------------	-------------



1								1
2								2
3								3
4								4
5								5
6								6
7								7
8								8
9								9
10								10
11								11
12								12

Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Checked By: LCJ

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
							<p>RB-8 in progress.</p>	
							<p>Completed RB-8.</p>	



Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects
 Start 8/18/2023 7:25am Finish 8/18/2023 9:00am Surface Elevation El 140' ±
 Checked By: LCJ

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
-------------	-----------	------------------------	---------------	--------------	--	-------------	-------------------------	-------------



Project No. Oakdale School Project Name Oakdale School, Dedham Client Jonathan Levi Architects

Checked By: LCJ

Depth (ft.)	Sample ID	Sampler Blows per 6 in	Recovery (in)	Casing Depth	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION and other remarks	USCS Symbol	Remarks and Other Tests	Depth (ft.)
					Setting up at RB-9			
						Completed RB-9		

Appendix B

Laboratory Tests



9/7/23

TerraSense Project Number: 23011673A

Lucy Jen, PhD, PE
Principal Engineer
Reliance Engineers, LLC
30 Yarmouth Road
Wellesley, MA 02481

Dear Ms. Jen:

Re: Laboratory Test Results for Oakdale Elementary School

The purpose of this letter is to present the results of the laboratory tests performed on the samples delivered to the TerraSense laboratory on 8/28/23. Testing was performed based on your assignment dated 8/28/23.

Test Results

Test results are reported on the accompanying test pages.

Test Comments

Testing was performed in general accordance to the ASTM or other methods as listed on the test pages. Deviations from the test standards are noted on these pages.

Limitations

Our professional services for this project have been performed in accordance with generally accepted engineering practices; no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

Sample Disposition

If we do not receive other instructions from you within thirty days, this material will be disposed of.

If you have any questions concerning the test results reported in this letter, please call us.

Sincerely,

Carolynn Jordan
Project Manager

Enclosure:

CLIENT GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY REQUEST FORM

CLIENT: Reliance Engineers (Contact: Lucy Jen, lcjen@reliance-eng.com) CLIENT PROJECT # 2301673A-8314 TS # 2301673A-8314

PROJECT: Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, MA

DATE: August 24, 2023

Test Boring/ Pit No.	Sample No./ Shelby Tube	Depth (ft.)	Moisture Content	Atterberg Limits	Sieve Analysis	Sieve & Hydrometer Analysis	Percent Fines	Organic Content	Specific Gravity	Proctor 1557 / 698 T99 / T180	Permeability	Unconfined Compression	UU Triaxial	CU Triaxial	Consolidation		
RB-2	bulk #1	5'-10'			D6931												
RB-5	bulk #2	10'-15'			D6931												

Comments/Remarks: Please contact Lucy Jen (cell: 617.642.0502; email: lcjen@reliance-eng.com) if you have any questions. Thank you.

Prepared By: [Signature] Received By: [Signature] 8/28/23

Client acknowledges, by the Client act of submitting samples to Lab for testing, receipt and acceptance of our Price List and all Business Terms and Conditions (BTC)

Reliance Engineers
Oakdale Elementary School - Dedham, MA
LABORATORY TESTING DATA SUMMARY


BORING NO.	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft)	IDENTIFICATION TESTS			REMARKS
			WATER CONTENT (%)	USCS SYMB. (1)	SIEVE MINUS NO. 200 (%)	
RB-2	Bulk #1	5-10	5.8	GM	15	entire sample used
RB-5	Bulk #2	10-15	7.1	ML	50	entire sample used

Note: (1) USCS symbol based on visual observation and Sieve reported.

Prepared by: NG
 Reviewed by: CMJ
 Date: 9/7/2023

 **TERRASENSE**
 Geotechnical Laboratory
 45H Commerce Way
 Totowa, NJ 07512

Project No.: 23011673A
 File: Indx1.xlsx
 Page 1 of 1



COBBLES		GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY	
		COARSE	FINE	COARSE	MEDIUM	FINE		
Symbol	□	◇	○					○
Boring	RB-2							
Sample	Bulk #1							
Depth	5-10							
% +3"	0							
% Gravel	52							
% SAND	33							
% C SAND	8							
% M SAND	11							
% F SAND	14							
% FINES	15							
D ₁₀₀ (mm)	38.1							
D ₆₀ (mm)	10.7							
D ₃₀ (mm)	0.48							
D ₁₀ (mm)								
Cc								
Cu								

Sieve		Percent Finer Data	
Size/ID #			
6"	100		
4"	100		
3"	100		
1 1/2"	100		
1"	85		
3/4"	72		
1/2"	63		
3/8"	58		
#4	48		
#10	40		
#20	34		
#40	29		
#60	25		
#100	21		
#140	18		
#200	15		
5µm			
2µm			
1µm			

PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION	
ASTM D6913 & ASTM D7928	
Open Symbols: Sieve analysis by ASTM D6913	
Filled Symbols: Hydrometer analysis by ASTM D7928 corrected for complete sample	
SYMBOL	DATE
□	08/28/23
◇	
○	
USCS DESCRIPTION AND REMARKS	
Gray, Silty gravel with sand organic mat'l noted, insufficient sample size	
USCS	
GM	
Reliance Engineers	Oakdale Elementary School
TERRASENSE Geotechnical Laboratory	Dedham, MA
#23011673A	


SILT or CLAY

SAND

GRAVEL

COBBLES

COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT or CLAY		
	COARSE	FINE	COARSE	MEDIUM	FINE			



Open Symbols: Sieve analysis by ASTM D6913
 Filled symbols: Hydrometer analysis by ASTM D7928 corrected for complete sample

SYMBOL	w (%)	LL	PL	PI	USCS	AASHTO	USCS DESCRIPTION AND REMARKS	DATE
□	7.1				ML		Gray, Sandy silt	08/28/23
◇								
○								

Reliance Engineers
 Oakdale Elementary School
 Dedham, MA
 #23011673A


Symbol	□	◇	○
Boring	RB-5		
Sample	Bulk #2		
Depth	10-15		
% +3"	0		
% Gravel	7		
% SAND	43		
%C SAND	6		
%M SAND	15		
%F SAND	22		
% FINES	50		
D ₁₀₀ (mm)	19.1		
D ₆₀ (mm)			
D ₃₀ (mm)			
D ₁₀ (mm)	0.163		
Cc			
Cu			

Sieve	Size/ID #	Percent Finer Data
6"		100
4"		100
3"		100
1 1/2"		100
1"		100
3/4"		100
1/2"		98
3/8"		96
#4		93
#10		87
#20		80
#40		72
#60		65
#100		59
#140		53
#200		50
5µm		
2µm		
1µm		

PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION
 ASTM D6913 & ASTM D7928

Appendix C

Current Site Topographic Survey



141/21
N/E
JOSEPH &
LESLIE F. POLLOTT
BK. 21548 PG. 168

141/20
N/E
LAUREN M. CALLAGHER
BK. 8815 PG. 35

141/19
N/E
MARC R. &
CHRISTINE M. STONIER
BK. 33565 PG. 80

141/18
N/E
JAMES M. &
RUTH A. LOUGHRAN
BK. 37880 PG. 168

SHEET 2 OF 4

WELCH
Associated Land
Surveyors, Inc.
218 North Main Street
Dedham, MA 01919
(617) 552-6000 FAX: (617) 552-4902
WWW.WELCHINC.COM


TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
147 CEDAR STREET
DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
(NORFOLK COUNTY)
Prepared for:
JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECTS

ACAD FILE: 02307027 CAD: JLL DATE: AUGUST 17, 2023

SCALE: 1"=20'

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
 OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 147 CEDAR STREET
 DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
 (NORFOLK COUNTY)
 Prepared for:
 JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECTS

ACAD FILE: 2252021 DATE: AUGUST 17, 2023




WELCH
 Associates, Inc.
 218 North Main Street
 Boston, MA 02109
 TEL: 617.552.4900 FAX: 617.552.4902
 WWW.WELCHINC.COM

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
 OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 147 CEDAR STREET
 DEDHAM, MASSACHUSETTS
 (NORFOLK COUNTY)
 Prepared for:
 JONATHAN LEVI ARCHITECTS

SCALE: 1"=20'

ADD FILE: 02507021 CAR: JUL DATE: AUGUST 17, 2023
 SHEET 4 OF 4





October 19, 2023

Mr. Philip Gray
Jonathan Levi Architects
266 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02116

RE: Geo-Environmental Sampling Results Summary
In Support of a Feasibility Study for the Oakdale Elementary School
147 Cedar Street, Dedham, MA 02026

Dear Mr. Gray:

CDW Consultants, Inc. (CDW) is pleased to provide a summary of results for the Geo-Environmental Sampling in support of the feasibility study for the above-mentioned property (hereinafter, the "Site"). The scope of work included the following:

- Collection of soil samples during the advancement of geotechnical borings.
- Field screening of soil samples for the presence of Total Organic Vapors (TOVs)
- Combining selected soil samples into 3 composite samples for laboratory analysis
- A summary of the results and preliminary recommendation

Soil Sample Collection:

On August 18 and 21, 2023 CDW personnel were present during the advancement of eight soil borings in the shallow subsurface at the Site via hollow-stem auger drilling methods. The purpose of the soil borings was primarily to perform a geotechnical assessment. CDW used this opportunity to collect soil samples across the assumed new construction footprint. This was conducted to assess the chemical characteristics of the subsurface soils within the boundary of the geotechnical borings. The eight soil borings were drilled by Northern Drilling Service under the direction of Reliance Engineering. All eight borings ranged from at least 0 to 10 feet in depth with a maximum penetration depth of 20 feet in selected borings. One composite sample was collected from soil at a depth of 10 to 20 feet and consisted of samples from boring locations RB1, RB3, RB5, and RB9. Two composite samples were collected from 0 to 10 feet. These were identified as follows: Comp. RB4, RB5, RB7, and RB8 and Comp. RB1, RB2, RB3, and RB9.

The samples taken were collected in laboratory-prepared containers, preserved, and submitted to NetLab for general chemistry, herbicides, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), reactivity, pH, flashpoint, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), total metals, and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). Three discrete samples were collected to test for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), RB9, RB1, and RB5. Boring for location RB6, located near what appears to

be an underground storage tank (UST), was not completed at this time.

Field observations:

Subsurface soil conditions were generally noted as follows:

- Boring locations began either on gravel, sand, or topsoil
- 0 to 2 feet consisted of brown loam and topsoil/organics, or fine to medium sands.
- 5 to 7 feet, was generally composed of light brown, fine to medium sand with some gravel and pebbles and/or tan/gray clays
- In RB2, a lens of quartz-like gravel was noted in the 5 to 7 feet depth
- 10 to 12 feet brown fine to med sands and some gravel
- 13 to 17 feet brown sand, fine to medium, tan/brown clay

Monitoring wells were not installed during the time of the geotechnical soil boring program. Therefore, no groundwater was collected, and no data accumulated. As such no opinion on groundwater quality is rendered at this time.

Soil results:

Each discrete soil sample collected during the boring program was field screened for Total Organic Vapors (TOVs) via a headspace analytical screening procedure. No detectable TOVs were observed in each of the samples.

All three composite samples detected concentrations of various metals. None of the detected concentrations of metals exceeded the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) RCS-1 Reportable Concentration Thresholds. Composite sample 3 detected concentrations of SVOCs, none of which exceed the MassDEP reportable concentrations. All soil sample concentrations detected were significantly lower than the reportable concentrations. Within the three composite samples no herbicides, pesticides, PCBs, reactivity, TPH, and VOCs were detected.

Conclusion:

Based on the initial soil sampling, field screening, and laboratory analysis, there are no reportable conditions identified and the soil, where sampled, does not exhibit evidence of contamination.

Recommendations:

CDW makes the following recommendations for future activities:

1. During design development, it will be necessary to establish the location and volume of subsurface soil that will be disturbed and exported, and an estimate of additional characterization should be prepared.

2. The need for focused sampling at specific Recognized Environmental Conditions and other environmental concerns (i.e., USTs) should also be addressed at this time.
3. Design documents should identify roles and responsibilities between the project owner and selected contractor for the collection of additional samples for precharacterization.
4. Preconstruction requirements should include an Excavated Materials Management Plan prepared and submitted by the selected earthwork contractor.
5. Groundwater has not been evaluated. If construction design requires earthwork into the water table, groundwater should be sampled, and a Dewatering Plan will be necessary.

Limitations

This is a preliminary summary of shallow subsurface soil conditions. These results indicate that the soil represented by these samples may be suitable for reuse onsite or may be exported to a location with similar characteristics. The results do not represent all conditions at all locations between borings or other areas outside of the boring program, such as, but not limited to, near underground storage tanks, onsite septic or drainage systems, or other structures or historical events that may have had the potential to impact the subsurface quality. This survey did not include an assessment of fill containing hazardous building materials in the subsurface, although none were observed in the limited borings.


I hope this information sufficiently addresses your concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,
CDW CONSULTANTS, INC.



William J. Betters, PG, LSP
Principal / COO
Director of Environmental Services

- Figure 1: Site Plan with Soil Boring Locations
Table 1: PID Field Screening Results for Total Organic Vapors
Table 2: Summary of Soil Analytical Results
Attachment 1: NetLabs Report on Laboratory Analytical Results



Oakdale Elementary School
145 Cedar street, Dedham, MA
Figure 1
Boring Hole Locations
September 29, 2023



Table 1.
 PID Field Screening Results for Total Organic Vapors
 Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

Sample ID	Date	Sample Depth (ft)	PID Reading (ppmv)
RB-1	8/18/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/18/2023	5-7	0.0
	8/18/2023	10-12	0.0
	8/18/2023	16-17	0.0
	8/18/2023	20-21	0.0
RB-2	8/18/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/18/2023	5-7	0.0
	8/18/2023	7-9	0.0
RB-3	8/18/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/18/2023	5-7	0.0
	8/18/2023	7-9	0.0
	8/18/2023	10-12	0.0
RB-4	8/18/2023	15-17	0.0
	8/18/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/18/2023	5-7	0.0
	8/18/2023	10-10'5"	0.0
RB-9	8/18/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/18/2023	5-7	0.0
	8/18/2023	7-9	0.0
	8/18/2023	10-12	0.0
	8/18/2023	15-15' 6 "	0.0
RB-5	8/21/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/21/2024	5-7	0.0
	8/21/2025	10-12	0.0
	8/21/2026	15-17	0.0
RB-7	8/21/2023	0-2	0.0
	8/21/2024	5-7	0.0
	8/21/2025	7.5 - 8.5	0.0
RB-8	8/21/2028	0-2	0.0
	8/21/2029	5-7	0.0
	8/21/2030	10-12	0.0

Notes:

Instrument used: MiniRae3000 photoionization detector (PID) equipped with a 10.6eV lamp, calibrated to respond as isobutylene.

ppmv - parts per million by volume

Table 2.
 Summary of Soil Analytical Results
 Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

Parameter	Units	SAMPLE ID and Depth:	Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')		Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')		Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')	
			Sample Result	Reporting Limit	Sample Result	Reporting Limit	Sample Result	Reporting Limit
General Chemistry								
Date Sampled:		VOC ID / Depth:	RB-9 (10-12')		RB-5 (5-7')		RB-1 (5-7')	
			8/21/2023		8/21/2023		8/21/2023	
		MassDEP Reportable Concentration S-1						
Flashpoint	degrees F		> 200	70	> 200	70	> 200	70
Specific Conductance	uS/cm		13.1	2	8.8	2	11.8	2
pH	SU		8.1		7.7		6.8	
Herbicides								
Dalapon	mg/kg	1000	ND	0.108	ND	0.104	ND	0.107
Dicamba	mg/kg	500	ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
Dichloroprop	mg/kg		ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
2,4-D	mg/kg	100	ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	mg/kg	100	ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
2,4,5-T	mg/kg	100	ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
2,4-DB	mg/kg	100	ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
Dinoseb	mg/kg	500	ND	0.108	ND	0.104	ND	0.107
MCPP	mg/kg		ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
MCPA	mg/kg		ND	0.054	ND	0.052	ND	0.053
Pesticides								
alpha-BHC	mg/kg	50	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	mg/kg	0.003	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
beta-BHC	mg/kg	10	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
delta-BHC	mg/kg	0.003	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Heptachlor	mg/kg	0.3	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Aldrin	mg/kg	0.08	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Heptachlor epoxide	mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
gamma-Chlordane	mg/kg	see Chlordane	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
alpha-Chlordane	mg/kg	see Chlordane	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Chlordane	mg/kg	5	ND	0.0177	ND	0.0179	ND	0.018
4,4'-DDE	mg/kg	6	ND	0.00354	ND	0.00357	ND	0.00358
Endosulfan I	mg/kg	0.5	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Dieldrin	mg/kg	0.08	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018

Table 2.
Summary of Soil Analytical Results
Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

Endrin	mg/kg	10	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
4,4'-DDD	mg/kg	8	ND	0.00354	ND	0.00357	ND	0.00358
Endosulfan II	mg/kg	0.5	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Endrin aldehyde	mg/kg	10	ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
4,4'-DDT	mg/kg	6	ND	0.00354	ND	0.00357	ND	0.00358
Methoxychlor	mg/kg	200	ND	0.00354	ND	0.00357	ND	0.00358
Endosulfan sulfate	mg/kg		ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Endrin ketone	mg/kg		ND	0.00177	ND	0.00179	ND	0.0018
Toxaphene	mg/kg	10	ND	0.0177	ND	0.0179	ND	0.018
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)								
Aroclor-1016	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1221	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1232	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1242	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1248	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1254	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1260	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1262	mg/kg		ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Aroclor-1268	mg/kg		ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
PCBs (Total)	mg/kg	1	ND	0.07	ND	0.071	ND	0.071
Reactivity								
Cyanide	mg/kg	30	ND	0.2	ND	0.2	ND	0.2
Sulfide	mg/kg		ND	0.1	ND	0.1	ND	0.1
Semivolatile organic compounds								
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	mg/kg	2	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	mg/kg	9	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	mg/kg	3	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
Phenol	mg/kg	1	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	mg/kg	4	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2,4-Dichlorophenol	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2,4-Dimethylphenol	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.358	ND	0.357	ND	0.356
2,4-Dinitrophenol	mg/kg	3	ND	0.358	ND	0.357	ND	0.356
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	mg/kg	100	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Chloronaphthalene	mg/kg	1000	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Chlorophenol	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Methylnaphthalene	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
Nitrobenzene	mg/kg	500	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Methylphenol	mg/kg	500	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Nitroaniline	mg/kg		ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
2-Nitrophenol	mg/kg	100	ND	0.358	ND	0.357	ND	0.356

Table 2.
Summary of Soil Analytical Results
Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

Pyrene	mg/kg	1000	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	0.302	0.14
m&p-Cresol	mg/kg	500	ND	0.282	ND	0.282	ND	0.28
Pyridine	mg/kg	500	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
Azobenzene	mg/kg		ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
Total Dichlorobenzene	mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.141	ND	0.141	ND	0.14
Total Metals								
Antimony	mg/kg	20	ND	0.8	ND	0.83	ND	0.75
Arsenic	mg/kg	20	2.87	1.21	6.07	1.26	4.03	1.13
Barium	mg/kg	1000	31	0.4	40.4	0.41	27.6	0.37
Beryllium	mg/kg	90	0.46	0.4	0.57	0.41	0.44	0.37
Cadmium	mg/kg	70	2.17	0.61	3.21	0.63	2.5	0.57
Chromium	mg/kg	100	10.7	0.61	20.4	0.63	11.9	0.57
Lead	mg/kg	200	6.68	0.61	13.8	0.63	27.8	0.57
Nickel	mg/kg	600	6.97	0.61	12	0.63	8.83	0.57
Selenium	mg/kg	400	ND	1.21	ND	1.26	ND	1.13
Silver	mg/kg	100	ND	1.21	ND	1.26	ND	1.13
Vanadium	mg/kg	400	17.6	0.4	21.9	0.41	19.2	0.37
Zinc	mg/kg	1000	23.3	2.4	35	2.5	33.3	2.3
Thallium	mg/kg	8	ND	0.4	ND	0.41	ND	0.37
Mercury	mg/kg	20	ND	0.141	ND	0.129	ND	0.148
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons								
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	mg/kg	1000	ND	29	ND	29	ND	29
Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL)								
Acetone	mg/kg	6	ND	0.112	ND	0.105	ND	0.106
Benzene	mg/kg	2	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Bromobenzene	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Bromochloromethane	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Bromodichloromethane	mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Bromoform	mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Bromomethane	mg/kg	0.5	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
2-Butanone	mg/kg	4	ND	0.112	ND	0.105	ND	0.106
tert-Butyl alcohol	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
sec-Butylbenzene	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
n-Butylbenzene	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
tert-Butylbenzene	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Carbon Disulfide	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Carbon Tetrachloride	mg/kg	5	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Chlorobenzene	mg/kg	1	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Chloroethane	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Chloroform	mg/kg	0.2	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Chloromethane	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
4-Chlorotoluene	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005

Table 2.
Summary of Soil Analytical Results
Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

2-Chlorotoluene		mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)		mg/kg	10	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Dibromochloromethane		mg/kg	0.005	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Dibromomethane		mg/kg	500	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2-Dichlorobenzene		mg/kg	9	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,3-Dichlorobenzene		mg/kg	3	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,4-Dichlorobenzene		mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1-Dichloroethane		mg/kg	0.4	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2-Dichloroethane		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene		mg/kg	1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1-Dichloroethene		mg/kg	3	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2-Dichloropropane		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
2,2-Dichloropropane		mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene		mg/kg	0.01	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene		mg/kg	0.01	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1-Dichloropropene		mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis + trans)		mg/kg	0.01	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Diethyl ether		mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,4-Dioxane		mg/kg	0.2	ND	0.112	ND	ND	0.105	ND	0.106
Ethylbenzene		mg/kg	40	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Hexachlorobutadiene		mg/kg	30	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
2-Hexanone		mg/kg	100	ND	0.112	ND	ND	0.105	ND	0.106
Isopropylbenzene		mg/kg	1000	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
p-Isopropyltoluene		mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Methylene Chloride		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.022	ND	ND	0.021	ND	0.021
4-Methyl-2-pentanone		mg/kg	0.4	ND	0.112	ND	ND	0.105	ND	0.106
Naphthalene		mg/kg	4	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
n-Propylbenzene		mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Styrene		mg/kg	3	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Tetrachloroethene		mg/kg	1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Tetrahydrofuran		mg/kg	500	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Toluene		mg/kg	30	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene		mg/kg	2	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene		mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1,2-Trichloroethane		mg/kg	0.1	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1,1-Trichloroethane		mg/kg	30	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Trichloroethene		mg/kg	0.3	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2,3-Trichloropropane		mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene		mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene		mg/kg	1000	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Vinyl Chloride		mg/kg	0.7	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
o-Xylene		mg/kg	see Total xylenes	ND	0.006	ND	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
m&p-Xylene		mg/kg	see Total xylenes	ND	0.011	ND	ND	0.011	ND	0.011

Table 2.
 Summary of Soil Analytical Results
 Oakdale Elementary School Dedham, MA

Total xylenes	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	mg/kg	0.005	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
tert-Amyl methyl ether	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
1,3-Dichloropropane	mg/kg	500	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	mg/kg		ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Diisopropyl ether	mg/kg	100	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Trichlorofluoromethane	mg/kg	1000	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005
Dichlorodifluoromethane	mg/kg	1000	ND	0.006	ND	0.005	ND	0.005



New England Testing Laboratory, Inc.
(401) 353-3420

REPORT OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS

NETLAB Work Order Number: 3H22059
Client Project: Oakdale School Dedham

Report Date: 30-August-2023

Prepared for:

Michael O'Brien
CDW Consultants
4 California Drive, Suite 301
Framingham, MA 01701

Richard Warila, Laboratory Director
New England Testing Laboratory, Inc.
59 Greenhill Street
West Warwick, RI 02893
rich.warila@newenglandtesting.com

Samples Submitted :

The samples listed below were submitted to New England Testing Laboratory on 08/22/23. The group of samples appearing in this report was assigned an internal identification number (case number) for laboratory information management purposes. The client's designations for the individual samples, along with our case numbers, are used to identify the samples in this report. This report of analytical results pertains only to the sample(s) provided to us by the client which are indicated on the custody record. The case number for this sample submission is 3H22059. Custody records are included in this report.

Lab ID	Sample	Matrix	Date Sampled	Date Received
3H22059-01	Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023
3H22059-02	Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023
3H22059-03	Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023
3H22059-04	RB-9 (10-12')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023
3H22059-05	RB -1 (5-7')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023
3H22059-06	RB-5 (5-7')	Soil	08/21/2023	08/22/2023

Request for Analysis

At the client's request, the analyses presented in the following table were performed on the samples submitted.

Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10') (Lab Number: 3H22059-03)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Antimony	EPA 6010C
Arsenic	EPA 6010C
Barium	EPA 6010C
Beryllium	EPA 6010C
Cadmium	EPA 6010C
Chromium	EPA 6010C
Flashpoint	EPA 1010A-Mod
Herbicides	EPA 8151A
Lead	EPA 6010C
Mercury	EPA 7471B
Nickel	EPA 6010C
PCBs	EPA 8082A
Pesticides	EPA 8081B
pH	SM4500-H-B (11)
Reactive Cyanide	NETL Internal
Reactive Sulfide	NETL Internal
Selenium	EPA 6010C
Semivolatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8270D
Silver	EPA 6010C
Specific Conductance	SM2510 - Modified
Thallium	EPA 6010C
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	EPA-8100-mod
Vanadium	EPA 6010C
Zinc	EPA 6010C

Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20') (Lab Number: 3H22059-01)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Antimony	EPA 6010C
Arsenic	EPA 6010C
Barium	EPA 6010C
Beryllium	EPA 6010C
Cadmium	EPA 6010C
Chromium	EPA 6010C
Flashpoint	EPA 1010A-Mod
Herbicides	EPA 8151A
Lead	EPA 6010C
Mercury	EPA 7471B
Nickel	EPA 6010C
PCBs	EPA 8082A
Pesticides	EPA 8081B
pH	SM4500-H-B (11)
Reactive Cyanide	NETL Internal
Reactive Sulfide	NETL Internal
Selenium	EPA 6010C
Semivolatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8270D
Silver	EPA 6010C
Specific Conductance	SM2510 - Modified
Thallium	EPA 6010C
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	EPA-8100-mod

Request for Analysis (continued)

Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20') (Lab Number: 3H22059-01) (contin

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Vanadium	EPA 6010C
Zinc	EPA 6010C

Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10') (Lab Number: 3H22059-02)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Antimony	EPA 6010C
Arsenic	EPA 6010C
Barium	EPA 6010C
Beryllium	EPA 6010C
Cadmium	EPA 6010C
Chromium	EPA 6010C
Flashpoint	EPA 1010A-Mod
Herbicides	EPA 8151A
Lead	EPA 6010C
Mercury	EPA 7471B
Nickel	EPA 6010C
PCBs	EPA 8082A
Pesticides	EPA 8081B
pH	SM4500-H-B (11)
Reactive Cyanide	NETL Internal
Reactive Sulfide	NETL Internal
Selenium	EPA 6010C
Semivolatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8270D
Silver	EPA 6010C
Specific Conductance	SM2510 - Modified
Thallium	EPA 6010C
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	EPA-8100-mod
Vanadium	EPA 6010C
Zinc	EPA 6010C

RB -1 (5-7') (Lab Number: 3H22059-05)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Volatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8260C

RB-5 (5-7') (Lab Number: 3H22059-06)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Volatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8260C

RB-9 (10-12') (Lab Number: 3H22059-04)

<u>Analysis</u>	<u>Method</u>
Volatile Organic Compounds	EPA 8260C

Method References

Reactive Cyanide, Standard Operating Procedure 407, New England Testing Laboratory Inc.

Reactive Sulfide, Standard Operating Procedure 426, New England Testing Laboratory Inc.

Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 20th Edition, APHA/ AWWA-WPCF, 1998

Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods, SW846, USEPA

Case Narrative

Sample Receipt:

The samples associated with this work order were received in appropriately cooled and preserved containers. The chain of custody was adequately completed and corresponded to the samples submitted.

Exceptions: None

Analysis:

All samples were prepared and analyzed within method specified holding times and according to NETLAB's documented standard operating procedures. The results for the associated calibration, method blank and laboratory control sample (LCS) were within method specified quality control requirements and allowances. Results for all soil samples, unless otherwise indicated, are reported on a dry weight basis.

Exceptions:

8270: The samples " Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9, Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8, and Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9" have surrogates outside quality control limits due to matrix interference.

Results: General Chemistry**Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')****Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Flashpoint	> 200		70	degrees F	08/28/23	08/28/23
pH	8.1			SU	08/29/23	08/29/23
Specific Conductance	13.1		2.0	uS/cm	08/29/23	08/29/23

Results: General Chemistry**Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')****Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Flashpoint	> 200		70	degrees F	08/28/23	08/28/23
pH	7.7			SU	08/29/23	08/29/23
Specific Conductance	8.8		2.0	uS/cm	08/29/23	08/29/23

Results: General Chemistry**Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')****Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Flashpoint	> 200		70	degrees F	08/28/23	08/28/23
pH	6.8			SU	08/29/23	08/29/23
Specific Conductance	11.8		2.0	uS/cm	08/29/23	08/29/23

Results: Reactivity

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Reactive Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23
Reactive Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23

Results: Reactivity

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Reactive Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23
Reactive Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23

Results: Reactivity

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')
Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Reactive Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23
Reactive Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg	08/25/23	08/25/23

Results: Total Metals

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')
Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Antimony	ND		0.80	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Arsenic	2.87		1.21	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Barium	31.0		0.40	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Beryllium	0.46		0.40	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Cadmium	2.17		0.61	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Chromium	10.7		0.61	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Lead	6.68		0.61	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Mercury	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Nickel	6.97		0.61	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Selenium	ND		1.21	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Silver	ND		1.21	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Vanadium	17.6		0.40	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Zinc	23.3		2.4	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Thallium	ND		0.40	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23

Results: Total Metals**Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')****Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Antimony	ND		0.83	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Arsenic	6.07		1.26	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Barium	40.4		0.41	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Beryllium	0.57		0.41	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Cadmium	3.21		0.63	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Chromium	20.4		0.63	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Lead	13.8		0.63	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Mercury	ND		0.129	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Nickel	12.0		0.63	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Selenium	ND		1.26	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Silver	ND		1.26	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Vanadium	21.9		0.41	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Zinc	35.0		2.5	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Thallium	ND		0.41	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23

Results: Total Metals**Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')****Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Antimony	ND		0.75	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Arsenic	4.03		1.13	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Barium	27.6		0.37	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Beryllium	0.44		0.37	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Cadmium	2.50		0.57	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Chromium	11.9		0.57	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Lead	27.8		0.57	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Mercury	ND		0.148	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Nickel	8.83		0.57	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Selenium	ND		1.13	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Silver	ND		1.13	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Vanadium	19.2		0.37	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Zinc	33.3		2.3	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23
Thallium	ND		0.37	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/24/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL)

Sample: RB-9 (10-12')

Lab Number: 3H22059-04 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Acetone	ND		0.112	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Benzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromochloromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromodichloromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromoform	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromomethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Butanone	ND		0.112	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butyl alcohol	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
sec-Butylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Butylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Disulfide	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Tetrachloride	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroform	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromochloromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromomethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloropropene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis + trans)	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diethyl ether	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dioxane	ND		0.112	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Hexanone	ND		0.112	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Isopropylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
p-Isopropyltoluene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methylene Chloride	ND		0.022	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	ND		0.112	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Sample: RB-9 (10-12') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-04 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Naphthalene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Propylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Styrene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrahydrofuran	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Toluene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichloroethene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Vinyl Chloride	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
o-Xylene	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
m&p-Xylene	ND		0.011	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Total xylenes	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Amyl methyl ether	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diisopropyl ether	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.006	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>4-Bromofluorobenzene</i>	<i>92.3%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>1,2-Dichloroethane-d4</i>	<i>103%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>Toluene-d8</i>	<i>102%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL)

Sample: RB -1 (5-7')

Lab Number: 3H22059-05 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Acetone	ND		0.106	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Benzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromodichloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromoform	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Butanone	ND		0.106	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butyl alcohol	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
sec-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Disulfide	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Tetrachloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroform	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis + trans)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diethyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dioxane	ND		0.106	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Hexanone	ND		0.106	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Isopropylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
p-Isopropyltoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methylene Chloride	ND		0.021	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	ND		0.106	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Sample: RB -1 (5-7') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-05 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Naphthalene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Propylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Styrene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrahydrofuran	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Toluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Vinyl Chloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
o-Xylene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
m&p-Xylene	ND		0.011	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Total xylenes	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Amyl methyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diisopropyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>4-Bromofluorobenzene</i>	<i>90.5%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>1,2-Dichloroethane-d4</i>	<i>103%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>Toluene-d8</i>	<i>101%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL)

Sample: RB-5 (5-7')

Lab Number: 3H22059-06 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Acetone	ND		0.105	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Benzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromodichloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromoform	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Bromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Butanone	ND		0.105	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butyl alcohol	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
sec-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Disulfide	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Carbon Tetrachloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloroform	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Chloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dibromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis + trans)	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diethyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,4-Dioxane	ND		0.105	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
2-Hexanone	ND		0.105	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Isopropylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
p-Isopropyltoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Methylene Chloride	ND		0.021	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	ND		0.105	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Sample: RB-5 (5-7') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-06 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Naphthalene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
n-Propylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Styrene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Tetrahydrofuran	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Toluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Vinyl Chloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
o-Xylene	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
m&p-Xylene	ND		0.011	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Total xylenes	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
tert-Amyl methyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
1,3-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Diisopropyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg	08/23/23	08/23/23
<hr/>						
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<hr/>						
<i>4-Bromofluorobenzene</i>	<i>90.9%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>1,2-Dichloroethane-d4</i>	<i>105%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23
<i>Toluene-d8</i>	<i>99.1%</i>		<i>70-130</i>		08/23/23	08/23/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dimethylphenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrophenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chloronaphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylnaphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Nitrobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylphenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitrophenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitrophenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthylene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Aniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzoic acid	ND		1.09	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Biphenyl	ND		0.043	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	ND		0.434	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Butyl benzyl phthalate	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Chrysene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-octyl phthalate	ND		0.217	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenzofuran	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Diethyl phthalate	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dimethyl phthalate	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-butyl phthalate	ND		0.217	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluorene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachloroethane	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Isophorone	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Naphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pentachlorophenol	ND		0.358	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenanthrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
m&p-Cresol	ND		0.282	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyridine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Azobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Total Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
<hr/>						
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<hr/>						
<i>Nitrobenzene-d5</i>	<i>135%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>p-Terphenyl-d14</i>	<i>144%</i>		<i>47-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>	<i>122%</i>		<i>34-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>Phenol-d6</i>	<i>106%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>	<i>134%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorophenol</i>	<i>102%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dichlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dimethylphenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrophenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chloronaphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chlorophenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylnaphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Nitrobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylphenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitrophenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitroaniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitrophenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthylene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Aniline	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzoic acid	ND		1.08	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Biphenyl	ND		0.043	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	ND		0.433	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Butyl benzyl phthalate	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Chrysene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-octyl phthalate	ND		0.217	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenzofuran	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Diethyl phthalate	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dimethyl phthalate	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-butyl phthalate	ND		0.217	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluoranthene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluorene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachloroethane	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Isophorone	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Naphthalene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pentachlorophenol	ND		0.357	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenanthrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyrene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
m&p-Cresol	ND		0.282	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyridine	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Azobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Total Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.141	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
<hr/>						
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<hr/>						
<i>Nitrobenzene-d5</i>	<i>125%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>p-Terphenyl-d14</i>	<i>133%</i>		<i>47-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>	<i>119%</i>		<i>34-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>Phenol-d6</i>	<i>91.5%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>	<i>124%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorophenol</i>	<i>86.5%</i>		<i>30-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dichlorophenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dimethylphenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrophenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chloronaphthalene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Chlorophenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylnaphthalene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Nitrobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Methylphenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitroaniline	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
2-Nitrophenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
3-Nitroaniline	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chloroaniline	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitroaniline	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
4-Nitrophenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Acenaphthylene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Aniline	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Anthracene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.181		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.149		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.183		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Benzoic acid	ND		1.08	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Biphenyl	ND		0.043	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	ND		0.431	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Butyl benzyl phthalate	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Chrysene	0.155		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-octyl phthalate	ND		0.216	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dibenzofuran	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10') (Continued)

Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Diethyl phthalate	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Dimethyl phthalate	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Di-n-butyl phthalate	ND		0.216	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluoranthene	0.357		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Fluorene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Hexachloroethane	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Isophorone	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Naphthalene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pentachlorophenol	ND		0.356	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Phenanthrene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyrene	0.302		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
m&p-Cresol	ND		0.280	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Pyridine	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Azobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Total Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.140	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>Nitrobenzene-d5</i>	115%		30-130		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>p-Terphenyl-d14</i>	133%		47-130		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>	103%		34-130		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>Phenol-d6</i>	86.4%		30-130		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>	113%		30-130		08/26/23	08/28/23
<i>2-Fluorophenol</i>	82.3%		30-130		08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Pesticides

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
alpha-BHC	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
beta-BHC	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
delta-BHC	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aldrin	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor epoxide	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-Chlordane	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
alpha-Chlordane	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Chlordane	ND		0.0177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.00354	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan I	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Dieldrin	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.00354	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan II	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin aldehyde	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.00354	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Methoxychlor	ND		0.00354	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan sulfate	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin Ketone	ND		0.00177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Toxaphene	ND		0.0177	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	68.4%		30-106		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	58.6%		32-110		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Pesticides

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
alpha-BHC	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
beta-BHC	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
delta-BHC	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aldrin	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor epoxide	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-Chlordane	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
alpha-Chlordane	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Chlordane	ND		0.0179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.00357	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan I	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Dieldrin	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.00357	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan II	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin aldehyde	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.00357	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Methoxychlor	ND		0.00357	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan sulfate	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin Ketone	ND		0.00179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Toxaphene	ND		0.0179	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	66.7%		30-106		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	58.3%		32-110		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Pesticides

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
alpha-BHC	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
beta-BHC	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
delta-BHC	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aldrin	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Heptachlor epoxide	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
gamma-Chlordane	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
alpha-Chlordane	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Chlordane	ND		0.0180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.00358	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan I	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Dieldrin	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.00358	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan II	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin aldehyde	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.00358	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Methoxychlor	ND		0.00358	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endosulfan sulfate	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Endrin Ketone	ND		0.00180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Toxaphene	ND		0.0180	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	<i>72.0%</i>		<i>30-106</i>		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	<i>63.1%</i>		<i>32-110</i>		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Aroclor-1016	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1221	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1232	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1242	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1248	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1254	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1260	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1262	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1268	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
PCBs (Total)	ND		0.070	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	76.3%		36.2-130		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	92.4%		43.3-130		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Aroclor-1016	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1221	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1232	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1242	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1248	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1254	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1260	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1262	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1268	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
PCBs (Total)	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	75.6%		36.2-130		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	94.4%		43.3-130		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Aroclor-1016	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1221	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1232	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1242	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1248	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1254	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1260	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1262	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Aroclor-1268	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
PCBs (Total)	ND		0.071	mg/kg	08/28/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>	<i>81.8%</i>		<i>36.2-130</i>		08/28/23	08/30/23
<i>Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>	<i>101%</i>		<i>43.3-130</i>		08/28/23	08/30/23

Results: Herbicides

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')

Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Dalapon	ND		0.108	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dicamba	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dichloroprop	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-D	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-T	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-DB	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dinoseb	ND		0.108	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPP	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPA	ND		0.054	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>	<i>94.1%</i>		<i>41-145</i>		08/24/23	08/30/23

Results: Herbicides

Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')
Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Dalapon	ND		0.104	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dicamba	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dichloroprop	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-D	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-T	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-DB	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dinoseb	ND		0.104	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPP	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPA	ND		0.052	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>	88.7%		41-145		08/24/23	08/30/23

Results: Herbicides

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')

Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Dalapon	ND		0.107	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dicamba	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dichloroprop	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-D	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4,5-T	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
2,4-DB	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Dinoseb	ND		0.107	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPP	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
MCPA	ND		0.053	mg/kg	08/24/23	08/30/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>	<i>108%</i>		<i>41-145</i>		08/24/23	08/30/23

Results: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Sample: Comp RB1, RB3, RB5, RB9 (10-20')
Lab Number: 3H22059-01 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	ND		29	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>Chlorooctadecane</i>	<i>70.4%</i>		<i>50-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons**Sample: Comp RB4, RB5, RB7, RB8 (0-10')****Lab Number: 3H22059-02 (Soil)**

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	ND		29	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>Chlorooctadecane</i>	<i>72.0%</i>		<i>50-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23

Results: Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Sample: Comp RB1, RB2, RB3, RB9 (0-10')
Lab Number: 3H22059-03 (Soil)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Date Prepared	Date Analyzed
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	ND		29	mg/kg	08/26/23	08/28/23
Surrogate(s)	Recovery%		Limits			
<i>Chlorooctadecane</i>	<i>88.1%</i>		<i>50-130</i>		08/26/23	08/28/23

Quality Control

General Chemistry

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H0825 - Flashpoint-EPA 1010A-Mod										
LCS (B3H0825-BS1)										
Flashpoint	79		70	degrees F	80.0		98.9	90-110		
Prepared & Analyzed: 08/18/23										
Duplicate (B3H0825-DUP1)										
Flashpoint	> 200		70	degrees F						20
Source: 3G19048-01 Prepared & Analyzed: 08/18/23										
Batch: B3H1249 - pH										
LCS (B3H1249-BS1)										
pH	7.0			SU	7.00		99.7	0-200		
Prepared & Analyzed: 08/29/23										
LCS (B3H1249-BS2)										
pH	7.0			SU	7.00		99.7	0-200		
Prepared & Analyzed: 08/29/23										
Duplicate (B3H1249-DUP1)										
pH	7.3			SU					0.137	200
Source: 3H22007-01 Prepared & Analyzed: 08/29/23										
Batch: B3H1258 - Conductivity										
Blank (B3H1258-BLK1)										
Specific Conductance	ND		2.0	uS/cm						
Prepared & Analyzed: 08/29/23										
Duplicate (B3H1258-DUP1)										
Specific Conductance	27.4		2.0	uS/cm					0.00	200
Source: 3H22007-01 Prepared & Analyzed: 08/29/23										

**Quality Control
(Continued)**

Reactivity

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1146 - Reactivity										
Blank (B3H1146-BLK1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg						
Blank (B3H1146-BLK2)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg						
LCS (B3H1146-BS1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Sulfide	3.9		0.1	mg/kg	4.00		97.5	90-110		
LCS (B3H1146-BS2)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Sulfide	3.9		0.1	mg/kg	4.00		97.5	90-110		
Duplicate (B3H1146-DUP1)					Source: 3H22007-01		Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23			
Sulfide	ND		0.1	mg/kg dry		ND				20
Matrix Spike (B3H1146-MS1)					Source: 3H22007-01		Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23			
Sulfide	4.7		0.1	mg/kg dry	4.80	ND	98.5	80-120		
Batch: B3H1147 - Reactivity										
Blank (B3H1147-BLK1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg						
Blank (B3H1147-BLK2)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23					
Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg						
Duplicate (B3H1147-DUP1)					Source: 3H22007-01		Prepared & Analyzed: 08/25/23			
Cyanide	ND		0.2	mg/kg dry		ND				20

**Quality Control
(Continued)**

Total Metals

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1001 - Metals Digestion Soils										
Blank (B3H1001-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
Antimony	ND		0.66	mg/kg						
Lead	ND		0.50	mg/kg						
Nickel	ND		0.50	mg/kg						
Chromium	ND		0.50	mg/kg						
Vanadium	ND		0.33	mg/kg						
Selenium	ND		1.00	mg/kg						
Zinc	ND		2.0	mg/kg						
Arsenic	ND		1.00	mg/kg						
Cadmium	ND		0.50	mg/kg						
Silver	ND		1.00	mg/kg						
Beryllium	ND		0.33	mg/kg						
Barium	ND		0.33	mg/kg						
Thallium	ND		0.33	mg/kg						
LCS (B3H1001-BS1)					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
Selenium	18.2		1.00	mg/kg	20.0		91.2	85-115		
Arsenic	19.8		1.00	mg/kg	20.0		99.1	85-115		
Cadmium	97.6		0.50	mg/kg	100		97.6	85-115		
Zinc	98.9		2.0	mg/kg	100		98.9	85-115		
Vanadium	105		0.33	mg/kg	100		105	85-115		
Lead	100		0.50	mg/kg	100		100	85-115		
Silver	40.4		1.00	mg/kg	40.0		101	85-115		
Chromium	104		0.50	mg/kg	100		104	85-115		
Nickel	96.5		0.50	mg/kg	100		96.5	85-112		
Barium	97.5		0.33	mg/kg	100		97.5	85-115		
Antimony	101		0.66	mg/kg	100		101	85-115		
Beryllium	20.5		0.33	mg/kg	20.0		103	85-115		
Thallium	96.9		0.33	mg/kg	100		96.9	85-115		

Quality Control
(Continued)

Total Metals (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1040 - Metals Cold-Vapor Mercury										
Blank (B3H1040-BLK1)										
Mercury	ND		0.100	mg/kg						
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
LCS (B3H1040-BS1)										
Mercury	0.364		0.100	mg/kg	0.357		102	93-114		
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
LCS Dup (B3H1040-BSD1)										
Mercury	0.358		0.100	mg/kg	0.357		100	93-114	1.57	200
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
Matrix Spike (B3H1040-MS1)										
Mercury	0.615		0.149	mg/kg dry	0.533	0.105	95.7	80-120		
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
Matrix Spike (B3H1040-MS2)										
Mercury	0.589		0.155	mg/kg dry	0.555	0.079	91.8	80-120		
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					
Matrix Spike Dup (B3H1040-MSD1)										
Mercury	0.682		0.152	mg/kg dry	0.545	0.105	106	80-120	10.4	20
					Prepared: 08/23/23 Analyzed: 08/24/23					

Quality Control
(Continued)

Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1057 - EPA 5035										
Blank (B3H1057-BLK1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
Acetone	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Benzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Bromobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Bromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Bromodichloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Bromoform	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Bromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
2-Butanone	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
tert-Butyl alcohol	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
sec-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
n-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
tert-Butylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Carbon Disulfide	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Carbon Tetrachloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Chlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Chloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Chloroform	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Chloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
4-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
2-Chlorotoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Dibromochloromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Dibromomethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2-Dichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
2,2-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1-Dichloropropene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,3-Dichloropropene (cis + trans)	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Diethyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,4-Dioxane	ND		0.100	mg/kg						
Ethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
2-Hexanone	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Isopropylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
p-Isopropyltoluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Methylene Chloride	ND		0.020	mg/kg						
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	ND		0.100	mg/kg						
Naphthalene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
n-Propylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Styrene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Tetrachloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Tetrahydrofuran	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Toluene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						

Quality Control

(Continued)

Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1057 - EPA 5035 (Continued)										
Blank (B3H1057-BLK1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Trichloroethene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Vinyl Chloride	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
o-Xylene	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
m&p-Xylene	ND		0.010	mg/kg						
Total xylenes	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
tert-Amyl methyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
1,3-Dichloropropane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Diisopropyl ether	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Trichlorofluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
Dichlorodifluoromethane	ND		0.005	mg/kg						
<i>Surrogate: 4-Bromofluorobenzene</i>			46.6	ug/kg	50.0		93.1	70-130		
<i>Surrogate: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4</i>			51.8	ug/kg	50.0		104	70-130		
<i>Surrogate: Toluene-d8</i>			50.5	ug/kg	50.0		101	70-130		
LCS (B3H1057-BS1)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
Acetone	0.018		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		36.0	50-150		
Benzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.9	70-130		
Bromobenzene	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		83.9	70-130		
Bromochloromethane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.3	70-130		
Bromodichloromethane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.4	70-130		
Bromoform	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.7	70-130		
Bromomethane	0.059		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		117	50-150		
2-Butanone	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.3	50-150		
tert-Butyl alcohol	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		95.0	70-130		
sec-Butylbenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.4	70-130		
n-Butylbenzene	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		93.1	70-130		
tert-Butylbenzene	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.1	70-130		
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.6	70-130		
Carbon Disulfide	0.028		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		55.7	50-150		
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		81.0	70-130		
Chlorobenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.0	70-130		
Chloroethane	0.066		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		131	50-150		
Chloroform	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.0	70-130		
Chloromethane	0.053		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		106	50-150		
4-Chlorotoluene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.6	70-130		
2-Chlorotoluene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.6	70-130		
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		95.0	70-130		
Dibromochloromethane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.8	70-130		
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.4	70-130		
Dibromomethane	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.3	60-140		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.8	70-130		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.9	70-130		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.0	70-130		
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.4	70-130		
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.040		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		80.2	70-130		
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.3	70-130		
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.0	70-130		
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.026		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		51.2	70-130		
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		93.3	70-130		
2,2-Dichloropropane	0.040		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		79.2	70-130		

Quality Control

(Continued)

Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1057 - EPA 5035 (Continued)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
LCS (B3H1057-BS1)										
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.9	70-130		
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.4	70-130		
1,1-Dichloropropene	0.039		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		78.9	70-130		
Diethyl ether	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.8	60-140		
1,4-Dioxane	0.206		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		82.3	0-200		
Ethylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.4	70-130		
Hexachlorobutadiene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.7	70-130		
2-Hexanone	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.3	50-150		
Isopropylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.3	70-130		
p-Isopropyltoluene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.1	70-130		
Methylene Chloride	0.058		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		116	60-140		
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.2	50-150		
Naphthalene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.4	70-130		
n-Propylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.8	70-130		
Styrene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.0	70-130		
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.5	70-130		
Tetrachloroethene	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.6	70-130		
Tetrahydrofuran	0.040		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		79.1	50-150		
Toluene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.9	70-130		
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.1	70-130		
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.2	70-130		
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.050		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		99.3	70-130		
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.040		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		80.4	70-130		
Trichloroethene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.6	70-130		
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.7	70-130		
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.8	70-130		
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.3	70-130		
Vinyl Chloride	0.052		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		105	50-150		
o-Xylene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.4	70-130		
m&p-Xylene	0.085		0.010	mg/kg	0.100		85.4	70-130		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		94.0	70-130		
tert-Amyl methyl ether	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.7	70-130		
1,3-Dichloropropane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		92.1	70-130		
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.2	70-130		
Trichlorofluoromethane	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		96.2	50-150		
Dichlorodifluoromethane	0.053		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		106	50-150		
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>										
Surrogate: 4-Bromofluorobenzene			48.8	ug/kg	50.0		97.5	70-130		
Surrogate: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4			52.5	ug/kg	50.0		105	70-130		
Surrogate: Toluene-d8			50.6	ug/kg	50.0		101	70-130		

Quality Control

(Continued)

Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1057 - EPA 5035 (Continued)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
LCS Dup (B3H1057-BSD1)										
Acetone	0.012		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		24.4	50-150	38.3	30
Benzene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.8	70-130	4.27	20
Bromobenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		86.7	70-130	3.28	20
Bromochloromethane	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		93.2	70-130	5.47	20
Bromodichloromethane	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.2	70-130	0.275	20
Bromoform	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.7	70-130	3.53	20
Bromomethane	0.060		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		121	50-150	3.19	30
2-Butanone	0.037		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		74.6	50-150	19.0	30
tert-Butyl alcohol	0.027		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		53.6	70-130	55.6	20
sec-Butylbenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.2	70-130	3.21	20
n-Butylbenzene	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		95.1	70-130	2.08	20
tert-Butylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.5	70-130	3.96	20
Methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE)	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.0	70-130	1.60	20
Carbon Disulfide	0.023		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		46.1	50-150	18.8	40
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.6	70-130	1.88	20
Chlorobenzene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		92.2	70-130	5.83	20
Chloroethane	0.065		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		131	50-150	0.305	30
Chloroform	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.2	70-130	1.41	20
Chloromethane	0.054		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		108	50-150	1.31	30
4-Chlorotoluene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.0	70-130	3.83	20
2-Chlorotoluene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.0	70-130	3.83	20
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.5	70-130	5.94	20
Dibromochloromethane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		92.3	70-130	0.478	20
1,2-Dibromoethane (EDB)	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.7	70-130	0.808	20
Dibromomethane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.0	60-140	5.35	30
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		93.4	70-130	2.85	20
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.7	70-130	3.23	20
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.7	70-130	3.00	20
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.9	70-130	3.79	20
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		81.2	70-130	1.26	20
trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.9	70-130	1.80	20
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.1	70-130	3.52	20
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.029		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		57.3	70-130	11.3	20
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		96.6	70-130	3.45	20
2,2-Dichloropropane	0.040		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		80.6	70-130	1.78	20
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.2	70-130	2.71	20
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.043		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		85.4	70-130	1.18	20
1,1-Dichloropropene	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.1	70-130	6.33	20
Diethyl ether	0.028		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		55.6	60-140	41.6	30
1,4-Dioxane	0.208		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		83.2	0-200	1.05	50
Ethylbenzene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.6	70-130	4.69	20
Hexachlorobutadiene	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		96.6	70-130	6.26	20
2-Hexanone	0.038		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		75.8	50-150	16.4	20
Isopropylbenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.6	70-130	2.65	20
p-Isopropyltoluene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.1	70-130	2.35	20
Methylene Chloride	0.070		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		141	60-140	19.4	30
4-Methyl-2-pentanone	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.1	50-150	7.14	20
Naphthalene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.9	70-130	3.93	20
n-Propylbenzene	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		90.6	70-130	3.09	20
Styrene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.2	70-130	4.74	20
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.6	70-130	4.58	20
Tetrachloroethene	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		84.4	70-130	2.13	20
Tetrahydrofuran	0.039		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		77.9	50-150	1.58	40
Toluene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.5	70-130	3.07	20
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.6	70-130	3.85	20
1,2,3-Trichlorobenzene	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		94.1	70-130	4.17	20
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0.045		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		89.4	70-130	10.5	20

Quality Control
(Continued)

Volatile Organic Compounds 8260C (5035-LL) (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1057 - EPA 5035 (Continued)					Prepared & Analyzed: 08/23/23					
LCS Dup (B3H1057-BSD1)										
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0.042		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		83.5	70-130	3.88	20
Trichloroethene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.6	70-130	3.47	20
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	0.048		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		96.4	70-130	8.32	20
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.4	70-130	1.89	20
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.1	70-130	2.13	20
Vinyl Chloride	0.053		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		106	50-150	1.39	30
o-Xylene	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		87.6	70-130	2.50	20
m&p-Xylene	0.091		0.010	mg/kg	0.100		90.8	70-130	6.10	20
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.047		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		94.0	70-130	0.0213	20
tert-Amyl methyl ether	0.041		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		82.6	70-130	0.121	20
1,3-Dichloropropane	0.046		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		91.1	70-130	1.09	20
Ethyl tert-butyl ether	0.044		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		88.0	70-130	2.04	20
Trichlorofluoromethane	0.049		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		98.0	50-150	1.83	20
Dichlorodifluoromethane	0.054		0.005	mg/kg	0.0500		108	50-150	1.90	30
<i>Surrogate: 4-Bromofluorobenzene</i>			<i>48.6</i>	<i>ug/kg</i>	<i>50.0</i>		<i>97.3</i>	<i>70-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4</i>			<i>49.1</i>	<i>ug/kg</i>	<i>50.0</i>		<i>98.1</i>	<i>70-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: Toluene-d8</i>			<i>49.0</i>	<i>ug/kg</i>	<i>50.0</i>		<i>98.0</i>	<i>70-130</i>		

Quality Control

(Continued)

Semivolatile organic compounds

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1153 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions										
Blank (B3H1153-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Phenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2,4-Dichlorophenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2,4-Dimethylphenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
2,4-Dinitrophenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Chloronaphthalene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Chlorophenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Methylnaphthalene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Nitrobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Methylphenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Nitroaniline	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
2-Nitrophenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
3-Nitroaniline	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4-Chloroaniline	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4-Nitroaniline	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
4-Nitrophenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
Acenaphthene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Acenaphthylene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Aniline	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Anthracene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzo(a)anthracene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzo(a)pyrene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Benzoic acid	ND		0.993	mg/kg						
Biphenyl	ND		0.040	mg/kg						
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	ND		0.397	mg/kg						
Butyl benzyl phthalate	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Chrysene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Di-n-octyl phthalate	ND		0.199	mg/kg						
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Dibenzofuran	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Diethyl phthalate	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Dimethyl phthalate	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
Di-n-butyl phthalate	ND		0.199	mg/kg						
Fluoranthene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Fluorene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Hexachlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Hexachlorobutadiene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
Hexachloroethane	ND		0.129	mg/kg						

Quality Control
(Continued)

Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1153 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions (Continued)										
Blank (B3H1153-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Isophorone	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Naphthalene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Pentachlorophenol	ND		0.328	mg/kg						
Phenanthrene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Pyrene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
m&p-Cresol	ND		0.258	mg/kg						
Pyridine	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Azobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
Total Dichlorobenzene	ND		0.129	mg/kg						
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: Nitrobenzene-d5</i>			<i>3.64</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>110</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: p-Terphenyl-d14</i>			<i>3.92</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>118</i>	<i>47-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>			<i>3.43</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>104</i>	<i>34-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: Phenol-d6</i>			<i>2.88</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>87.0</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>			<i>3.37</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>102</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorophenol</i>			<i>2.89</i>	mg/kg	<i>3.31</i>		<i>87.2</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<hr/>										
LCS (B3H1153-BS1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	2.98		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		89.9	40-130		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	2.77		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		83.7	40-130		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	2.48		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		74.8	40-130		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	2.47		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		74.5	40-130		
Phenol	2.65		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		80.0	40-130		
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	2.72		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		82.2	40-130		
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	2.79		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		84.2	40-130		
2,4-Dichlorophenol	2.90		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		87.4	40-130		
2,4-Dimethylphenol	2.43		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		73.2	40-130		
2,4-Dinitrophenol	0.813		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		24.5	15-140		
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	2.61		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		78.8	40-130		
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	2.48		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		74.9	40-130		
2-Chloronaphthalene	2.51		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		75.7	40-130		
2-Chlorophenol	2.58		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		77.8	40-130		
2-Methylnaphthalene	2.77		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		83.6	40-130		
Nitrobenzene	2.96		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		89.5	40-130		
2-Methylphenol	2.56		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		77.4	40-130		
2-Nitroaniline	2.85		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		86.1	40-130		
2-Nitrophenol	2.45		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		74.1	40-130		
3-Nitroaniline	2.18		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		65.8	40-130		
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	2.19		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		66.2	30-130		
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	2.97		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		89.7	40-130		
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	2.66		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		80.2	40-130		
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	3.48		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		105	40-130		
4-Nitroaniline	2.49		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		75.1	40-130		
4-Nitrophenol	4.80		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		145	40-130		
Acenaphthene	2.64		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		79.6	40-130		
Acenaphthylene	2.42		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		73.2	40-130		
Anthracene	2.94		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		88.7	40-130		
Benzo(a)anthracene	3.14		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		94.9	40-130		
Benzo(a)pyrene	3.18		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		95.9	40-130		
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	3.39		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		102	40-130		
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	3.01		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		91.0	40-130		
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	3.55		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		107	40-130		
Biphenyl	0.567		0.040	mg/kg	0.828		68.5	40-130		
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	2.47		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		74.6	40-130		

Quality Control

(Continued)

Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1153 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions (Continued)										
LCS (B3H1153-BS1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	2.19		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		66.1	40-130		
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	2.36		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		71.1	40-130		
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	3.38		0.397	mg/kg	3.31		102	40-130		
Butyl benzyl phthalate	2.98		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		90.0	40-130		
Chrysene	3.41		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		103	40-130		
Di-n-octyl phthalate	3.43		0.199	mg/kg	3.31		104	40-130		
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	3.05		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		92.2	40-130		
Dibenzofuran	2.72		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		82.3	40-130		
Diethyl phthalate	2.83		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		85.4	40-130		
Dimethyl phthalate	2.67		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		80.8	40-130		
Di-n-butyl phthalate	3.13		0.199	mg/kg	3.31		94.6	40-130		
Fluoranthene	3.33		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		101	40-130		
Fluorene	3.27		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		98.7	40-130		
Hexachlorobenzene	2.81		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		84.9	40-130		
Hexachlorobutadiene	4.01		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		121	40-130		
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	2.46		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		74.4	40-130		
Hexachloroethane	2.99		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		90.4	40-130		
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	2.90		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		87.6	40-130		
Isophorone	2.73		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		82.4	40-130		
Naphthalene	2.83		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		85.3	40-130		
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	4.02		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		121	40-130		
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	2.54		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		76.7	40-130		
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	3.24		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		97.8	40-130		
Pentachlorophenol	2.17		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		65.5	15-140		
Phenanthrene	2.99		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		90.4	40-130		
Pyrene	2.87		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		86.6	40-130		
m&p-Cresol	2.31		0.258	mg/kg	3.31		69.8	40-130		
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: Nitrobenzene-d5</i>			<i>3.93</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>119</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: p-Terphenyl-d14</i>			<i>3.75</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>113</i>	<i>47-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>			<i>3.40</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>103</i>	<i>34-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: Phenol-d6</i>			<i>3.12</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>94.2</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>			<i>3.86</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>117</i>	<i>30-130</i>		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorophenol</i>			<i>2.86</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>3.31</i>		<i>86.3</i>	<i>30-130</i>		

**Quality Control
(Continued)**

Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1153 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions (Continued)										
LCS Dup (B3H1153-BSD1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	3.35		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		101	40-130	11.9	30
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	3.12		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		94.4	40-130	11.9	30
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	2.73		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		82.5	40-130	9.79	30
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	2.75		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		83.0	40-130	10.7	30
Phenol	2.93		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		88.5	40-130	10.1	30
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	3.04		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		91.7	40-130	10.9	30
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	3.11		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		93.9	40-130	10.9	30
2,4-Dichlorophenol	3.24		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		97.8	40-130	11.2	30
2,4-Dimethylphenol	2.86		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		86.4	40-130	16.5	30
2,4-Dinitrophenol	1.14		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		34.4	15-140	33.5	30
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	3.07		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		92.7	40-130	16.2	30
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	2.85		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		86.1	40-130	14.0	30
2-Chloronaphthalene	2.87		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		86.7	40-130	13.6	30
2-Chlorophenol	2.76		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		83.5	40-130	6.97	30
2-Methylnaphthalene	3.12		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		94.2	40-130	12.0	30
Nitrobenzene	3.26		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		98.4	40-130	9.41	30
2-Methylphenol	2.86		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		86.3	40-130	10.9	30
2-Nitroaniline	3.27		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		98.8	40-130	13.7	30
2-Nitrophenol	2.69		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		81.3	40-130	9.26	30
3-Nitroaniline	2.48		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		74.9	40-130	12.9	30
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	2.44		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		73.7	30-130	10.8	30
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	3.23		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		97.7	40-130	8.47	30
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	2.96		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		89.4	40-130	10.8	30
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	3.97		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		120	40-130	13.1	30
4-Nitroaniline	2.83		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		85.6	40-130	13.1	30
4-Nitrophenol	5.65		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		171	40-130	16.2	30
Acenaphthene	2.93		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		88.6	40-130	10.7	30
Acenaphthylene	2.77		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		83.7	40-130	13.4	30
Anthracene	3.19		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		96.3	40-130	8.22	30
Benzo(a)anthracene	3.27		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		98.8	40-130	4.01	30
Benzo(a)pyrene	3.45		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		104	40-130	8.33	30
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	3.73		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		113	40-130	9.44	30
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	3.15		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		95.3	40-130	4.53	30
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	3.84		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		116	40-130	7.92	30
Biphenyl	0.657		0.040	mg/kg	0.828		79.4	40-130	14.7	30
Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	2.81		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		84.8	40-130	12.7	30
Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	2.54		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		76.6	40-130	14.7	30
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	2.52		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		76.2	40-130	6.84	30
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	3.58		0.397	mg/kg	3.31		108	40-130	5.75	30
Butyl benzyl phthalate	3.12		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		94.2	40-130	4.56	30
Chrysene	3.60		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		109	40-130	5.41	30
Di-n-octyl phthalate	3.78		0.199	mg/kg	3.31		114	40-130	9.53	30
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	3.21		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		96.8	40-130	4.93	30
Dibenzofuran	3.08		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		93.1	40-130	12.3	30
Diethyl phthalate	3.15		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		95.0	40-130	10.6	30
Dimethyl phthalate	3.05		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		92.0	40-130	13.0	30
Di-n-butyl phthalate	3.36		0.199	mg/kg	3.31		102	40-130	7.02	30
Fluoranthene	3.57		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		108	40-130	6.86	30
Fluorene	3.72		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		112	40-130	12.9	30
Hexachlorobenzene	3.11		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		93.9	40-130	10.1	30
Hexachlorobutadiene	4.48		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		135	40-130	11.0	30
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	2.93		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		88.6	40-130	17.4	30
Hexachloroethane	3.30		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		99.5	40-130	9.65	30
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	3.00		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		90.6	40-130	3.41	30
Isophorone	3.02		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		91.2	40-130	10.1	30
Naphthalene	3.06		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		92.4	40-130	7.94	30
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	4.39		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		133	40-130	8.85	30

Quality Control
(Continued)

Semivolatile organic compounds (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1153 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions (Continued)										
LCS Dup (B3H1153-BSD1)										
					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	2.91		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		87.7	40-130	13.4	30
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	3.57		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		108	40-130	9.61	30
Pentachlorophenol	2.51		0.328	mg/kg	3.31		75.7	15-140	14.4	30
Phenanthrene	3.27		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		98.8	40-130	8.90	30
Pyrene	3.05		0.129	mg/kg	3.31		92.0	40-130	6.09	30
m&p-Cresol	2.48		0.258	mg/kg	3.31		74.8	40-130	6.97	30
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: Nitrobenzene-d5</i>			4.26	mg/kg	3.31		129	30-130		
<i>Surrogate: p-Terphenyl-d14</i>			3.87	mg/kg	3.31		117	47-130		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorobiphenyl</i>			3.71	mg/kg	3.31		112	34-130		
<i>Surrogate: Phenol-d6</i>			3.33	mg/kg	3.31		101	30-130		
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,6-Tribromophenol</i>			4.09	mg/kg	3.31		123	30-130		
<i>Surrogate: 2-Fluorophenol</i>			3.14	mg/kg	3.31		94.9	30-130		

Quality Control
(Continued)

Pesticides

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1185 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions										
Blank (B3H1185-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
alpha-BHC	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
beta-BHC	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
delta-BHC	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Heptachlor	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Aldrin	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Heptachlor epoxide	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
gamma-Chlordane	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
alpha-Chlordane	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Chlordane	ND		0.0167	mg/kg						
4,4'-DDE	ND		0.00333	mg/kg						
Endosulfan I	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Dieldrin	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Endrin	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
4,4'-DDD	ND		0.00333	mg/kg						
Endosulfan II	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Endrin aldehyde	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
4,4'-DDT	ND		0.00333	mg/kg						
Methoxychlor	ND		0.00333	mg/kg						
Endosulfan sulfate	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Endrin Ketone	ND		0.00167	mg/kg						
Toxaphene	ND		0.0167	mg/kg						
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			0.00935	mg/kg	0.0133		70.1	30-106		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			0.0104	mg/kg	0.0133		77.9	32-110		
LCS (B3H1185-BS1)					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
alpha-BHC	0.0102		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.7	50-132		
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	0.0103		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		77.3	54-128		
beta-BHC	0.00997		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		74.8	69-126		
delta-BHC	0.0102		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.8	40-126		
Heptachlor	0.00978		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		73.4	55-125		
Aldrin	0.0103		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		77.1	45-135		
Heptachlor epoxide	0.0101		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.9	54-127		
gamma-Chlordane	0.00996		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		74.7	55-124		
alpha-Chlordane	0.0102		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.3	54-126		
4,4'-DDE	0.0108		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		81.2	63-130		
Endosulfan I	0.00983		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		73.8	53-128		
Dieldrin	0.0105		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		78.5	57-124		
Endrin	0.00979		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		73.4	40-140		
4,4'-DDD	0.00978		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		73.4	74-140		
Endrin aldehyde	0.00935		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		70.1	40-140		
Endosulfan II	0.0100		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.1	45-125		
4,4'-DDT	0.0135		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		101	60-140		
Methoxychlor	0.0116		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		86.7	71-140		
Endosulfan sulfate	0.0108		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		81.0	43-131		
Endrin Ketone	0.0112		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		84.1	56-131		
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			0.00949	mg/kg	0.0133		71.2	38-106		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			0.0104	mg/kg	0.0133		77.7	32-110		

**Quality Control
(Continued)**

Pesticides (Continued)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1185 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions (Continued)										
LCS Dup (B3H1185-BSD1)										
					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
alpha-BHC	0.00990		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		74.3	50-132	3.25	30
gamma-BHC (Lindane)	0.0100		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.1	54-128	2.92	30
beta-BHC	0.0104		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		77.6	69-126	3.81	30
delta-BHC	0.0100		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.2	40-126	2.14	30
Heptachlor	0.0100		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.1	55-125	2.26	30
Aldrin	0.00992		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		74.4	45-135	3.50	30
Heptachlor epoxide	0.00987		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		74.0	54-127	2.50	30
gamma-Chlordane	0.0101		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.0	55-124	1.76	30
alpha-Chlordane	0.0102		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.3	54-126	0.0983	30
4,4'-DDE	0.0102		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		76.8	63-130	5.54	30
Endosulfan I	0.0101		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		75.6	53-128	2.44	30
Dieldrin	0.0102		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.4	57-124	2.74	30
Endrin	0.00969		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		72.7	40-140	0.993	30
4,4'-DDD	0.0102		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		76.5	74-140	4.14	30
Endosulfan II	0.0101		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		76.0	45-125	1.29	30
Endrin aldehyde	0.00931		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		69.9	40-140	0.357	30
4,4'-DDT	0.0134		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		100	60-140	1.34	30
Methoxychlor	0.0114		0.00333	mg/kg	0.0133		85.9	71-140	0.956	30
Endosulfan sulfate	0.0107		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		80.4	43-131	0.682	30
Endrin Ketone	0.0112		0.00167	mg/kg	0.0133		83.9	56-131	0.298	30
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			<i>0.00977</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>0.0133</i>		<i>73.3</i>	<i>38-106</i>		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			<i>0.0104</i>	<i>mg/kg</i>	<i>0.0133</i>		<i>77.8</i>	<i>32-110</i>		

**Quality Control
(Continued)**

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1184 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions										
Blank (B3H1184-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
Aroclor-1016	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1221	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1232	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1242	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1248	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1254	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1260	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1262	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
Aroclor-1268	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
PCBs (Total)	ND		0.066	mg/kg						
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			0.00967	mg/kg	0.0133		72.5	36.2-130		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			0.0119	mg/kg	0.0133		89.4	43.3-130		
LCS (B3H1184-BS1)					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
Aroclor-1016	0.144		0.066	mg/kg	0.167		86.5	58.2-125		
Aroclor-1260	0.139		0.066	mg/kg	0.167		83.4	65.5-130		
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			0.0101	mg/kg	0.0133		75.5	36.2-130		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			0.0122	mg/kg	0.0133		91.6	43.3-130		
LCS Dup (B3H1184-BSD1)					Prepared: 08/28/23 Analyzed: 08/30/23					
Aroclor-1016	0.148		0.066	mg/kg	0.167		88.7	58.2-125	2.55	20
Aroclor-1260	0.168		0.066	mg/kg	0.167		101	65.5-130	18.9	20
<hr/>										
<i>Surrogate: 2,4,5,6-Tetrachloro-m-xylene (TCMX)</i>			0.0145	mg/kg	0.0133		108	36.2-130		
<i>Surrogate: Decachlorobiphenyl (DCBP)</i>			0.0130	mg/kg	0.0133		97.8	43.3-130		

Quality Control
(Continued)

Herbicides

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1086 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions										
Blank (B3H1086-BLK1) Prepared: 08/24/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23										
Dalapon	ND		0.100	mg/kg						
Dicamba	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
Dichloroprop	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
2,4-D	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
2,4,5-T	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
2,4-DB	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
Dinoseb	ND		0.100	mg/kg						
MCPP	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
MCPA	ND		0.050	mg/kg						
<i>Surrogate: 2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>			0.205	mg/kg	0.250		82.0	41-145		
LCS (B3H1086-BS1) Prepared: 08/24/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23										
Dalapon	0.124		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		49.4	40-140		
Dicamba	0.203		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		81.2	40-140		
Dichloroprop	0.213		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		85.2	40-140		
2,4-D	0.163		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		65.2	40-140		
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	0.210		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		83.8	40-140		
2,4,5-T	0.162		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		64.7	40-140		
2,4-DB	0.273		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		109	40-140		
Dinoseb	0.186		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		74.5	40-140		
<i>Surrogate: 2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>			0.227	mg/kg	0.250		90.7	41-145		
LCS Dup (B3H1086-BSD1) Prepared: 08/24/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23										
Dalapon	0.115		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		45.8	40-140	7.46	20
Dicamba	0.206		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		82.3	40-140	1.30	20
Dichloroprop	0.215		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		86.1	40-140	1.12	20
2,4-D	0.168		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		67.0	40-140	2.66	20
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	0.208		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		83.2	40-140	0.697	20
2,4,5-T	0.158		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		63.3	40-140	2.16	20
2,4-DB	0.279		0.050	mg/kg	0.250		111	40-140	2.00	20
Dinoseb	0.188		0.100	mg/kg	0.250		75.2	40-140	0.886	20
<i>Surrogate: 2,4-Dichlorophenyl acetic acid</i>			0.224	mg/kg	0.250		89.5	41-145		

Quality Control
(Continued)

Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

Analyte	Result	Qual	Reporting Limit	Units	Spike Level	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limits	RPD	RPD Limit
Batch: B3H1154 - 1_Semivolatiles Extractions										
Blank (B3H1154-BLK1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	ND		27	mg/kg						

Surrogate: Chlorooctadecane			6.18	mg/kg	8.33		74.1	50-130		
LCS (B3H1154-BS1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	392		27	mg/kg	667		58.8	44.7-125		

Surrogate: Chlorooctadecane			5.85	mg/kg	8.33		70.2	50-130		
LCS Dup (B3H1154-BSD1)					Prepared: 08/26/23 Analyzed: 08/28/23					
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	389		27	mg/kg	667		58.4	44.7-125	0.758	200

Surrogate: Chlorooctadecane			5.82	mg/kg	8.33		69.8	50-130		

Notes and Definitions

Item	Definition
Wet	Sample results reported on a wet weight basis.
ND	Analyte NOT DETECTED at or above the reporting limit.

New England Testing Laboratory

59 Greenhill Street
West Warwick, RI 02893
1-888-863-8522



3 H 2 2059 m

Chain of Custody

Project No.	Project Name/Location:	Matrix			No. of Containers	Preservative	Tests**										
		Aqueous	Soil	Other			VC's 2260	SVC's	TPH	ME & 14 metals	PCB's	Herbicides/Pesticides	Reactive organics	pH/Resistivity	Fresh point	Conductivity	
Client:	CDH CONSULTANTS, INC.																
Report To:	MERRIS & CDH CONSULTANTS, LLC																
Invoice To:	Leslie & CDH CONSULTANTS, LLC																
Date	Time	Comp	Grab	Sample I.D.													
8/21/23	12:00	X		Comp RB# 203, 205, 207, 209	5	methanol											
"	12:30	X		Comp RB# 204, 206, 208, 210	5												
"	1:00	X		Comp RB# 201, 202, 203, 205 (0-10)	5												
"	12:00		X	RB-9 (0-12')	1												
"	12:30		X	RB-1 (5-7')	1												
"	1:00		X	RB-5 (5-7')	1												
Sampled By:		Date/Time		Received By:	Date/Time		Laboratory Remarks:		Date/Time		Special Instructions:						
B. J. ...		8/21/23		J. ...	8/22/23		Temp. Received: 4		8/22/23								
Relinquished By:		Date/Time		Received By:	Date/Time				8/22/23								
J. ...		8/22/23		J. ...	8/22/23												

**Netlab Subcontracts the following tests: Radiologicals, Radon, TOC, Asbestos, UCMRs, Perchlorate, Bromate, Bromide, Sieve, Salmonella, Carbamates

J. ... 8/22/23
AR 8/16/23
AR 8/16/23
 16/2

MassDEP Analytical Protocol Certification Form

Laboratory Name: New England Testing Laboratory, Inc.

Project #:

Project Location: Dedham, MA

RTN:

This Form provides certifications for the following data set: list Laboratory Sample ID Number(s):
3H22059

 Matrices: Groundwater/Surface Water Soil/Sediment Drinking Water Air Other:

CAM Protocol (check all that apply below):

8260 VOC CAM II A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7470/7471 Hg CAM III B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MassDEP VPH (GC/PID/FID) CAM IV A <input type="checkbox"/>	8082 PCB CAM V A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9014 Total Cyanide/PAC CAM VI A <input type="checkbox"/>	6860 Perchlorate CAM VIII B <input type="checkbox"/>
8270 SVOC CAM II B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7010 Metals CAM III C <input type="checkbox"/>	MassDEP VPH (GC/MS) CAM IV C <input type="checkbox"/>	8081 Pesticides CAM V B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7196 Hex Cr CAM VI B <input type="checkbox"/>	MassDEP APH CAM IX A <input type="checkbox"/>
6010 Metals CAM III A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6020 Metals CAM III D <input type="checkbox"/>	MassDEP EPH CAM IV B <input type="checkbox"/>	8151 Herbicides CAM V C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8330 Explosives CAM VIII A <input type="checkbox"/>	TO-15 VOC CAM IX B <input type="checkbox"/>

Affirmative Responses to Questions A through F are required for "Presumptive Certainty" status

A	Were all samples received in a condition consistent with those described on the Chain-of-Custody, properly preserved (including temperature) in the field or laboratory, and prepared/analyzed within method holding times?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
B	Were the analytical method(s) and all associated QC requirements specified in the selected CAM protocol(s) followed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
C	Were all required corrective actions and analytical response actions specified in the selected CAM protocol(s) implemented for all identified performance standard non-conformances?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
D	Does the laboratory report comply with all the reporting requirements specified in CAM VII A, "Quality Assurance and Quality Control Guidelines for the Acquisition and Reporting of Analytical Data"?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
E	VPH, EPH, APH, and TO-15 only a. VPH, EPH, and APH Methods only: Was each method conducted without significant modification(s)? (Refer to the individual method(s) for a list of significant modifications). b. APH and TO-15 Methods only: Was the complete analyte list reported for each method?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
F	Were all applicable CAM protocol QC and performance standard non-conformances identified and evaluated in a laboratory narrative (including all "No" responses to Questions A through E)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Responses to Questions G, H and I below are required for "Presumptive Certainty" status

G	Were the reporting limits at or below all CAM reporting limits specified in the selected CAM protocol(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No ¹
----------	---	--

Data User Note: Data that achieve "Presumptive Certainty" status may not necessarily meet the data usability and representativeness requirements described in 310 CMR 40. 1056 (2)(k) and WSC-07-350.

H	Were all QC performance standards specified in the CAM protocol(s) achieved?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No ¹
I	Were results reported for the complete analyte list specified in the selected CAM protocol(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No ¹

¹All negative responses must be addressed in an attached laboratory narrative.

I, the undersigned, attest under the pains and penalties of perjury that, based upon my personal inquiry of those responsible for obtaining the information, the material contained in this analytical report is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, is accurate and complete.

 Signature: 

 Position: Laboratory Director

 Printed Name: Richard Warila

 Date: 8/30/2023

**REPORT
FOR
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IDENTIFICATION STUDY
AT
OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
DEDHAM, MA**

PROJECT NUMBER:
223 501.00

SURVEY DATES:
February 2020, April 2023
July-August 2023

STUDY CONDUCTED BY:
**UNIVERSAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS
12 BREWSTER ROAD
FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS**

August 14, 2023

Mr. Phillips Gray
Senior Principal
Jonathan Levi Architects
266 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02116

Reference: **Hazardous Materials Identification Survey**
Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, MA

Dear Mr. Gray:

Thank you for the opportunity for Universal Environmental Consultants (UEC) to provide professional services.

Enclosed please find the report for the Hazardous Materials Identification Survey at Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, MA.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 628-5486 if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Universal Environmental Consultants



Ammar Dieb
President

UEC:\223 501.00\Report.DOC

Enclosure

INTRODUCTION:

Universal Environmental Consultants (UEC) has been providing comprehensive asbestos services since 2001 and has completed projects throughout New England. We have completed projects for a variety of clients including commercial, industrial, municipal, and public and private schools. We maintain appropriate asbestos licenses and staff with a minimum of thirty-three years of experience.

UEC was contracted by Jonathan Levi Architects to conduct the following services at Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, Massachusetts:

- Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) inspection and sampling.
- Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's)-Electrical Equipment and Light Fixtures inspection.
- PCB's Caulking inspection.
- Lead Based Paint (LBP) inspection.
- Airborne Mold sampling.
- Mercury in Rubber Flooring inspection.
- Radon sampling.

The scope of work included the inspection of accessible ACM, collection of bulk samples, determination, and quantities of types of ACM found and cost estimates for remediation. *A comprehensive survey per the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) NESHAP regulation would be required prior to any renovation or demolition activities.*

Bulk samples analyses for asbestos were performed using the standard Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM) Method in accordance with EPA standard. Bulk samples were collected by Massachusetts licensed asbestos inspectors Mr. Leonard J. Busa (AI-001899) and Mr. Keith McGovern (AI-901149). Samples were analyzed by Massachusetts licensed laboratories EMSL and Asbestos Identification Laboratory, Woburn, MA.

Airborne mold samples were analyzed by an EPA trained laboratory EMSL, Woburn, MA.

Radon samples were analyzed by an EPA licensed laboratory AccuStar, Ward Hill, MA.

Samples results are attached.

FINDINGS:

Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM):

The regulations for asbestos inspection are based on representative sampling. It would be impractical and costly to sample all materials in all areas. Therefore, representative samples of each homogenous area were collected and analyzed or assumed.

All suspect materials were grouped into homogenous areas. By definition, a homogenous area is one in which the materials are evenly mixed and similar in appearance and texture throughout. Per Massachusetts regulations, a homogeneous area shall be determined to be ACM based on findings that the results of at least one sample collected from that area shows that asbestos is present in an amount 1 percent or greater. Per EPA, a homogeneous area shall be determined to be ACM based on findings that the results of at least one sample collected from that area shows that asbestos is present in an amount of greater than 1 percent. Per the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) any amount of asbestos found must be disposed as asbestos.

No additional suspect and accessible ACM were found during this survey. However, hidden ACM may be found during the renovation and demolition activities.

Number of Samples Collected:

February 21, 2020 (Original Building):

One hundred (100) bulk samples were collected from materials suspected of containing asbestos, including:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

1. Light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
2. Mastic for light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
3. Light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
4. Mastic for light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
5. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
6. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
7. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
8. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
9. Black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
10. Mastic for black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
11. Black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
12. Mastic for black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
13. Grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
14. Mastic for grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
15. Grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
16. Mastic for grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
17. Lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
18. Mastic for lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
19. Lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
20. Mastic for lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
21. Black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
22. Mastic for black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
23. Black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
24. Mastic for black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
25. Grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
26. Mastic for grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
27. Grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
28. Mastic for grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
29. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
30. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
31. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
32. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
33. Gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
34. Mastic for gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
35. Gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
36. Mastic for gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
37. Grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
38. Mastic for grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl
39. Grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
40. Mastic for grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl
41. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
42. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
43. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
44. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
45. Sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
46. Mastic for sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
47. Sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
48. Mastic for sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
49. Grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
50. Mastic for grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
51. Grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
52. Mastic for grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
53. Linoleum flooring under grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
54. Linoleum flooring under grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile

55. Hard tan vinyl baseboard
56. Adhesive for hard tan vinyl baseboard
57. Hard tan vinyl baseboard
58. Adhesive for hard tan vinyl baseboard
59. Blue vinyl baseboard
60. Adhesive for blue vinyl baseboard
61. Blue vinyl baseboard
62. Adhesive for blue vinyl baseboard
63. Black vinyl baseboard
64. Adhesive for black vinyl baseboard
65. Black vinyl baseboard
66. Adhesive for black vinyl baseboard
67. Ceiling plaster type I
68. Ceiling plaster type I
69. Ceiling plaster type I
70. Ceiling plaster type I
71. Ceiling plaster type I
72. Wall plaster type I
73. Wall plaster type I
74. Wall plaster type I
75. Wall plaster type I
76. Wall plaster type I
77. Ceiling plaster type II
78. Ceiling plaster type II
79. Ceiling plaster type II
80. Ceiling plaster type III
81. Ceiling plaster type III
82. Ceiling plaster type III
83. Green wall paint at boiler room
84. Green wall paint at boiler room
85. Panel over classroom entrance door
86. Panel over classroom entrance door
87. Dark sink damproofing
88. Dark sink damproofing
89. Interior window glazing caulking
90. Interior window glazing caulking
91. Adhesive for glazed wall tile
92. Adhesive for glazed wall tile
93. Homosote wall panel
94. Homosote wall panel
95. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type I
96. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type I
97. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type II
98. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type II
99. Wall plaster
100. Wall plaster

Sample Results:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

Sample Result

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |
| 2. Mastic for light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |
| 3. Light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |
| 4. Mastic for light grey/green-red 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |
| 5. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |
| 6. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile | No Asbestos Detected |

7. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
8. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
9. Black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
10. Mastic for black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
11. Black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
12. Mastic for black 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
13. Grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
14. Mastic for grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
15. Grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
16. Mastic for grey type I 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
17. Lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
18. Mastic for lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
19. Lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
20. Mastic for lime green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
21. Black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
22. Mastic for black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
23. Black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
24. Mastic for black/brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
25. Grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
26. Mastic for grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
27. Grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
28. Mastic for grey type II 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
29. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
30. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
31. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
32. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
33. Gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
34. Mastic for gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
35. Gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
36. Mastic for gold 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
37. Grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
38. Mastic for grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl	No Asbestos Detected
39. Grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
40. Mastic for grey type III 12" x 12" vinyl	No Asbestos Detected
41. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
42. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
43. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
44. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
45. Sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
46. Mastic for sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
47. Sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
48. Mastic for sea green 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
49. Grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
50. Mastic for grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
51. Grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
52. Mastic for grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
53. Linoleum flooring under grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	30% Asbestos
54. Linoleum flooring under grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	40% Asbestos
55. Hard tan vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
56. Adhesive for hard tan vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
57. Hard tan vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
58. Adhesive for hard tan vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
59. Blue vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
60. Adhesive for blue vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
61. Blue vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
62. Adhesive for blue vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected

63. Black vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
64. Adhesive for black vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
65. Black vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
66. Adhesive for black vinyl baseboard	No Asbestos Detected
67. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
68. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
69. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
70. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
71. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
72. Wall plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
73. Wall plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
74. Wall plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
75. Wall plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
76. Wall plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
77. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
78. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
79. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
80. Ceiling plaster type III	No Asbestos Detected
81. Ceiling plaster type III	No Asbestos Detected
82. Ceiling plaster type III	No Asbestos Detected
83. Green wall paint at boiler room	No Asbestos Detected
84. Green wall paint at boiler room	No Asbestos Detected
85. Panel over classroom entrance door	No Asbestos Detected
86. Panel over classroom entrance door	No Asbestos Detected
87. Dark sink damproofing	5% Asbestos
88. Dark sink damproofing	3% Asbestos
89. Interior window glazing caulking	No Asbestos Detected
90. Interior window glazing caulking	No Asbestos Detected
91. Adhesive for glazed wall tile	No Asbestos Detected
92. Adhesive for glazed wall tile	No Asbestos Detected
93. Homosote wall panel	No Asbestos Detected
94. Homosote wall panel	No Asbestos Detected
95. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type I	No Asbestos Detected
96. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type I	No Asbestos Detected
97. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type II	No Asbestos Detected
98. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile type II	No Asbestos Detected
99. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected
100. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected

February 21, 2020 (1951 Addition):

Thirty five (35) bulk samples were collected from materials suspected of containing asbestos, including:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

1. Ceiling plaster type I
2. Ceiling plaster type I
3. Ceiling plaster type I
4. Ceiling plaster type I
5. Wall plaster
6. Wall plaster
7. Wall plaster
8. Ceiling plaster type II
9. Ceiling plaster type II
10. Ceiling plaster type II
11. Interior window glazing caulking
12. Interior glazing caulking in wood door

13. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile
14. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile
15. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile
16. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile
17. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile
18. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
19. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
20. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
21. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
22. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets
23. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets
24. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets
25. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
26. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
27. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
28. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
29. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
30. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
31. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
32. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
33. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
34. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
35. Wall plaster

Sample Results:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

Sample Result

1. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
2. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
3. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
4. Ceiling plaster type I	No Asbestos Detected
5. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected
6. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected
7. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected
8. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
9. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
10. Ceiling plaster type II	No Asbestos Detected
11. Interior window glazing caulking	2% Asbestos
12. Interior glazing caulking in wood door	2% Asbestos
13. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile	No Asbestos Detected
14. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile	No Asbestos Detected
15. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile	No Asbestos Detected
16. Glue daub for pressed wood 1' x 1' acoustical tile	No Asbestos Detected
17. 1' x 1' Acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
18. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
19. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
20. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
21. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
22. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets	No Asbestos Detected
23. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets	No Asbestos Detected
24. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl tile on heating cabinets	No Asbestos Detected
25. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
26. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	5% Asbestos
27. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos
28. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	5% Asbestos
29. Chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	2% Asbestos

30. Mastic for chocolate 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
31. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
32. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
33. Blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
34. Mastic for blue 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
35. Wall plaster	No Asbestos Detected

February 21, 2020 (1960 Addition):

Twelve (12) bulk samples were collected from materials suspected of containing asbestos, including:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

1. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
2. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
3. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
4. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
5. Black glue in fiberglass ceiling insulation
6. Black glue in fiberglass ceiling insulation
7. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
8. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
9. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
10. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
11. Interior vertical expansion joint in CMU
12. Interior vertical expansion joint in CMU

Sample Results:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

Sample Result

1. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
2. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
3. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
4. 2' x 4' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
5. Black glue in fiberglass ceiling insulation	No Asbestos Detected
6. Black glue in fiberglass ceiling insulation	No Asbestos Detected
7. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
8. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
9. Mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
10. Mastic for mottled brown 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	3% Asbestos
11. Interior vertical expansion joint in CMU	No Asbestos Detected
12. Interior vertical expansion joint in CMU	No Asbestos Detected

April 19, 2023 (Modular Building)

Eight (8) bulk samples were collected from materials suspected of containing asbestos, including:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

1. 2' x 2' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
2. 2' x 2' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile
3. White/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
4. Mastic for white/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
5. White/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
6. Mastic for white/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile
7. Joint compound
8. Joint compound

Sample Results:

Type and Location of Suspect Material**Sample Result**

1. 2' x 2' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
2. 2' x 2' Suspended acoustical ceiling tile	No Asbestos Detected
3. White/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
4. Mastic for white/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
5. White/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
6. Mastic for white/grey specs 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile	No Asbestos Detected
7. Joint compound	No Asbestos Detected
8. Joint compound	No Asbestos Detected

August 10, 2023

Twenty two (22) bulk samples were collected from materials suspected of containing asbestos, including:

Type and Location of Suspect Material

1. Exterior window framing caulking at original building
2. Exterior window framing caulking at original building
3. Exterior window framing caulking at original building
4. Exterior residue caulking on brick at original building
5. Exterior residue caulking on brick at original building
6. Exterior door framing caulking at original building
7. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition
8. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition
9. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition
10. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition
11. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition
12. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition
13. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition
14. Exterior door framing caulking at 1951 addition
15. Exterior door framing caulking at 1951 addition
16. Exterior transite panel at 1951 addition
17. Exterior window framing caulking at 1960 addition
18. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1960 addition
19. Exterior window framing caulking at 1960 addition
20. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1960 addition
21. Interior glazing caulking for exterior window at 1951 addition
22. Interior glazing caulking for exterior window at 1951 addition

Sample Results:**Type and Location of Suspect Material****Sample Result**

1. Exterior window framing caulking at original building	7% Asbestos
2. Exterior window framing caulking at original building	No Asbestos Detected
3. Exterior window framing caulking at original building	No Asbestos Detected
4. Exterior residue caulking on brick at original building	10% Asbestos
5. Exterior residue caulking on brick at original building	10% Asbestos
6. Exterior door framing caulking at original building	3% Asbestos
7. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition	20% Asbestos
8. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition	No Asbestos Detected
9. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition	20% Asbestos
10. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition	3% Asbestos
11. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition	20% Asbestos
12. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition	2% Asbestos
13. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition	No Asbestos Detected
14. Exterior door framing caulking at 1951 addition	20% Asbestos

15. Exterior door framing caulking at 1951 addition	20% Asbestos
16. Exterior transite panel at 1951 addition	15% Asbestos
17. Exterior window framing caulking at 1960 addition	No Asbestos Detected
18. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1960 addition	2% Asbestos
19. Exterior window framing caulking at 1960 addition	No Asbestos Detected
20. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1960 addition	2% Asbestos
21. Interior glazing caulking for exterior window at 1951 addition	5% Asbestos
22. Interior glazing caulking for exterior window at 1951 addition	2% Asbestos

Observations and Conclusions:

The condition of ACM is very important. ACM in good condition does not present a health issue unless it is disturbed. Therefore, it is not necessary to remediate ACM in good condition unless it will be disturbed through renovation, demolition, or other activity.

Refer to the AHERA Management Plan for condition of ACM.

1. Various types of 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile were found to contain asbestos.
2. Mastic for various types of 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile were found to contain asbestos.
3. Linoleum flooring under grey/black spots 12" x 12" vinyl floor tile was found to contain asbestos.
4. Dark sink coating was found to contain asbestos.
5. Interior wood door glazing caulking was found to contain asbestos.
6. Interior window glazing caulking was found to contain asbestos.
7. Exterior window framing caulking at original building
8. Exterior residue caulking on brick at original building
9. Exterior door framing caulking at original building
10. Exterior window framing caulking at 1951 addition
11. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1951 addition
12. Exterior door framing caulking at 1951 addition
13. Exterior window glazing caulking at 1960 addition
14. Interior glazing caulking for exterior window at 1951 addition
15. Transite panels under/over exterior windows at 1951 addition were found to contain asbestos.
16. Paper/mastic under gymnasium wood floor was assumed to contain asbestos.
17. Paper/mastic under hardwood floor was assumed to contain asbestos.
18. Chalkboard glue was assumed to contain asbestos.
19. Ceramic glue was assumed to contain asbestos.
20. Underground sewer pipes were assumed to contain asbestos.
21. Roofing material was assumed to contain asbestos.
22. Dampproofing on exterior and foundation walls was assumed to exist and assumed to contain asbestos. A Non-Traditional Work Plan (NTWP) will be required to be prepared and submitted to the DEP for approval.
23. All other suspect materials were found not to contain asbestos. Hidden ACM may be found during renovation and demolition activities.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's)-Electrical Equipment and Light Fixtures:

Observations and Conclusions

Visual inspection of various equipments such as light fixtures, thermostats, exit signs and switches was performed for the presence of PCB's and mercury. Ballasts in light fixtures were assumed not to contain PCB's since there were labels indicating that "No PCB's" was found. Tubes in light fixtures, thermostats, signs, and switches were assumed to contain mercury. It would be very costly to test those equipments and dismantling would be required to access. Therefore, the above mentioned equipments should be disposed of in an EPA approved landfill as part of the demolition project.

PCB's in Caulking:

PCB's are manmade chemicals that were widely produced and distributed across the country from the 1950s to 1977 until the production of PCB's was banned by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) law which became effective in 1978. PCB's are a class of chemicals made up of more than 200 different compounds. PCB's are non-flammable, stable, and good insulators so they were widely used in a variety of products including

electrical transformers and capacitors, cable and wire coverings, sealants and caulking, and household products such as television sets and fluorescent light fixtures. Because of their chemical properties, PCB's are not very soluble in water, and they do not break down easily in the environment. PCB's also do not readily evaporate into air but tend to remain as solids or thick liquids. Even though PCB's have not been produced or used in the country for more than 30 years, they are still present in the environment, in the air, soil, and water and in our food. EPA requires that all construction waste including caulking be disposed as PCB's if PCB's level exceed 50 mg/kg (ppm). An abatement plan might also be required as part of renovations.

Observations and Conclusions:

Caulking was assumed to contain PCB's.

Lead Based Paint (LBP):

Observations and Conclusions

LBP was assumed to exit on painted surfaces. A school is not considered a regulated facility. All LBP activities performed, including waste disposal, should be in accordance with applicable Federal, State, or local laws, ordinances, codes, or regulations governing evaluation and hazard reduction. In the event of discrepancies, the most protective requirements prevail. These requirements can be found in OSHA 29 CFR 1926-Construction Industry Standards, 29 CFR 1926.62-Construction Industry Lead Standards, 29 CFR 1910.1200-Hazards Communication, 40 CFR 261-EPA Regulations. According to OSHA, any amount of LBP triggers compliance.

Airborne Mold:

Airborne mold testing was performed utilizing Zefon International Incorporated's Air-O-Cell® sampling device following all manufacturer supplied recommended sampling procedures.

The Air-O-Cell® is a direct read total particulate air sampling device. It works using the inertial impaction principle similar to other spore trap devices. It is designed for the rapid collection and analysis of airborne particulate including bioaerosols. The particulate includes fibers (e.g., asbestos, fiberglass, cellulose, clothing fibers) opaque particles (e.g., fly ash, combustion particles, copy toner, oil droplets, paint), and bioaerosols (e.g., mold spores, pollen, insect parts, skin cell fragments).¹

The method involves drawing a known quantity of air through a sterile sampling cassette. Subsequent to sampling, the cassette is sealed and transferred to a microbiology laboratory under chain of custody protocol for microscopic analysis. This method counts both viable and nonviable mold spores.

AIRBORNE MOLD and PARTICULATE

Lab ID #	Location	Total Mold Counts/M ³	Pollen	Insect Fragment	Hyphal Fragments
132304947-0001	Music Room	40	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0002	Basement Office	600	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0003	Room 13	690	ND	ND	40
132304947-0004	Room 15	960	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0005	Room 16	300	ND	ND	20
132304947-0006	Room 18	180	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0007	Gymnasium	20	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0008	Room 21	690	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0009	Room 11	40	ND	ND	ND
132304947-0010	Outside	1,500	ND	ND	ND

¹ Zefon International Inc. <www.zefon.com>1

**AIRBORNE MOLD and PARTICULATE
(Subjective Scales)**

Lab ID #	Location	Skin Fragment Density (SFD)	Fibrous Particulates (FP)	Total Background Particulate (TBP)
132304947-0001	Music Room	1	1	1
132304947-0002	Basement Office	1	1	1
132304947-0003	Room 13	1	1	1
132304947-0004	Room 15	1	1	1
132304947-0005	Room 16	1	1	1
132304947-0006	Room 18	1	1	1
132304947-0007	Gymnasium	1	1	1
132304947-0008	Room 21	1	1	1
132304947-0009	Room 11	1	1	1
132304947-0010	Outside	1	1	1

Legend:

ND - Not Detected

Observations:

There are currently no guidelines or standards promulgated by a government agency or widely recognized scientific organization for the interpretation of airborne mold spore levels. The most commonly employed tool used to assess if mold growth is occurring in a structure is to compare quantities and species of mold outdoors to indoor. If there were more mold indoor, and/or if species were present indoor which were not present outdoors, then growth is occurring, and remediation is recommended.

Based on comparisons with historical data from projects of similar type, building utilization, geographic location and season, the indoor airborne levels are considered low. Indoor mold spore counts in the summer are typically in the 2,500-6,500-spores/cubic meter range.

Pollen, insect fragments and Hyphal fragments were either not present or low in the samples. Hyphal fragment is a non-reproductive part of the mold.

Total background particulate on all samples was assessed as "1" on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is low and 5 is high. Skin fragment density on all samples was assessed as "1" on a scale of 1-4 where 1 is low and 4 is high. The total background levels are measured to determine airborne dust not related to airborne mold. Skin fragments are measured to determine proper housing cleaning.

Mercury in Rubber Flooring:

Observations and Conclusions:

No rubber flooring exists in the school.

Radon:

Number of Samples Collected

Ten (10) air samples were collected at the following locations:

Location of Sample

1. Room 13
2. Room 15

3. Room 18
4. Room 16
5. Gymnasium
6. Room 11
7. Room 1
8. Room 4
9. Secretary
10. Room 19

Location of Sample

Sample Result

1. Room 13	<0.4 pCi\L
2. Room 15	<0.4 pCi\L
3. Room 18	0.4 pCi\L
4. Room 16	0.4 pCi\L
5. Gymnasium	<0.4 pCi\L
6. Room 11	<0.4 pCi\L
7. Room 1	<0.4 pCi\L
8. Room 4	0.4 pCi\L
9. Secretary	<0.4 pCi\L
10. Room 19	<0.4 pCi\L

Observations and Conclusions:

The measured radon concentrations of the samples were found to be much lower than the EPA guideline of 4 picoCuris of radon per liter of air (pCi/L). No further action is required based on the results.

COST ESTIMATES:

The cost includes removal and disposal of all accessible ACM, other hazardous material, and an allowance for removal of inaccessible or hidden ACM that may be found during renovation or demolition project.

Location	Material	Approximate Quantity	Cost Estimate (\$)
Throughout	Vinyl Floor Tile and Mastic	18,500 SF	111,000.00
	Hardwood Flooring/Paper/Mastic	21,500 SF	215,000.00
	Pipe and Hard Joint Insulation	30 LF	1,500.00
	Hidden Pipe and Hard Joint Insulation	Unknown	75,000.00
	Sinks	1 Total	300.00
	Interior Doors/Windows	60 Total	18,000.00
	Transite Panels	50 SF	5,000.00
	Flexible Connector	2 Total	500.00
	Miscellaneous Hazardous Materials	Unknown	25,000.00
	Tubes in Light Fixtures	Unknown	50,000.00
	Chalkboards/Tackboards	120 Total	36,000.00
	Stage	Ceiling Plaster	800 SF
Gymnasium/Stage	Hardwood Flooring/Paper/Mastic	4,250 SF	42,500.00
Crawl Space	Pipe and Hard Joint Insulation	3,500 LF	105,000.00
	Debris	Unknown	25,000.00
Exterior	Windows	425 Total	170,000.00
	Doors	47 Total	9,400.00
	Transite Panels	150 Total	45,000.00
	Roofing Material	32,000 SF	100,000.00
	Damproofing	2,500 Tons ¹	500,000.00

Location	Material	Approximate Quantity	Cost Estimate (\$)
	Transite Sewer Pipes	Unknown ¹	75,000.00
Estimated costs for NESHAP Inspection			18,500.00
Estimated costs for Design, Construction Monitoring and Air Sampling Services			184,800.00
TOTAL:			\$ 1,980,000.00

¹: Part of total demolition.

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY METHODS AND LABORATORY ANALYSES:

Asbestos:

Asbestos samples were analyzed using PLM and dispersion staining techniques with EPA/600/R-93/116 method.

Airborne Mold:

The samples were analyzed by an EPA approved laboratory EMSL, Woburn, MA.

Radon:


Radon samples were analyzed by an EPA licensed laboratory AccuStar, Ward Hill, MA.

LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS:

This report has been completed based on visual and physical observations made and information available at the time of the site visits, as well as an interview with the Owner's representatives. This report is intended to be used as a summary of available information on existing conditions with conclusions based on a reasonable and knowledgeable review of evidence found in accordance with normally accepted industry standards, state, and federal protocols, and within the scope and budget established by the client. Any additional data obtained by further review must be reviewed by UEC and the conclusions presented herein may be modified accordingly.

This report and attachments, prepared for the exclusive use of Owner for use in an environmental evaluation of the subject site, are an integral part of the inspections and opinions should not be formulated without reading the report in its entirety. No part of this report may be altered, used, copied, or relied upon without prior written permission from UEC, except that this report may be conveyed in its entirety to parties associated with Owner for this subject study.

Inspected By:



Leonard J. Busa
Asbestos Inspector
(AI-001899)

Inspected By:



Keith McGovern
Asbestos Inspector
(AI-901149)



Asbestos Identification Laboratory

165 New Boston St., Ste 227
Woburn, MA 01801
781-932-9600

Web: www.asbestosidentificationlab.com
Email: mikemanning@asbestosidentificationlab.com

Batch: 51050



Lab Code: 200919-0

February 26, 2020

Ammar Dieb
Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: *Oakdale School, Dedham, MA- Original School*
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

Dear Ammar Dieb,

Asbestos Identification Laboratory has completed the analysis of the samples from your office for the above referenced project. The information and analysis contained in this report have been generated using the EPA /600/R-93/116 Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials. Materials or products that contain more than 1% of any kind or combination of asbestos are considered an asbestos containing building material as determined by the EPA. This Polarized Light Microscope (PLM) technique may be performed either by visual estimation or point counting. Point counting provides a determination of the area percentage of asbestos in a sample. If the asbestos is estimated to be less than 10% by visual estimation of friable material, the determination may be repeated using the point counting technique. The results of the point counting supersede visual PLM results. Results in this report only relate to the items tested. This report may not be used by the customer to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other U.S. Government Agency.

Laboratory results represent the analysis of samples as submitted by the customer. Information regarding sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the customer. Asbestos Identification Laboratory is not responsible for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Unless notified in writing to return samples, Asbestos Identification Laboratory discards customer samples after 30 days. Samples containing subsamples or layers will be analyzed separately when applicable. Reports are kept at Asbestos Identification Laboratory for three years. This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

- NVLAP Lab Code: 200919-0
- Massachusetts Certification License: AA000208
- State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health Approved Environmental Laboratory Registration Number: PH-0142
- State of Maine, Department of Environmental Protection Asbestos Analytical Laboratory License Number: LB-0078(Bulk) LA-0087(Air)
- State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Department of Health Certification: AAL-121
- State of Vermont, Department of Health Environmental Health License AL934461

Thank you Ammar Dieb for your business.

Michael Manning
Owner/Director

February 26, 2020

Ammar Dieb
 Universal Environmental Consultants
 12 Brewster Road
 Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: Oakdale School, Dedham, MA- Original School
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
1 568187	VT-I (12" Light Grey w/ Green-Red)	1st FL Server RM/1st FL Hall	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
2 568188	Mastic #1	1st FL Server RM/1st FL Hall	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
3 568189	VT-I	Hall by C'rm-1	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
4 568190	M #3	Hall by C'rm-1	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
5 568191	VT-II (12" Blue)	1st FL Hall, Random	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
6 568192	M #5	1st FL Hall, Random	black	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
7 568193	VT-II	1st FL Hall, Random	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
8 568194	M #7	1st FL Hall, Random	black	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
9 568195	VT-III (12" Black)	C'rm-5	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
10 568196	M #9	C'rm-5	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
11 568197	VT-III	C'rm-4	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
12 568198	M #11	C'rm-4	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
13 568199	VT-IV (12" Grey-I)	C'rm-5 (Closet)	gray	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
14 568200	M #13	C'rm-5 (Closet)	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
15 568201	VT-IV	C'rm-7	gray	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
16 568202	M #15	C'rm-7	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
17 568203	VT-V (12" Lime Green)	Stairwell by C'rm-4	green	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
18 568204	M #17	Stairwell by C'rm-4	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
19 568205	VT-V	Stairwell by C'rm-4	green	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
20 568206	M #19	Stairwell by C'rm-4	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
21 568207	VT-VI (12" Black-Brown)	C'rm 4/5 Pass Thru	brown	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
22 568208	M #21	C'rm 4/5 Pass Thru	black	Cellulose 10 Non-Fibrous 90	None Detected
23 568209	VT-VI	C'rm 4/5 Pass Thru	brown	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
24 568210	M #23	C'rm 4/5 Pass Thru	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
25 568211	VT-VII (12" Grey-II)	C'rm-2	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
26 568212	M #25	C'rm-2	black	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
27 568213	VT-VII	C'rm-2	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
28 568214	M #27	C'rm-2	black	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
29 568215	VT-VIII (12" Mottled Brown)	Landing by C'rm-3	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
30 568216	M #29	Landing by C'rm-3	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
31 568217	VT-VIII	C'rm-1	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
32 568218	M #31	C'rm-1	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
33 568219	VT-IX (12" Gold)	C'rm-9	brown	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
34 568220	M #33	C'rm-9	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
35 568221	VT-IX	2nd FL Hall	brown	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
36 568222	M #35	2nd FL Hall	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
37 568223	VT-X (12" Grey-III)	C'rm-6	gray	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
38 568224	M #37	C'rm-6	brown	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
39 568225	VT-X	C'rm-6	gray	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
40 568226	M #39	C'rm-6	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
41 568227	VT-XI (12" Chocolate)	2nd FL Rm 11-B	tan	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
42 568228	M #41	2nd FL Rm 11-B	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
43 568229	VT-XI	Teacher's Rm @ 2nd FL	tan	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
44 568230	M #43	Teacher's Rm @ 2nd FL	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
45 568231	VT-XII (12" Sea Green)	2nd FL Bathroom	green	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
46 568232	M #45	2nd FL Bathroom	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
47 568233	VT-XII	2nd FL Bathroom	green	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
48 568234	M #47	2nd FL Bathroom	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
49 568235	VT-XIII (12" Grey w/ Black Spots)	2nd FL Bathroom	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
50 568236	M #49	2nd FL Bathroom	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
51 568237	VT-XIII	2nd FL Bathroom	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
52 568238	M #51	2nd FL Bathroom	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
53 568239	Linoleum Under #49/50	2nd FL Bathroom	multi	Non-Fibrous 70	Detected Chrysotile 30
54 568240	Lino Under #51/52	2nd FL Bathroom	multi	Non-Fibrous 60	Detected Chrysotile 40
55 568241	(Hard) Tan Vinyl Baseboard (VBB)	2nd FL Teacher's Rm	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
56 568242	Adhesive #55	2nd Floor Teacher's Rm	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
57 568243	(Hard) Tan VBB	2nd FL Hall	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
58 568244	Adh #57	2nd FL Hall	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
59 568245	Blue VBB	1st FL Hall	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
60 568246	Adh #59	1st FL Hall	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
61 568247	Blue VBB	1st FL Hall	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
62 568248	M #61	1st FL Hall	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
63 568249	Black VBB	C'rm-7	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
64 568250	M #63	C'rm-7	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
65 568251	Black VBB	C'rm-6	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
66 568252	M #65	C'rm-6	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
67 568253	Ceiling Plaster-I (CP-I)	Nurse Bathroom	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
68 568254	CP-I	3rd FL Rear Hall (to Fire Escape)	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
69 568255	CP-I	Bsmt Hall by Girl;s Rm	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
70 568256	CP-I	Bsmt Boy's Rm	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
71 568257	CP-I	C'rm-4	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
72 568258	Wall Plaster-I (WP)	Main Office	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
73 568259	WP-I	1st FL Hall Closet	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
74 568260	WP-I	3rd FL @ Stage	multi	Hair 15 Non-Fibrous 85	None Detected
75 568261	WP-I	C'rm 9/10 Pass Thru	multi	Hair 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
76 568262	WP-I	Bsmt Girl's Rm, Below Window	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
77 568263	CP-II	Boiler Rm	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
78 568264	CP-II	Boiler Rm	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
79 568265	CP-II	Boiler Rm	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
80 568266	CP-III	New Boiler Rm	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
81 568267	CP-III	New Boiler Rm	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
82 568268	CP-III	New Boiler Rm	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
83 568269	Sig Dam Green Wall Paint	Boiler Rm	green	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
84 568270	Sig Dam Green Wall Paint @ Boiler Fire Wall	Boiler Rm	green	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
85 568271	Panel Over C'rm Entrance Door	C'rm-1	gray	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
86 568272	Panel Over C'rm Entrance Door	C'rm-4	gray	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
87 568273	Dark Damp Proofing for Sink	Bsmt Kitchen	black	Non-Fibrous 95	Detected Chrysotile 5
88 568274	DK DP for Sink	Bsmt Kitchen	black	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
89 568275	Glazing for Interior Window	SW by C'rm-4	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
90 568276	GL for Int Win	SW by C'rm-2	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
91 568277	Exposed Glazed Wall Tile Adhesive	Bsmt Girl's Rm	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
92 568278	Exp GL Wall Tile Adh	Bsmt Boy's Rm	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
93 568279	Homosote Wall Panel	Bsmt Kitchen	brown	Cellulose 95 Non-Fibrous 5	None Detected
94 568280	Homosote Wall Panel	Bsmt Kitchen Office	brown	Cellulose 95 Non-Fibrous 5	None Detected
95 568281	1x1 AT-I	Bsmt Kitchen	brown	Cellulose 98 Non-Fibrous 2	None Detected
96 568282	1x1 AT-I	Bsmt Kitchen	brown	Cellulose 98 Non-Fibrous 2	None Detected
97 568283	1x1 AT-II (Fissured)	Bsmt Hall by Music	gray	Fiberglass 90 Non-Fibrous 10	None Detected
98 568284	1x1 AT-II	Bsmt Hall by Music	gray	Fiberglass 90 Non-Fibrous 10	None Detected
99 568285	Sig Dam White Plaster @ Interior Window Sill	Bsmt Boy's	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
100 568286	Sig Dam White Plaster @ Interior Window Sill	Bsmt Girl's	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

Wednesday 26

Analyzed by:

Michael Manning

End of Report

Batch: 51050

Page 6 of 6

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

10/5

original Bldg

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Fredham, MA Building Name: Oakdale School

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
1		VT-I (12" light grey w/green-red)	1 st Fl. Server rm / 1 st Fl hall
2		mastic #1	" " " "
3		VT-I	hall by cim-1
4		Ⓜ #3	" "
5		VT-II (12" Blue)	1 st Fl hall, random
6		Ⓜ #5	
7		VT-II	
8		Ⓜ #7	
9		VT-III (12" Black)	cim-5
10		Ⓜ #9	cim-5
11		VT-III	cim-4
12		Ⓜ #11	cim-4
13		VT-IV (12" Grey-I)	cim-5 (closet)
14		cim-5 Ⓜ #13	cim-5 (closet)
15		VT-IV	cim-7
16		Ⓜ #15	cim-7
17		VT-V (12" Lime Green)	stairwell by cim-4
18		Ⓜ #17	
19		VT-I	
20		Ⓜ #19	

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 8-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr

Received By: [Signature] Date: 8/21/2020

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

2020

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Framingham, MA Building Name: OAKDALE SCHOOL

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
21		VT-VI 12" (Black-Brown)	rim 4/5 pass thro
22		Ⓜ # 21	
23		VT-VI	
24		Ⓜ # 23	
25		VT-VII (Grey-II)	rim-2
26		Ⓜ # 25	
27		VT-VII	
28		Ⓜ # 27	
29		VT-VIII (2 mixed Browns)	landing by rim-3
30		Ⓜ # 29	" " "
31		VT-VIII	rim-1
32		Ⓜ # 31	rim-1
33		VT-IX (12" Gold)	rim-9
34		Ⓜ # 33	rim-9
35		VT-IX	2 nd FL ball
36		Ⓜ # 35	2 nd FL ball
37		VT-X (Grey-III)	rim-6
38		Ⓜ # 37	
39		VT-X	
40		Ⓜ # 39	

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr

Received By: _____ Date: _____

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Fedham, MA Building Name OAKDALE SCHOOL

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
41		VT-XI (12" Chocolate)	2 nd FL rm 11-B
42		Ⓜ # 41	" " "
43		VT-XI	Teacher's rm on 2 nd FL
44		Ⓜ # 43	" " "
45		VT-XII (12" Sea Green)	2 nd FL Bathroom
46		Ⓜ # 45	
47		VT-XII	
48		Ⓜ # 47	
49		VT-XIII (12" Grey w/ Black spots)	2 nd FL Bathroom
50		Ⓜ # 49	
51		VT-XIII	
52		Ⓜ # 51	
53		Lint under # ⁴⁹ 50	2 nd FL Bathroom
54		Lint under # 51/52	2 nd FL Bathroom
55		(hard) tan vinyl (VBB) baseboard	2 nd FL Teacher's rm
56		adhesive # 55	2 nd FL Teacher's rm
57		(hard) tan VBB	2 nd FL hall
58		adh # 57	2 nd FL hall
59		Blue VBB	1 st FL hall
60		adh # 59	1 st FL hall

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr

Received By: _____ Date: _____

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Norham, MA Building Name: OAKDALE School

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
61		Blue VAB	1 st FL hall
62		(m) + 61	1 st FL hall
63		Black VAB	crm-7
64		(m) + 63	crm-7
65		Black VAB	crm-6
66		(m) + 65	crm-6
67		ceiling plaster - I (CP-I)	Nurse Bathroom
68		CP-I	3 rd FL rear hall (to fire escape)
69		CP-I	Basmt hall by Girl's rm
70		CP-I	Basmt Boy's rm
71		CP-I	crm-4
72		wall plaster - I (WP-I)	main OFFICE
73		WP-I	1 st FL hall closet
74		WP-I	3 rd FL c' stage
75		WP-I	crm 9/10 pass thro
76		WP-I	Basmt Girl's rm below window
77		CP-II	Boiler rm
78		CP-II	Boiler rm
79		CP-II	Boiler rm
80		CP-III	new Boiler rm

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr

Received By: _____ Date: _____

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Fedham, MA Building Name: Oakdale School

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
81		CP-III	new Boiler rm
82		CP-III	new Boiler rm
83		sig dam green wall paint	Boiler Rm
84		sig dam green wall paint	boiler fire wall
85		panel over cim ^{ENTRANCE} door	cim-1
86		panel over cim entrance door	cim-4
87		dark damp proofing for sink	Boys Kitchen
88		dk dp for sink	" " "
89		glazing for interior window	sw by cim-4
90		gl for int. win.	sw by cim-2
91		exposed glazed wall tile adhesive	Boys Girls cm
92		exp. gl wall tile adh	Boys cm
93		Hemoseal wall panel	Boys Kitchen
94		Hemoseal wall panel	Boys Kitchen office
95		1x1 AT-I	Boys Kitchen
96		1x1 AT-I	Boys Kitchen
97		1x1 AT-II (fissured)	Boys hall by Music
98		1x1 AT-II	Boys hall by Music
99		sig dam white plaster @ interior window sill	Boys Boys
100		sig dam white plaster @ interior window sill	Boys Girls

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 7C-hi

Received By: _____ Date: _____



Asbestos Identification Laboratory

165 New Boston St., Ste 227
Woburn, MA 01801
781-932-9600

Web: www.asbestosidentificationlab.com
Email: mikemanning@asbestosidentificationlab.com

Batch: 51033



February 26, 2020

Ammar Dieb
Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: Oakdale School, Dedham, MA
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

Dear Ammar Dieb,

Asbestos Identification Laboratory has completed the analysis of the samples from your office for the above referenced project. The information and analysis contained in this report have been generated using the EPA /600/R-93/116 Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials. Materials or products that contain more than 1% of any kind or combination of asbestos are considered an asbestos containing building material as determined by the EPA. This Polarized Light Microscope (PLM) technique may be performed either by visual estimation or point counting. Point counting provides a determination of the area percentage of asbestos in a sample. If the asbestos is estimated to be less than 10% by visual estimation of friable material, the determination may be repeated using the point counting technique. The results of the point counting supersede visual PLM results. Results in this report only relate to the items tested. This report may not be used by the customer to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other U.S. Government Agency.

Laboratory results represent the analysis of samples as submitted by the customer. Information regarding sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the customer. Asbestos Identification Laboratory is not responsible for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Unless notified in writing to return samples, Asbestos Identification Laboratory discards customer samples after 30 days. Samples containing subsamples or layers will be analyzed separately when applicable. Reports are kept at Asbestos Identification Laboratory for three years. This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

- NVLAP Lab Code: 200919-0
- Massachusetts Certification License: AA000208
- State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health Approved Environmental Laboratory Registration Number: PH-0142
- State of Maine, Department of Environmental Protection Asbestos Analytical Laboratory License Number: LB-0078(Bulk) LA-0087(Air)
- State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Department of Health Certification: AAL-121
- State of Vermont, Department of Health Environmental Health License AL934461

Thank you Ammar Dieb for your business.

Michael Manning
Owner/Director

Ammar Dieb
 Universal Environmental Consultants
 12 Brewster Road
 Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: Oakdale School, Dedham, MA
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
1 567976	Ceiling Plaster	C'Rm. 12 Storage	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
2 567977	Ceiling Plaster	C'Rm. 20 @ Coatrack	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
3 567978	Ceiling Plaster	C'Rm. 17 @ Coatrack	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
4 567979	Ceiling Plaster	C'Rm. 16 @ Coatrack	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
5 567980	Wall Plaster	C'Rm. 11	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
6 567981	Wall Plaster	Gym Foyer Storage	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
7 567982	Wall Plaster	C'Rm. 12 Storage	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
8 567983	CP-II	Boiler Room	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
9 567984	CP-II	Boiler Room	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
10 567985	CP-II	Boiler Room	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
11 567986	Glazing for (Interior) Window	Hall by Gym Foyer Storage	multi	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
12 567987	Gl for Win in Door	C' Rm.-11	multi	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
13 567988	Glue Daub for 1x1 Pressed Wood AT	AT Gym Foyer	brown	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
14 567989	Pressed Wood AT on #13	Gym Foyer	brown	Cellulose 85 Non-Fibrous 15	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
15 567990	Glue Daub for 1x2 PW AT	Gym Foyer	brown	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
16 567991	Glue Daub for 1x1 PW AT	Hall by Teacher's Rm.	brown	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
17 567992	1x1 AT Smooth	C' Rm.- 13	brown	Cellulose 85 Non-Fibrous 15	None Detected
18 567993	12" Mottled Brown VT	C' Rm.- 13	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
19 567994	Adhesive #18	C' Rm.- 13	yellow	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
20 567995	12" Mottled Brown VT	Hall By C'Rm. - 18	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
21 567996	Mastic #20	C' Rm. - 18	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
22 567997	12" Mottled Brown - On htg Cabinet	C' Rm. - 11	brown	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
23 567998	Mastic #22	C' Rm. - 11	black	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
24 567999	Mastic for 12" Mottled Brown on htg Cabinet	On htg Cabinet C' Rm. - 20	black	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 95	None Detected
25 568000	12" Chocolate VT	Gym Foyer	brown	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
26 568001	Matic #25	Gym Foyer	black	Non-Fibrous 95	Detected Chrysotile 5
27 568002	12" Chocolate VT	Hall by IT	brown	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
28 568003	Mastic #27	Hall by IT	black	Non-Fibrous 95	Detected Chrysotile 5
29 568004	12" Chocolate VT	Vestibule by Boy's Rm.	gray	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
30 568005	Mastic #29	Vestibule by Boy's Rm.	black	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
31 568006	12" New Blue VT	Gym Foyer Storage	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
32 568007	Mastic/Layers #31	Gym Foyer Storage	brown	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
33 568008	12" New Blue VT	Gym Foyer Storage	blue	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
34 568009	M/Layers #33	Gym Foyer Storage	brown	Cellulose 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
35 568010	WP	C'Rm. - 16	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected

Wednesday 26

Analyzed by:

Elena Blatus

End of Report

Batch: 51033

Page 3 of 3

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Universal Environmental Consultants
 12 Brewster Road
 Framingham, MA 01702
 Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
 adieb@uec-env.com

1951, 1st addition

Town/City: Framingham, MA Building Name: Oakdale School

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
1		ceiling plaster (CP)	cim-12 storage
2		CP	cim-20 @ COATLACK
3		CP	cim-17 @ COATLACK
4		CP	cim-16 @ COATLACK
5		wall plaster (WP)	cim-11
6		WP	Gym Foyer storage
7		WP	cim 12 storage
8		CP-II	Boiler Rm
9		CP-II	Boiler Rm
10		CP-II	Boiler Rm
11		glazing for (interior) windows	hall by Gym Foyer storage
12		gl for win in door	cim-11
13		glue daub for 1x1 pressed wood [AT]	Gym Foyer
14		pressed wood [AT] on #13	" "
15		glue daub for 1x1 PW [AT]	" "
16		glue daub for 1x1 PW [AT]	hall by Teacher's rm
17		1x1 [AT] smooth	cim-13
18		12" mottled Brown vt	cim-13
19		adhesive #18	cim-13
20		12" mottled Brown vt	hall by → cim-18

Reported By: Shawn Buser Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr
 Received By: [Signature] Date: 2/24/2020

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

1951, 1st ADDITION

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adie@uec-env.com

Town/City: Fedham, MA Building Name: DAKDALE SCHOOL

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
21		MASTIC # 20	rm-18
22		12" mottled brown - on hfg cabinet	rm-11
23		MASTIC # 22	rm-11
24		MASTIC for 12" mottled brown on hfg cabinet	rm-20
25		12" chocolate vt	Gym foyer
26		MASTIC # 25	" "
27		12" chocolate vt	hall by IT
28		MASTIC # 27	" "
29		12" chocolate vt	VESTIBULE by Rajan
30		MASTIC # 29	" " "
31		12" new blue vt	Gym foyer Storage
32		MASTIC/layers # 31	↓
33		12" new blue vt	
34		MASTIC/layers # 33	
35		wp	rm-16

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 2-21-20 Due Date: 72-hr

Received By: _____ Date: _____



Asbestos Identification Laboratory

165 New Boston St., Ste 227
Woburn, MA 01801
781-932-9600

Web: www.asbestosidentificationlab.com
Email: mikemanning@asbestosidentificationlab.com

Batch: 51061



Lab Code: 200919-0

February 26, 2020

Ammar Dieb
Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: *Oakdale School*
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

Dear Ammar Dieb,

Asbestos Identification Laboratory has completed the analysis of the samples from your office for the above referenced project. The information and analysis contained in this report have been generated using the EPA /600/R-93/116 Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials. Materials or products that contain more than 1% of any kind or combination of asbestos are considered an asbestos containing building material as determined by the EPA. This Polarized Light Microscope (PLM) technique may be performed either by visual estimation or point counting. Point counting provides a determination of the area percentage of asbestos in a sample. If the asbestos is estimated to be less than 10% by visual estimation of friable material, the determination may be repeated using the point counting technique. The results of the point counting supersede visual PLM results. Results in this report only relate to the items tested. This report may not be used by the customer to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other U.S. Government Agency. Laboratory results represent the analysis of samples as submitted by the customer. Information regarding sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the customer. Asbestos Identification Laboratory is not responsible for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Unless notified in writing to return samples, Asbestos Identification Laboratory discards customer samples after 30 days. Samples containing subsamples or layers will be analyzed separately when applicable. Reports are kept at Asbestos Identification Laboratory for three years. This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

- NVLAP Lab Code: 200919-0
- Massachusetts Certification License: AA000208
- State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health Approved Environmental Laboratory Registration Number: PH-0142
- State of Maine, Department of Environmental Protection Asbestos Analytical Laboratory License Number: LB-0078(Bulk) LA-0087(Air)
- State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Department of Health Certification: AAL-121
- State of Vermont, Department of Health Environmental Health License AL934461

Thank you Ammar Dieb for your business.

Michael Manning
Owner/Director

Ammar Dieb
 Universal Environmental Consultants
 12 Brewster Road
 Framingham, MA 01702

Project Name: Oakdale School
Project Number:
Date Sampled: 2020-02-21
Work Received: 2020-02-21
Work Analyzed: 2020-02-25

Analysis Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS EPA/600/R-93/116

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
1 568316	2x4 SAT-I	C'Rm 22	gray	Fiberglass 20 Cellulose 40 Non-Fibrous 40	None Detected
2 568317	SAT-I	C'RM21	gray	Fiberglass 20 Cellulose 40 Non-Fibrous 40	None Detected
3 568318	SAT-I	Hall by C'RM 14	gray	Fiberglass 20 Cellulose 40 Non-Fibrous 40	None Detected
4 568319	SAT-I	C' RM 14	gray	Fiberglass 20 Cellulose 40 Non-Fibrous 40	None Detected
5 568320	Black in CLG Batt	C' RM 22	multi	Fiberglass 40 Cellulose 20 Non-Fibrous 40	None Detected
6 568321	Black in CLG Batt	C' Rm 14	multi	Fiberglass 50 Cellulose 20 Non-Fibrous 30	None Detected
7 568322	12" Mottled Brown VT	Hall by C'Rm 22	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
8 568323	Mastic #7	Hall by C'Rm 22	black	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
9 568324	12" Mottled Brown VT	Hall by C'Rm 22	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
10 568325	Mastic #9	Hall by C'Rm 22	black	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
11 568326	Vertical Expansion Joint in CMU	Hall by C'Rm 22	tan	Other 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected
12 568327	Vert. XJ in CMU	Hall by C'Rm 21	tan	Other 2 Non-Fibrous 98	None Detected

Wednesday 26

Analyzed by:



End of Report

Batch: 51061


Page 1 of 1

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

→ 2nd ADDITION

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Framingham, MA Building Name: OAKDALE SCHOOL

Sample	Result	Description of Material	Sample Location
1		2x4 SAT-I	cim 22
2		SAT-I	cim 21
3		SAT-I	hall by cim 14
4		SAT-I	cim-14
5		Blank in cly Batt	cim-22
6		Blank in cly Batt	cim-14
7		12" mottled brown vt	hall by cim 22
8		MASTIC #7	
9		12" mottled brown vt	
10		MASTIC #9	
11		NEUTRICE expansion joint in cmu	hall by cim 22
12		VEIT. XL in cmu	hall by cim 21

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 7-21-20 Due Date: 7-2-20

Received By: [Signature] Date: 7/21/20



Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

165 New Boston St., Ste 227
Woburn, MA 01801
781-932-9600

Web: www.asbestosidentificationlab.com Email:
mikemanning@asbestosidentificationlab.com



Batch: 96390

Ammar Dieb
Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702

Project Information

Oakdale School

*Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS,
EPA/600/R-93/116*

Dear Ammar Dieb,

Asbestos Identification Laboratory has completed the analysis of the samples from your office for the above referenced project. The Analysis Method is BULK PLM ANALYSIS, EPA/600/R-93/116. The information and analysis contained in this report have been generated using the EPA /600/R-93/116 Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials. Materials or products that contain more than 1% of any kind or combination of asbestos are considered an asbestos containing building material as determined by the EPA. This Polarized Light Microscope (PLM) technique may be performed either by visual estimation or point counting. Point counting provides a determination of the area percentage of asbestos in a sample. If the asbestos is estimated to be less than 10% by visual estimation of friable material, the determination may be repeated using the point counting technique. The results of the point counting supersede visual PLM results. Results in this report only relate to the items tested. This report may not be used by the customer to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other U.S. Government Agency.

Laboratory results represent the analysis of samples as submitted by the customer. Information regarding sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the customer. Asbestos Identification Laboratory is not responsible for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Unless notified in writing to return samples, Asbestos Identification Laboratory discards customer samples after 30 days. Samples containing subsamples or layers will be analyzed separately when applicable. Reports are kept at Asbestos Identification Laboratory for three years. This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

- NVLAP Lab Code: 200919-0
- Massachusetts Certification License: AA000208
- State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health Approved Environmental Laboratory Registration Number: PH-0142
- State of Maine, Department of Environmental Protection Asbestos Analytical Laboratory License Number: LB-0078(Bulk) LA-0087(Air)
- State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Department of Health Certification: AAL-121
- State of Vermont, Department of Health Environmental Health License AL934461

Thank you Ammar Dieb for your business.

Michael Manning
Owner/Director

FieldID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
LabID					
1	ACT	Basement Near Kitchen	tan	Cellulose 10	None Detected
1057140				Non-Fibrous 90	
2	ACT	Basement Near Kitchen	tan	Cellulose 10	None Detected
1057141				Non-Fibrous 90	
3	VFT White w Gray Specs	Server Rm 1951	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
1057142					
4	VFT Mastic	Server Rm 1951	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
1057143					
5	VFT White w Gray Specs	Server Rm 1951	tan	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
1057144					
6	VFT Mastic	Server Rm 1951	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
1057145					
7	JC/Sheetrock	Main Office	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
1057146					
8	JC/Sheetrock	Main Office	multi	Cellulose 10	None Detected
1057147				Non-Fibrous 90	

Sampled: April 19, 2023

Received: April 19, 2023

Analyzed: April 19, 2023

Thursday 20 April 2023

Analyzed by:



Batch: 96390

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

PLM

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: DEDHAM MA Building Name OAKDALE School

Sample	Description of Material	Sample Location
1	2x2 ACT	BASEMENT NEAR KITCHEN
2	2x2 ACT	BASEMENT NEAR KITCHEN
3	12x12 vft White w Gray Spcks	SERVEN RM 1951
4	12x12 vft MASTIC	SERVEN RM 1951
5	12x12 vft White w Gray Spcks	SERVEN RM 1951
6	12x12 vft MASTIC	SERVEN RM 1951
7	JL / SHEETROCK	MAIN OFFICE
8	JL / SHEETROCK	MAIN OFFICE

Reported By: Keith ML Date: 4-19-23
 Received By: PO 4/19/23 Date: _____

Due Date: 24-Hours



Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

165 New Boston St., Ste 227
Woburn, MA 01801
781-932-9600

Web: www.asbestosidentificationlab.com Email:
mikemanning@asbestosidentificationlab.com



Batch: 102138

Project Information

*Oakdale Elementary,
Dedham,
MA*

*Method: BULK PLM ANALYSIS,
EPA/600/R-93/116*

Ammar Dieb
Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702

Dear Ammar Dieb,

Asbestos Identification Laboratory has completed the analysis of the samples from your office for the above referenced project. The Analysis Method is BULK PLM ANALYSIS, EPA/600/R-93/116. The information and analysis contained in this report have been generated using the EPA /600/R-93/116 Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials. Materials or products that contain more than 1% of any kind or combination of asbestos are considered an asbestos containing building material as determined by the EPA. This Polarized Light Microscope (PLM) technique may be performed either by visual estimation or point counting. Point counting provides a determination of the area percentage of asbestos in a sample. If the asbestos is estimated to be less than 10% by visual estimation of friable material, the determination may be repeated using the point counting technique. The results of the point counting supersede visual PLM results. Results in this report only relate to the items tested. This report may not be used by the customer to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any other U.S. Government Agency.

Laboratory results represent the analysis of samples as submitted by the customer. Information regarding sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the customer. Information provided by the customer can affect the validity of results. Asbestos Identification Laboratory is not responsible for sample collection activities or analytical method limitations. Unless notified in writing to return samples, Asbestos Identification Laboratory discards customer samples after 30 days. Samples containing subsamples or layers will be analyzed separately when applicable. Reports are kept at Asbestos Identification Laboratory for three years. All customer information will be maintained in confidentiality. This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of Asbestos Identification Laboratory.

- NVLAP Lab Code: 200919-0
- Massachusetts Certification License: AA000208
- State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health Approved Environmental Laboratory Registration Number: PH-0142
- State of Maine, Department of Environmental Protection Asbestos Analytical Laboratory License Number: LB-0078(Bulk) LA-0087(Air)
- State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Department of Health Certification: AAL-121
- State of Vermont, Department of Health Environmental Health License AL934461

Thank you Ammar Dieb for your business.

Michael Manning
Owner/Director

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
1 1120872	Window Frame Caulk	Rear, Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 93	Detected Chrysotile 7
2 1120873	Win Fr.	Pkg. Lot Side, Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
3 1120874	Win. Fr.	Fr ont, Rt., Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
4 1120875	Residual Orig. on Brick @ #3	Front Rt., Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 90	Detected Chrysotile 10
5 1120876	Residual Orig. on Brick	Front Left, Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 90	Detected Chrysotile 10
6 1120877	Door Frame Caulk	Rear Door #25, Exterior, Original Bldg.	gray	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
7 1120878	Win. Fr.	C'rm. 18, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 20
8 1120879	Thick Glazing	C'rm. 18, Exterior, 1950	white	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
9 1120880	Win. Fr.	C'rm. 16, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 20
10 1120881	Thick Gl.	C'rm. 16, Exterior, 1950	gray	Non-Fibrous 97	Detected Chrysotile 3
11 1120882	Win. Fr.	By Door 5, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 20
12 1120883	Thick Gl.	By Door 5, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
13 1120884	Thick Gl.	C'rm. 19, Exterior, 1950	multi	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
14 1120885	Door Fr.	Random, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 20
15 1120886	Door Fr.	Door 7, Exterior, 1950	tan	Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 20
16 1120887	Transite Panel under Window	C'rm. 18, Exterior, 1950	gray	Cellulose 5 Non-Fibrous 80	Detected Chrysotile 15

Sampled: August 10, 2023 Received: August 11, 2023 Analyzed: August 11, 2023

Monday 14 August 2023

Analyzed by:



Batch: 102138

Page 2 of 3

FieldID LabID	Material	Location	Color	Non-Asbestos %	Asbestos %
17 1120888	Win. Fr.	C'rm. 22, 1960	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
18 1120889	Thin Glazing	C'rm. 22, 1960	tan	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
19 1120890	Win. Fr.	C'rm. 14, 1960	gray	Non-Fibrous 100	None Detected
20 1120891	Thin Gl.	C'rm. 14, 1960	tan	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2
21 1120892	Interior Glaze for Exterior Window	1950 - C'rm. 11	white	Non-Fibrous 95	Detected Chrysotile 5
22 1120893	Int. Gl. for Ext. Win.	1950 - C'rm. 17	gray	Non-Fibrous 98	Detected Chrysotile 2

Sampled: August 10, 2023

Received: August 11, 2023

Analyzed: August 11, 2023

Monday 14 August 2023

Analyzed by:



Batch: 102138

CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Universal Environmental Consultants
12 Brewster Road
Framingham, MA 01702
Tel: (508) 628-5486 - Fax: (508) 628-5488
adieb@uec-env.com

Town/City: Framingham Building Name: Oakdale Elementary

Sample	Description of Material	Sample Location
1	window frame caulk	rear exterior, original Bldg
2	wind fr	pkc lot side
3	wind fr	Front, rt
4	residue orig on brick c #3	" "
5	residue orig on brick	Front left
6	door frame caulk	rear, door # 25
7	wind fr	circ 18 exterior, 1950
8	Thick glazing	" "
9	wind fr	circ 16
10	Thick gl	" "
11	wind fr	by door - 5
12	Thick gl	" "
13	Thick gl	circ 19
14	door fr	random
15	door fr	Door - 7
16	Transite panel under window	circ 18
17	wind fr	circ 22 1960
18	Thin glazing	" "
19	wind fr	circ 14
20	Thin gl	" "

Reported By: [Signature] Date: 8/10/23

Due Date: 24-Hours

Received By: [Signature] Date: 8/11/23

21 interior glaze for exterior window 1950 - circ 11

22 int. gl for ext. win 1950 - circ 17

3 Evaluation of Alternatives

UPDATE - On January 31, 2024 the MSBA issued a letter documenting a re-calculation of the enrollment projections and revised the enrollment options for consideration. 13 options are identified for consideration. These options are included in the revised PSR Cost Estimate in Section 3.7 of this Revised Report.

- Oakdale site - Oakdale only - 360 student - Base Repair*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale Only - 360 students- new construction*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale Only - 360 students- add/reno*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale+Riverdale - 560 students - new construction*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale+Riverdale - 560 students - add/reno*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale+Greenlodge - 665 students - new construction*
- Oakdale site - Oakdale+Greenlodge - 665 students - add/reno*
- Riverdale site - Oakdale+Riverdale - 560 students - Base Repair*
- Riverdale site - Oakdale+Riverdale - 560 students - new construction*
- Riverdale site - Oakdale+Riverdale - 560 students - add/reno*
- Greenlodge site - Oakdale+Greenlodge - 665 students - Base Repair*
- Greenlodge site - Oakdale+Greenlodge - 665 students - new construction*
- Greenlodge site - Oakdale+Greenlodge - 665 students - add/reno*

Dedham, Oakdale Elementary Schools Final Evaluation of Alternatives

MSBA PREPARED TABLE

Enrollment Options	Enrollment for grades 1-5 at the Oakdale ES (360 Students)	Grade 1-5 enrollment in a consolidated Oakdale and Riverdale ES (560 students)		Grade 1-5 enrollment in a consolidated Oakdale and Greenlodge ES (665 students)	
		<i>Oakdale ES</i>	<i>Oakdale ES</i>	<i>Riverdale ES</i>	<i>Oakdale ES</i>
Base Repair (Code Upgrade)	Yes		Yes		Yes
Addition/Renovation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Construction	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Space Summaries were revised to reflect the new enrollment options, coordinate with the Town's updated Educational Plan, and to generate revised building GSF for consideration per option. Space Summaries for the following options are included in Section 4.2 of this revised PSR.

- 360 students, 91,100gsf
- 560 students, 109,100gsf
- 665 students, 126,400gsf

The massing studies were revisited to track the revised enrollments new construction and add/reno options.

The programmatic and structural quality of existing schools on Oakdale, Riverdale and Greenlodge sites were assessed for viability to accommodate the new program identified in the Space Summaries with different enrollment scenarios. The addition/renovations studied aim at maintaining the existing school structure where viable. Demolition is suggested when the existing structure does not deem to provide productive condition for renovation. For the existing structure to remain, a gut renovation would be required to provide new mechanical, electrical and plumbing work and layout. In these options, the existing gymnasium is usually converted to a cafetorium, and a new gymnasium is included in the new addition.

Dedham Options

	Base Repair - No Drawing
	Old SD adjustment - Remove 10 Classrooms,
	Old PSR Option C adjustment - Remove 10 Classrooms
	Old PDP adjustment - Add 5 Classrooms

13 ENROLLMENT OPTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION


Site	Option	Enrollment		All New or Add Reno	New GSF	Reno GSF	Demo GSF
Oakdale	O-BR	Oakdale Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	53,524	0
	O-O-N	Oakdale Only - Option D	360 Students	New	91,100	0	53,524
	O-O-A/R	Oakdale Only	360 Students	Add Reno	66,000	29,100	24,900
	O-R-N	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	New	109,100	0	53,524
	O-R-A/R	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	Add Reno	84,000	29,100	24,900
	O-G-N	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	New	126,400	0	53,524
	O-G-A/R	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	Add Reno	101,300	29,100	24,900
Riverdale	R-BR	Riverdale Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	40,500	0
	R-R-N	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	New	109,100	0	40,500
	R-R-A/R	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	Add Reno	71,600	40,500	0
Greenlodge	G-BR	Greenlodge Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	38,950	0
	G-G-N	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	New	126,400	0	38,950
	G-G-A/R	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	Add Reno	90,450	38,950	0

New construction options locate a new building on the open space of a site, allowing for the existing building to remain in operation during construction and negate or minimize the need for swing space. The siting orients the building for optimal natural light harvesting in the east-west orientation, respects zoning and wetlands setbacks, and provides full access around the building for emergency vehicle access. The new building options are for massing purposes only and reflect the planning of spaces with appropriate sizes as indicated in the Space Summary for each enrollment option. An organizational parti of a central building core including main entry, administration, media center, cafeteria and gymnasium flanked by two story academic wings. The enrollment configurations are addressed by varying the academic wings length to accommodate the required amount of classrooms. The gymnasium size remains the same in all scenarios as it is sized to meet basketball court standards that are required regardless of enrollment size. This configuration offers flexibility to accommodate different school options in the future.

Oakdale Site

Oakdale - Base Repair

The building would require a full gut renovation with accessibility and code upgrades. The existing building with its' additions is only 53,524 GSF, about 58% the area required for the smallest enrollment option.



1. O-BR: Oakdale Only -Base Repair

Oakdale - NEW Construction: 360 - Oakdale

A new building is proposed at the southwest corner of the site oriented east-west for optimal solar orientation. Vehicular traffic for drop off is directed from Cedar St. towards Madison St. with bus drop off on Madison St. The new field is located at the northeast corner of the site in the location of the previous school..

All of the new Oakdale schemes have the same organizational parti- with different length of the academic wings to accommodate the three school enrollment scenarios.



**OAKDALE-360 NEW CONSTRUCTION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

OAKDALE ONLY
91,000 GSF
82 SPACES, 3 BUSES, 1 VAN

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated


2. O-O-N: Oakdale Only - 360
- New

Oakdale - ADDITION/RENOVATION: 360 - Oakdale

The existing 1902 brick portion, beloved to many in the community, is proposed to remain and maintain the historic character of the exterior. The building would require a full gut renovation with accessibility and code upgrades. The later additions to the south are proposed to be removed as they are in poor condition and do not have appropriately sized spaces to meet the desired program. This scheme proposes 2 two-story academic wings added to connect the north and south of the existing building. The two new wings hug the existing building to create a quad area for the main entrance with vehicular drop off from Cedar St. The dual entrances may be retained for the building to accommodate two different schools, or other cohort organization, within the school. A new gym with adjacency to the field and cafeteria is added to the north academic wings.

The 1950s and 1970s wings may remain in use while the new wings are constructed to minimize the requirement of swing space. Some swing space is required during renovation of the existing brick structure. Siting and orientation as previously indicated. The east classroom wing is eliminated and west classroom wing and cafeteria reduce in size and quantity since less program space required. Gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.

Same as above. The east classroom wing is omitted and west classroom wing and cafeteria reduce in size and quantity since less program space is required. The gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.



**OAKDALE-360 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

OAKDALE ONLY
91,000 GSF
82 SPACES, 3 BUSES, 1 VAN

Orange outline: New Construction
Yellow outline: Existing to be Renovated

3. O-O-A/R: Oakdale Only - 360 - Add/Reno

Oakdale -NEW Construction: 560 - Oakdale +Riverdale

Siting and orientation as previously indicated. The classroom wings and cafetorium increase in size and quantity for the additional program space required. Gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.



OAKDALE-560 NEW CONSTRUCTION TEST FIT DIAGRAM

OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
109,000GSF
138 SPACES, 3 BUS, 2 VANS

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

4. O-R-N: Oakdale + Riverdale - 560 - New

Oakdale - ADDITION/RENOVATION: 560 - Oakdale + Riverdale

Same as above. The classroom wings and cafetorium increase in size and quantity for additional program space required. The gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.



OAKDALE-560 ADDITION/RENOVATION TEST FIT DIAGRAM

OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
109,000GSF
138 SPACES, 3 BUS, 2 VANS

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

5. O-R-N: Oakdale + Riverdale - 560 - Add/Reno

Oakdale -NEW Construction: 665 - Oakdale + Greenlodge

Siting and orientation as previously indicated. The classroom wings and cafetorium increase in size and quantity for the additional program space required. Gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.



**OAKDALE-665 NEW CONSTRUCTION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
126,000 GSF
151 SPACES, 4 BUSES, 1 VAN

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

6. O-G-N: Oakdale + Greenlodge - 665
- New

Oakdale - ADDITION/RENOVATION: 665 - Oakdale +Greenlodge

Same as above. The classroom wings and cafetorium increase in size and quantity for additional program space required. The gymnasium size remains the same per gym court standards.



**OAKDALE-665 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
126,000 GSF
151 SPACES, 4 BUSES, 1 VAN

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

7. O-G-N: Oakdale + Greenlodge - 665
- Add/Reno

Riverdale Site

Riverdale - Base Repair

The building would require a full gut renovation with accessibility and code upgrades. The existing building with its' additions is only 37,098GSF, about 40% the area required for the smallest enrollment option



8. R-BR: Riverdale - Base Repair

Riverdale - NEW Construction: 360 - Oakdale + Greenlodge

A new construction is proposed at the north of site with classroom wings in the east-west orientation for maximized daylight. Vehicular traffic is concentrated on the east portion of the site from Needham Street allowing for the newly constructed playground with bus drop off to be maintained. The playfield is re-located at the site of the demolished building along Needham Street.



RIVERDALE -560 NEW CONSTRUCTION TEST FIT DIAGRAM

OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
109,000GSF
138 SPACES, 3 BUS, 2 VANS

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

9. R-R-N: Oakdale + Riverdale - 560 - New

Riverdale - ADDITION/RENOVATION: 360 - Oakdale + Riverdale

The existing two-story Riverdale elementary school is situated on a flat topography with a newly added playground off the driveway from Needham St.

The existing two-story Riverdale building is in adequate condition for renovation, but the current layout provides undersized classrooms and inefficient spatial proportions so the interior layout is proposed to be demolished. The addition/renovation scheme proposes a 2-story academic wing at the north of the existing building. The gym is located at the north of the new wing with direct access to the field. The existing building is connected to the new building on both levels and vertical circulation is rearranged to service both levels. A new vestibule addition is added to the existing entrance to provide better thermal isolation. Interior layout around the entrance is thoroughly reorganized, locating the Administrative and media center adjacent to the entrance. Similar to other options, the existing gym is converted to a cafetorium. The recently built new playground is preserved and new drop off traffic and bus drop off is directed from Needham St.



**RIVERDALE - 560 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

1 OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
109,000GSF
138 SPACES, 3 BUS, 2 VANS


■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

10. R-R-A/R: Oakdale + Riverdale - 560 -
Add/Reno

Greenlodge Site

Oakdale - Base Repair

The building would require a full gut renovation with accessibility and code upgrades. The existing building with its' additions is only 40,246 GSF, about 44% the area required for the smallest enrollment option



GREENLODGE SCHOOL - EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

11. G-BR: Greenlodge-Base Repair

Greenlodge - NEW Construction: 665 - Oakdale + Greenlodge

A new building is located on the north corner of the site, while keeping most of the forestry on the west area with steeper topography. The building is oriented for optimal natural lighting. Parking and traffic is concentrated at the northeast. The play field is located at the south portion of the site in the location of the existing school.



GREENLODGE -665 NEW CONSTRUCTION TEST FIT DIAGRAM

OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
126,000 GSF
151 SPACES, 4 BUS, 1 VANS

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated


12. G-G-N: Oakdale + Greenlodge- 665 - New

Greenlodge - ADDITION/RENOVATION: 665 - Oakdale + Greenlodge

The existing Greenlodge school is in adequate condition for renovation. The modular temporary classrooms at the north of existing building wings are demolished as they are in poor condition and undersized for the academic program.

Due to the constraints of the site with hilly terrain and substantial ledge, it is beneficial programmatically, structurally and financially to construct a smaller-footprint building on the site. Therefore, this scheme proposes a three-story academic wing and a new gym south of the existing west wing. It is advisable to be aware of the challenge of building on the existing topography since extra retaining walls and structural reinforcements is needed to negotiate the steep and ledge filled terrain.

Some of the existing interior partitions will be removed to create space for the media center and administration area. The existing gym is converted into a new cafetorium. The field remains at the north of the site for field and sport activities. One way travel lanes are directed from north to south parallel to Greenlodge St., with drop off in front of the building entrance and bus drop off at the north of the site. Noted that extensive cut and fill operation will be required to create parking spaces in the Southeast corner of the site. A cafetorium is added to the north academic wings.



**GREENLODGE -665 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
126,000 GSF
151 SPACES, 4 BUS, 1 VANS

13. G-G-A/R: Oakdale + Greenlodge- 665 -
Add/Reno

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated

3.1 Site


On March 20, 2024 the School Committee unanimously votes for 360 student enrollment.

On March 25, 2024 the SBRC unanimously votes for the Oakdale site.

The existing Oakdale school site offers several advantages. The existing building is restricted to the eastern portion of the site, leaving a large potential new construction area to the west. For site access and circulation, the site offers two long frontages allowing for separation of vehicle, service, bus and pedestrian access points. Both site depth and breadth are generous for compliance with zoning setbacks and required yards. The site orientation as a rectangle with its long axis running east to west is ideal for orienting sun harvesting classrooms. There are no wetlands nor flood restrictions and no apparent underground obstacles.

Various building configurations and options are considered on the Oakdale site:

- Option 0 Code Renovation
- Option A Academic Courtyard
- Option B Common Core Welcome
- Option C Addition/Renovation
- Option D Core Cluster



Option 0 - Existing Oakdale site with building, parking, athletic fields

Options A, B, and D are new construction in differing configurations on the existing fields of the Oakdale site. The massings allow for the 1902 portion of the existing school to remain if desired by decision of the Town. Option 0 and C Add/Reno maintains construction at the eastern portion of the site and athletic fields to the western portion of the site as it is today.

- Building footprint
- Athletic Fields
- Parking Areas and Drives
- Bus and Parent Drop-off
- Site Access



Option A - new construction



Option B - new construction



Option C - Addition Renovation



UPDATED Option D - new construction

3.2 Potential Impact

Construction impact on students was evaluated for each of the alternatives in regard to potential disruption to the educational process. Because each of the options would be built in close proximity to the school, standard general conditions to control noise, dust, and construction traffic would apply.

Option 0 - Repair to Code Baseline

This option would have a significant impact on students because they would need to be relocated to temporary modular swing space for the duration of construction work.

Option A - New Construction

This option would allow the new building to be entirely built while the existing Oakdale School remains in full operation, resulting in minimal disruption to the students. Because this option is built along Madison Street, there would be minimal disruption to vehicular and pedestrian access to the existing school, which occurs off Cedar Street.

Option B - New Construction

Effectively identical to Option A regarding construction impact on students.

Option C - Addition/Partial Renovation

This option would require complex phasing to avoid the need for swing space. The phasing would take place as follows:

- Phase 1) Build new addition to North of existing building. Move existing Oakdale Students into the new wing. There would be a temporary condition with no Kitchen or Media Center of for the students.
- Phase 2) Demolish Existing 1902 and 1970 wings, renovate existing 1902 building, Build new addition to the south of the 1902 building.
- Phase 3) Move Greenlodge students into the completed new school.

This entire process would unquestionably be very disruptive to the students.

Option D - New Construction

Effectively identical to Option A regarding construction impact on students.

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Concept Options Evaluation Matrix

DRAFT

7/26/2023

RATINGS:

+	Advantageous
-0-	Neutral
-	Disadvantageous
--	Very Disadvantageous


	Option 0 Repair to Code Baseline	Option A Academic Courtyard	Option B Common Core Welcome	Option C Addition Partial Renovation	Option D Core Cluster	Comments
PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA						
1 Total Project Cost						
2 Schedule	+	+	+	--	+	2 Phase renovation/ addition would add approximately 18 months to the project
3 Construction Impact to Education	--	-0-	-0-	--	-0-	Option 0 would require modular swing space, Renovation would require complex logistics, with temporary condition with no kitchen or Media Center
4 Construction Impact to Neighbors	+	-0-	-0-	-0-	+	Options O and D would have the least impact on abutters
5 Educational Program Accommodation	--	+	+	-0-	+	Option 0 would not accommodate the proposed 550 student enrollment. Option C has 4 stories, making some spaces more remote
6 Flexibility-Fixed Classroom Count per Cohort	+	+	+	-	+	Option C has wings which are necessarily remote from each other
7 STEM Enhancement-Visible learning	-0-	+	+	+	+	Option 0 is inefficient with poor circulation
8 Flexibility-Building Systems	-	+	+	-	+	Renovation requires reuse of already fixed spaces, allowing less flexibility of systems
9 Open Space /Building Massing / Footprint	-	-0-	-0-	-0-	+	Option 0 is inefficient with poor circulation, Option D consolidates open space
10 Security	+	+	+	+	+	
11 Community Use	-0-	-0-	+	-0-	+	Option A has less usable open space than B or D, Gym in Option C is more remote
12 Natural Light and Views	+	+	+	-0-	+	Option C central classrooms have existing windows facing east-west, which is undesirable for natural light
13 LEED / Sustainability	-0-	+	+	-0-	+	Options 0 and C reuse existing materials, but would necessarily have a less fuel efficient design due to existing windows facing east-west
14 Risk	--	+	+	--	+	Renovations involve unknown conditions which can add time and cost
15 Long Term Maintenance and Repair Costs	-	-0-	+	-	+	Options 0 and C would require more challenging maintenance of the existing exterior skin and roof. Option A has enclosed courtyard requiring maintenance.
16 Operating Costs	-	+	+	-	+	Options 0 and C would necessarily have a less fuel efficient design due to the existing windows facing east-west
Swing Space Cost (\$Million)						
Order of Magnitude Project Cost (\$Million)						
MSBA Share						
Dedham Share						

3.3 Conceptual Drawings

Option 0 - 'Code Renovation'

Option 0 Code Renovation does not satisfy the program identified in the Space Summary reflecting the revised enrollment requirements for 360 students. At 53,523gsf, it offers just over 1/2 the required area of the 91,100gsf identified for a school of this enrollment reflecting the standards of the Town and MSBA. Additional deficiencies include the following:

- Full Hazmat abatement (see Section 2.3 for cost estimate)
- New 4 floor elevator
- New sprinkler system throughout
- New fire alarm throughout
- Enlarged updated bathrooms
- New door hardware throughout
- Exterior HC accessible ramps
- Temporary modular swing space required for 250 students during construction.




OAKDALE SCHOOL - EXISTING FLOOR PLANS
August 1, 2013



The remaining 4 alternative design concepts include the same number and sizes of classrooms, specialized instruction spaces, cafeteria, Gym (with community entrance), and all other support spaces. What differentiates the alternatives is how they are configured on the site.

Option A - 'Academic Courtyard'

In this option two, two-story wings, correctly oriented for sustainability, frame an enclosed courtyard which can be used both for recreation and for protected outdoor learning activities or outdoor classrooms'. The building would be entered from a shared lobby with grades 1 and 2 moving to left, greeted by their 'school within a school' welcome and administration area. Grades 3-5 circulate to the right to their upper school learning community. Directly fronting the lobby is the media center which then looks out through high windows to the cafeteria at the other end of the academic courtyard. The cafeteria can be joined to the adjacent gym for whole community events. Both have direct access to the outdoors.



PSR Concepts - Option 'A'



'Academic Courtyard' – Level 2

PSR Concepts-Option 'A'



'Academic Courtyard' – Level 1

PSR Concepts - Option 'A'



'Academic Courtyard' – Exterior View

PSR Concepts - Option 'A'



'Academic Courtyard' – Interior View




Option B - 'Common Core Welcome'

This approach could have either a shared entry for all students or remote entrances and administration for grades 1 and 2 and grades 3-5 for a stronger separation of learning communities. The two 'schools within a school' share a central core of interrelated common spaces including the gym, cafeteria and media center. A 2 1/2 story design, the east or upper school wing is three stories in height with its taller portion kept away from neighbors and bordering the large open space of the playfields.



'Common Core Welcome' – Site plan

PSR Concepts - Option 'B1'




'Common Core Welcome' – Level 2

PSR Concepts - Option 'B1'




'Common Core Welcome' – Level 1, Single Entry

PSR Concepts - Option 'B1'



'Common Core Welcome' – Level 3

PSR Concepts - Option 'B2'



'Common Core Welcome' – Level 1, Dual Entry

PSR Concepts - Option 'B1'



'Common Core Welcome' – Interior View

PSR Concepts - Option 'B1'



'Common Core Welcome' – Interior View



Option C - 'Addition Partial Renovation'

To demonstrate the feasibility of preserving the existing Oakdale core 1902 structure for school use, this concept proposed the demolition of the 1950s and 1970s wings, a full renovation of the 1902 building, and the addition of two new wings. The school would be entered from a glass porch whose ramps and stairs would provide full ADA access to the existing building's elevated floor level. Dual administration areas would occupy the entry level of the 1902 building along with the lobby and the media center. The media center overlooks the cafetorium addition, one story below the rear. Glass corridors and new stair towers connect the historic structure to the semi-detached new wings which frame it. The first-floor level of the new wings is set at the center building's basement level, with the adjoining ground carved out to allow light and view to their classrooms. With multiple phases for renovation, temporary occupancy and sequential construction, this option will require an extended construction schedule.



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Site plan

UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'




'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Level 2
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Level 1
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Level 4
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Level 3
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Interior View

PSR Concepts - Option 'C'



'Addition/Partial Renovation' – Interior View



Option D - 'Core Cluster'

This 2 story approach further reduces the depth of the front to back building footprint by relocating the gymnasium to the pocket of space at the NW corner of the site. This creates greater continuity of the green space surrounding the building while at the same time maintaining proper solar orientation for the classrooms. An exciting cluster of interactive core spaces occupies the center of the building, with cafetorium, media center, maker space, art and music all proximate and visible to each other. The two academic wings, grades 1-2 to the left and 3-5 to the right, are differentiated from each other according to the program requirements, with the 3-5 corridor widening into the shared collaborative cohort commons activity areas.



'Core Cluster' – Site plan
 UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'D'



'Cluster Core' – Level 2
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'D'



'Core Cluster' – Level 1
UPDATED - massing for 360 students at 91,100gsf

PSR Concepts - Option 'D'



PSR Concepts - Option 'D'



'Core Cluster' – Exterior View

3.4 Structural Systems

Outline of the major building structural systems follow.

I. Structural Systems Overview

The proposed new building will consist of two and three stories on a relatively flat site with no basement totaling 103,000 gross square feet. The building will be configured to support a design enrollment of 550 students. The proposed building structure will be a structural steel frame with concrete floor slabs on composite steel deck. The roof will be steel deck with no concrete. Lateral loads will be resisted by structural steel braced frames. Foundations will be cast-in-place reinforced concrete walls, slabs-on-grade, and spread footings.

II. Foundations

No geotechnical engineering information is available at this time therefore we will base these recommendations on suitable foundation conditions with an allowable bearing pressure of 2 tons per square foot and a seismic site class C. This information will be validated by the geotechnical engineer later in Feasibility Study. Based on this information the foundations for the project will be as follows:

A. Walls

Typical foundation walls will be 16-inch thick reinforced concrete with 8-inch wide shelves as required to support façade elements. Exterior foundation walls will extend down to a minimum of 4'-0" below finished exterior grade. All foundation walls enclosing below-grade space shall be waterproofed on the exterior surface and a drainage system shall be installed around the perimeter of the foundation to divert ground water away from the building.

B. Slab-on-Grade

The first floor slab will be a 5-inch thick slab-on-grade. A 15-mil vapor barrier and a 12-inch layer of crushed stone will be placed beneath the slab to provide an adequate substrate and to allow for an under-slab drainage system where portions of the floor slab extend below exterior grade. Further development in design will provide for depressions, trenches, housekeeping pads, and other potential equipment requirements.

C. Footings

The foundations will be reinforced concrete spread footings and continuous wall footings bearing on compacted structural fill or undisturbed soil.

LeMessurier.

D. Pits

Elevator and other pits that may be required will consist of an 18-inch thick reinforced concrete base slab and 12-inch thick reinforced concrete pit walls. All pits shall receive waterproofing.

III. Gravity Load System

A. Ground Floor

Slab-on-grade as described above.

B. Typical Floor Construction

Floor construction will be 3-inch normal weight concrete on 3-inch deep, 18-gage galvanized, composite steel deck for a total slab thickness of 6 inches. The floor slab will be reinforced with WWF 6x6-W4.0xW4.0 throughout. Beams and girders will be structural steel rolled shapes (typically W14, W16, & W18) made composite with the floor slabs via ¾-inch diameter, 5½-inch long welded steel shear studs. Columns will be structural steel HSS shapes (typically 6 inch and 8 inch square).

C. Typical Roof Construction

The roof will be 3-inch deep, 18 gage, galvanized steel roof deck. Roof beams and girders will be structural steel rolled shapes. Where it is preferred or necessary to place concrete on the roof, such as for sound attenuation at mechanical equipment, the construction will be similar to the typical floor construction described above. Hot-dipped galvanized steel dunnage will be provided on top of the roof if necessary to support mechanical equipment and for mechanical equipment screening.

D. Gym Roof

The roof will be 1½-inch deep, 20 gage, galvanized steel roof deck. The framing over the gym will consist of deep long span open web joists, spanning clear between the side walls, and configured to match the roof profile.

E. Typical Façade Support

Continuous support of the building façade is expected to occur from each framed level above grade. This may likely consist of hung steel angle frames with all material outside the air and vapor barrier system to be hot-dipped galvanized.

F. Lateral Load System

The lateral force resisting system will consist of concentrically braced steel frames in both primary structural directions. Structural steel tubes, 6 inch and 8 inch square, will be oriented diagonally in vertical planes between columns to provide resistance to wind and seismic forces.

Initial considerations will be to concentrate the majority of the longitudinal braced frames within the two bathroom core groups, at either end of the curved corridor, to provide stability along the longitudinal axis of the building. Transverse stability will be achieved by vertical braced frames stacked along the three floors and located in the common classroom walls, where classroom connections do not exist. The stability of the gym will be satisfied with braced frames located in all four walls.

Final locations of the frames will be coordinated with the architectural layout as design progresses.

The seismic design category is expected to be B. This shall be validated upon receipt of the geotechnical engineering report.

s:\2022\22.0258\05-narratives\oakdale elementary school psr structural narrative option d.docx

LeMessurier.

1380 SOLDIERS FIELD ROAD BOSTON, MA 02135 TEL 617.868.1200 WWW.LEMESSURIER.COM

REVISED Preferred Schematic Report
Oakdale Elementary School, Dedham, Massachusetts

3.5 Utilities

A survey of the Oakdale site including utilities is included in section 2.2. The current Oakdale school is operational and is connected to the Town infrastructure. All options would connect to the available electric, water, sewer, and storm drain. Verifications of existing infrastructure to be further verified during Schematic Design.


A hydrant flow test was conducted. It was confirmed that a fire pump is required. Refer to section 3.6 Fire Protection systems for more information.

Dedham Public Infrastructure Viewer



7/26/2023, 2:56:34 PM

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Sewer Gravity Mains | Storm Open Drains |
| Sewer Pressurized Mains | Storm Detention Areas |
| Discharge Structure | Detention Pond |
| Grease Separator | Sediment Forebay |
| Pump Station | Storm Gravity Mains |
| Sewer Manholes | Storm Culverts |
| | Parcels |



Town of Dedham, MA GIS Division; MassGIS, Town of Dedham, MA GIS Division

ArcGIS Web AppBuilder
Use Limitations: For planning purposes only.

3.6 Building Systems

Narratives of the proposed building systems follow.

- Fire Protection
- Plumbing
- HVAC
- Electrical
- Technology
- Security

Oakdale E.S
Dedham, Massachusetts

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS
NARRATIVE REPORT

The following is the Fire Protection Systems narrative, which defines the scope of work and capacities of the Fire Protection Systems, as well as, the Basis of Design.

1. CODES

- A. All work installed under Section 21 00 00 shall comply with the Massachusetts Building Code and all state, county, and federal codes, laws, statutes, and authorities having jurisdiction.

2. DESIGN INTENT

- A. All work is new and consists of furnishing all materials, equipment, labor, transportation, facilities, and all operations and adjustments required for the complete and operating installation of the Fire Protection work and all items incidental thereto, including commissioning and testing.

3. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The building will be served by the new 8" fire service line from the campus hydrant line. Cross connection control shall be provided by use a supervised double check valve assembly backflow preventer on the fire service as it enters the building in the Fire pump room adjacent to the exterior building wall.

A hydrant flow test was conducted, and it was confirmed that a Fire pump is required for this building. The fire pump will be 750 GPM @ 40 PSI with a 30 HP motor and controller with ATS. A jockey pump will be 10 GPM @45 PSI with a 2 HP motor and controller.

The entire building shall be protected throughout with a wet automatic fire suppression system and fed from an 8" Wet Riser Check Valve. The system will be a wet sprinkler system with control valve assemblies to limit the sprinkler area controlled to less than 52,000 s.f. as required by NFPA 13-2013.

Standpipes meeting the requirements of NFPA 14-2013 shall be provided in all egress stairwells and in the Stage area. Roof manifolds will be provided at locations approved by the AHJ.

Each floor will be divided into sprinkler zones (3 zones) and each wet sprinkler zone will include a control valve assembly. Control valve assemblies shall consist of a supervised shutoff valve, check valve, flow switch and test connection with drain.

Three fire department Storz pumper connections will be provided one at the outside of the fire service entrance, second at the courtyard and the third at the front of the building. The FDC will be wall-mount. This system shall be designed in accordance with NFPA 13, 2013, the MA State Building Code, and the town of Dedham requirements.

Furnish and install all Supervisory Switches, Flow Switches, Pressure Switches, and other Alarm Devices. Install all such devices on the piping and coordinate with the Electrical Subcontractor who shall wire all such devices to the Fire Alarm System. Every shutoff valve installed on this project shall have a supervisory trouble switch wired to the Fire Alarm Panel.

An 8" electric bell will be provided on the exterior wall outside the fire water service entrance.

Electrical rooms, emergency electric rooms, elevator machine rooms and elevator shaft will not be provided with sprinkler heads.

4. BASIS OF DESIGN

Sprinkler heads in areas with finished ceilings shall be concealed pendant type and in areas with no suspended ceilings shall be upright sprinkler heads.

The administrative office spaces, Cafeteria, corridors, rest rooms and general classrooms will be hydraulically designed for Light Hazard occupancy requirements with a design criterion of 0.10 gpm/sf over 1,500 sf with 100 gpm hose allowance. Maximum sprinkler spacing will be 225sf.

5. PIPING

Sprinkler piping 1-1/2 in. and smaller shall be ASTM A-53, Schedule 40 black steel pipe. Sprinkler/standpipe piping 2 in. and larger shall be ASTM A-135, Schedule 10 black steel pipe.

6. FITTINGS

Fittings on fire service piping, 2 in. and larger, shall be Victaulic Fire Lock Ductile Iron Fittings conforming to ASTM A-536 with integral grooved shoulder and back stop lugs and grooved ends for use with Style 009-EZ or Style 005 couplings. Branch line fittings shall be welded or shall be Victaulic 920/920N Mechanical Tees. Schedule 10 pipe shall be roll grooved. Schedule 40 pipe, where used with mechanical couplings, shall be roll grooved and shall be threaded where used with screwed fittings. Fittings for threaded piping shall be malleable iron screwed sprinkler fittings.

END OF SECTION

Oakdale E.S
Dedham, Massachusetts

PLUMBING

GENERAL

The Plumbing System will be designed per the 9th Edition of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Building Code, 248 CMR Plumbing Code, Latest addition of National Fuel Gas Code NFPA 54.

PLUMBING SYSTEMS:

Domestic Cold Water Service:

The building will have a new 6" domestic water supply and will enter into the facility through boiler room. The cold-water supply system will be extended 10'-0" outside the building and connected to the underground yard main system. Reduced Pressure Backflow Preventer will be provided to the main domestic water supply to protect the service (per the DEP regulation 310 CMR 22). Potable water will meet both the NSF 61 and NSF 372 standards for lead-free safe drinking water Act. Domestic cold water inside the building will be "L" type copper tube with wrought or cast copper fittings. All cold-water piping will be insulated to prevent condensation

Domestic Hot Water Service:

Domestic hot water supply will be generated through a point of use instantaneous electric water heater. The electric water heater in the range of 3 to 8 kw will be mounted under each fixture requiring hot water. The water heater will be modulating type and will be capable of providing fixture hot water flow at 60 °F rise. The kitchen hot water demand will be generated through one 50 KW electric hot water heater manifold with 120-gallon buffer tank. The hot water will maintain dual system and operate at 140°F to serve the pre-rinse and 3-Compartment sink. The other system will operate at 120°F and will serve the other kitchen appliances, hand sinks, and custodian room sink. Domestic hot water will be distributed in "L" type copper tube with wrought or cast copper fittings. The hot water (HW) and re-circulating (HWC) piping will be insulated per IECC2015.

Roof Storm Drainage:

The surface of the roof deck will be drained with dual-level promenade drains with the lower drain bodies flashed into the waterproofing membrane. Roof with parapet wall will have overflow drains. Overflow drains will be extended to the exterior wall with a nozzle. The rainwater system will be sized to handle a rainfall rate of 4 inches per hour, with a total runoff from the main roof and the roof deck of just under 1 cubic foot per second. The storm system will be installed in cast iron piping with all horizontal piping insulated to prevent condensation. The storm system will exit at various locations of the building and connect to the rainwater collection system.

Sanitary:

The sanitary waste system will drain by gravity and will run to exit the building and connect to the sewer system at the site. A dedicated grease waste line will be installed to collect grease laden wastewater from the Kitchen appliances and fixtures. The grease line will exit the building adjacent to the Sanitary Sewer and will be connected to an exterior grease trap outside the building. For culinary sink or prep sinks grease tarp will be provided at the source. A new 5,000 gallon capacity outdoor grease interceptor will be placed on the site to intercept grease laden waste prior connection to site sewer system. Art room sinks will be provided with solid interceptors.

Oakdale E.S
 Dedham, Massachusetts

The above ground sanitary drainage and vent will be piped in cast iron with “no-hub” joints.(3” or larger). Piping smaller than 3 inch will be piped in copper. Piping below floor shall be weight cast iron hub and spigot.

A floor drain will be provided in all toilet rooms where more than one water closet/urinal is present. Floor drains will be of cast iron body construction, heavy duty grade, PDI approved. Those for use in toilet rooms and other finished spaces will have rough bronze exposed finishes. Floor drains in Toilet rooms will require automatic trap primer systems. Those for use in mechanical rooms and other unfinished spaces will be all cast iron. All trap primers are to be electric, timer type.

Fixtures and Fixture Count

Fixtures and Fixture Count

Number of plumbing fixtures will be added in the facility to accommodate population of male students and female students and shall be in accordance with 248 CMR Paragraph 10.10, Table 1.

Plumbing fixtures will be equipped with the following water conserving features (for 30% indoor water use reduction-LEED-V4, Credit 2).

Water Closet	Urinals	Lavatory
Dual Flush Valve (Sloan WES-111, 1.6 gpf up and 1.1 gpf down) Or Electronic sensor 1.28 gpf flush valve (Sloan 8111-1.28)	Electronic sensor ultra low flow flush valve type- 0.25gpf (Sloan WEUS 1002) Or Waterfree Urinals (Sloan WES-1000)	Sloan Optima ETF-600- electronic sensor activated, hand washing faucet with integral spout temperature mixer, 0.5 gpm flow restricting aerator spray head and field adjustable run time limit setting.

Water closets and urinals will be commercial vitreous china, wall hung (ADA compliant). Lavatories will be self-rimming countertop mounted china. Each floor will include a janitor’s closet with a corner mop service basin. Toilet cores on each floor will include alcove-recessed electric water cooler, in a high-low handicapped accessible configuration to meet MAAB requirement.

All toilet and mechanical rooms will have floor drains complete with trap primers.

Boiler room will include service sink and eyewash station.

Plumbing roughing connections and faucets will be provided to each kitchen appliances requiring plumbing work. Non-freeze wall hydrants will be provided along the exterior wall of school building.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 1/August 25, 2023

HVAC SYSTEM NARRATIVE

The following is the HVAC system narrative, which defines the scope of work and capacities of the HVAC system as well as the Basis of Design. The HVAC systems shall be designed and constructed for **LEED for Schools v4** where indicated on this narrative.

1. **CODES**

All work installed under Division 230000 shall comply with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Adopted Building Codes (IBC 2021, IMC 2021, International Energy Efficiency Based on IECC 2021 - or latest Adopted Editions), Massachusetts Municipal Opt-In Specialized Stretch Energy Code 2023, and all local, county, and federal codes, laws, statutes, and authorities having jurisdiction.

2. **DESIGN INTENT**

The work of Division 230000 is described within the narrative report. The HVAC project scope of work shall consist of providing new HVAC equipment and systems as described here within. All new work shall consist of furnishing all materials, equipment, labor, transportation, facilities, and all operations and adjustments required for the complete and operating installation of the Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning work and all items incidental thereto, including commissioning and testing.

3. **BASIS OF DESIGN: (MASS CODE)**

Project weather and Code temperature values are listed herein based on weather data values as determined from ASHRAE weather data tables and the International Energy Conservation Code.

Outside: Winter 7 deg. F, Summer 91 deg. F DB 74 deg. F WB

Inside: 70 deg. F +/- 2 deg. F for Heating, 75 deg. F +/- 2 deg. F (55% RH) for cooling for air-conditioned areas. Unoccupied temperature setback will be provided (60 deg. F heating (adj.), 85 deg. F cooling (adj.).

Outside air shall be provided at the rate in accordance with ASHRAE guide 62.1-2019 and the International Mechanical Code 2021 as a minimum. All occupied areas will be designed to maintain 800 PPM carbon dioxide maximum.

4. **HVAC SYSTEM OPTIONS:** As part of a life cycle cost analysis (LCCA), different HVAC systems shall be compared against a Stretch Code Compliant Baseline system to determine the system with the overall greatest savings over a 50 year study period.

By comparison of each option to the baseline system, the option with the greatest total life-cycle savings is generally recommended. To further enhance controllability and overall system performance, additional options should be considered that will enhance year-round temperature control and comfort at a possible marginal increase in capital cost. The following HVAC systems are proposed to be studied as part of the life cycle cost analysis (LCCA) during the Schematic Design phase of the project.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 2/August 25, 2023

- A. Baseline (All Electric Code):** The Baseline HVAC All-Electric System for comparison would be Packaged Air-Source Heat Pump Rooftop Units with 75% eff. ERV providing Overhead Mixed-Air to terminal VAV units with Hot Water Coil Reheats. Hot water would be provided by an Air-to-Water Heat Pump Heater plant to terminal hot water radiation/radiant heating equipment for space perimeter heating, utility rooms, storage rooms, entryways, and other heated only areas of the building. Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Split system heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms. A back-up electric boiler would be provided for the Air-to-Water Heat Pump Heater that would only operate in the event of an equipment failure.
- B. Option 1 (Air Source Heat Pump):** A central air source to hydronic hot and chilled water heat recovery heat pump chiller plant shall be provided to generate hot water and chilled water for building air handling unit and terminal heating/cooling equipment. Central (indoor or rooftop) hot water and chilled water air handling units with 75% eff. Energy recovery ventilation (ERV) providing Displacement Ventilation to terminal VAV units w/ CO2 DCV (demand control ventilation) and terminal hot water and chilled water dual-temp perimeter passive radiant heating/cooling panels. Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Ground source heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms. A back-up electric boiler would be provided for the Air-to-Water Heat Pump Heater that would only operate in the event of an equipment failure.
1. Pros: Lower Maintenance than Option 3, High efficiency (low EUI), Utility Incentives, Moderate first cost
 2. Cons: Higher Maintenance than Option 2, Additional maintenance and future replacement costs for outdoor air source heat pump, Additional Exterior Sound from Air Source Heat pump equipment, Potential snow removal concerns.
- C. Option 2 (Geothermal Heat Pump):** A central geothermal ground source water to water heat recovery heat pump chiller plant shall be provided to generate hot water and chilled water for building air handling unit and terminal heating/cooling equipment. Central (indoor or rooftop) hot water and chilled water air handling units with 75% eff. Energy recovery ventilation (ERV) providing Displacement Ventilation to terminal VAV units w/ CO2 DCV (demand control ventilation) and terminal hot water and chilled water dual-temp perimeter passive radiant heating/cooling panels. Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Ground source heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms.
1. Pros: Smallest Emergency Generator Size of All-Electric Options, Simultaneous Heating & Cooling, No Fossil Fuel Use, Highest energy efficiency (lowest EUI), Highest Utility Company Incentives, Federal IRA Tax Credit potential, Lowest Maintenance due to hydronic based systems, No exterior sound associated with exterior heat pumps, and no concern for Snow Removal for Heating/Cooling Plant Equipment.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 3/August 25, 2023

2. Cons: Highest First Cost (can potentially be reduced with incentives and Federal tax credits), Site area required for wellfield. Indoor mechanical room required for heat pumps.

D. Option 3 (Air Source VRF): Roof mounted air source VRF (variable refrigerant flow) heat recovery heat pump units shall be connected to a combination of indoor ducted and ductless VRF indoor air handling units. Packaged Dedicated Outdoor Air System (DOAS) Air-Source Heat Pump Rooftop Units with 75% eff. Energy recovery ventilation (ERV) and back-up electric heat shall provide the ventilation requirements for the majority of building areas. Backup heating shall be provided in areas of the building with extensive exterior exposures via perimeter electric resistance radiant heating panels. Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Air source heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms.

1. Pros: Largest Emergency Generator Size of All Options, Simultaneous Heating & Cooling, No Fossil Fuel Use, Moderate First Cost, High energy efficiency (lower EUI), Utility Company Incentives.
2. Cons: Largest Emergency Generator Size of All Options, Increased Refrigerant piping in occupied areas, Increased cost for refrigerant monitoring, Greatest maintenance costs, Increased System replacement costs, outdoor "plant" equipment results in increased outdoor sound and concerns for keeping equipment clear of snow build up for heating. System is not compatible with Displacement air distribution (lower ventilation effectiveness)

E. Option 4 (Mixed Fuel Building (Natural Gas & Electric) - Air Source Heat Pump RTUs with Gas fired Boiler Plant Heating: If the building design complies with all the requirements of **Massachusetts Energy Code SECTION CC105 & CC106**, and a Mixed Fuel (Natural Gas and Electric) System was selected to be studied then the Baseline HVAC System for comparison would be a Packaged Air-Source Heat Pump Rooftop Units with 75% eff. ERV providing Overhead Mixed-Air to terminal VAV units w/ Hot Water Reheat coils. Limited supplemental heating would be provided by hot water radiation heating that would be served by High-Efficiency Gas-Fired Condensing Boilers (with a minimum eff. of 95%). Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Air source heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms.

Under this option, Packaged Air-Source Heat Pump Rooftop Units with 75% eff. ERV shall provide ventilation via a Displacement Ventilation distribution system with terminal VAV units w/ DCV and terminal hot water radiation. Hot water would be provided by High-Efficiency Gas-Fired Condensing Boilers (with a minimum eff. of 95%). Exhaust fans would be provided for janitor's closets, and utility rooms. Air source heat pump AC units shall be provided for IT Server Rooms, Electric rooms and elevator machine rooms.

1. Pros: Smaller Emergency Generator Size versus All Electric Options
2. Cons: Fossil Fuel Use, High Energy Use (EUI), Minimal Utility Co Incentives, No Federal IRA tax credits

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 4/August 25, 2023

5. **HVAC SYSTEM FEATURES AND CAPACITIES: The following HVAC system features and capacities are based on HVAC Option 2 (Geothermal Heat Pump Displacement Ventilation System).** Other HVAC system features and airflow, heating and cooling capacities will vary from this system and those differences will be studied and presented further during the Schematic Design LCCA phase of the project.
 - A. Geothermal Heating and Cooling Plant:
 1. Heating and cooling for the entire building will be capable of being provided through the use of a high-efficiency geothermal heating and cooling plant including a modular ground water source to water simultaneous heating/cooling heat pump chillers with heat recovery with a capacity of 340 nominal tons total; with three (3) 80 ton modules and two (2) 50 ton modules, with one of the 80 ton and one of 50 ton modules for backup redundancy purposes. The heat pump chiller units will be located in the Mechanical Room. The heat pump heat recovery chillers will be provided with ground source condenser water from approximately (65) closed loop type quad-loop ground source geothermal wells approximately 600 feet deep and spaced a minimum of 20' apart from one-another. The final well quantity, depth and distances shall be determined by the geothermal design consultant.
 2. The heat pump chiller plant will supply heating hot water to heating equipment and systems located throughout the building through a two-pipe fiberglass insulated schedule 40 black steel and copper piping system. The plant shall supply maximum hot water temperature of 130°F on a design heating day. Primary and standby end suction base mounted pumps will be provided with variable frequency drives for variable volume flow through the water distribution system for improved energy efficiency. In addition to pumps, new hot water accessories including air separators and expansion tanks shall be provided.
 3. The heat pump chiller plant will distribute between 45°F and 55°F chilled water to the roof mounted air handling units and a compensated chilled water distribution system located throughout the building will distribute between 55°F and 65°F chilled water to the terminal radiant cooling panels units in the fully-air conditioned Classrooms, Admin, Guidance, Media Center, and Nursing Areas. The chilled water distribution piping will be of the fiberglass insulated schedule 40 type and will be completely separate from the hot water distribution piping system. Chilled water pumps and variable frequency drives (which will control down to maintain a minimum flow to the chiller) will be provided for overall variable flow chilled water system distribution. Compensated chilled water pumps with variable frequency drives will be provided for variable flow chilled water system distribution. In addition to pumps, new chilled water accessories including air separators and expansion tanks shall be provided.
 4. Primary and standby geothermal water pumps with variable frequency drives (which will control down to maintain a minimum flow to the heat pump chillers) will be provided for overall variable flow condenser water system distribution. In addition to pumps, new geothermal water accessories including air separators and expansion tanks shall be provided.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 5/August 25, 2023

- B. Ventilation air handling equipment: It is proposed that a new air-conditioning displacement ventilation system should be provided to provide air-conditioning and ventilation to the occupied areas of the building.
1. New rooftop air handling units with 100% outside air operation capability, supply and return air fans with VFDs, energy recovery wheels, hot water heating coil with modulating valve, chilled water cooling coil, hot water re-heat coil, economizer capability, and MERV 14 filtration will be provided to serve a new full air conditioning displacement ventilation system. Different building rooms and zones shall be provided with a variable volume (VAV) terminal box with combination temperature, humidity, and CO2 sensor controls. The controls will reduce outside air as allowed maintaining a maximum of 800 PPM while providing sufficient ventilation to meet the required heating or cooling load of the classroom. As VAV boxes modulate, the supply and return air fans associated Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) of the rooftop units will adjust the fan speed based on system static pressure, reducing the energy consumed by the fans. Each room (or zone) shall be provided with low wall or floor mounted supply air displacement diffusers. Classroom will typically be provided with two individual wall mounted displacement diffusing units between 300 and 400 CFM each (depending on room size). Return air will be drawn back to the units by ceiling return air registers located within the rooms and will be routed back to the rooftop unit by a galvanized sheet metal return air ductwork distribution system. Supplemental ceiling mounted chilled/hot water radiant panels will be provided along exterior walls that shall be interlocked with space enthalpy sensors that shall modulate the control valve of the coil closed when the space enthalpy is above dewpoint conditions.
 2. It is estimated that the following Rooftop air handling equipment will be required to serve the building areas (based on approximate 105,000 GSF):
 - a. RTU-1,2,3,4: Classrooms including SPED, Music, Art, Teacher Support, Circulation Areas, Administration & Media Center: Estimated total airflow of 48,000 CFM (Average 12,000 CFM each)
 - b. RTU-5: Cafeteria & Stage - Estimated airflow of 10,000 CFM
 - c. RTU-6: Gym - Estimated airflow of 10,000 CFM
 - d. RTU-7 Kitchen & Custodial/Support - Estimated airflow of 2,500 CFM
 - e. MUA-1: Kitchen Make-up air unit estimated at 5,000 CFM, with Kitchen Exhaust Fand and Dishwasher Exhaust Fan combined capacity of 5,500 CFM

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 6/August 25, 2023

6. COMMON REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL HVAC OPTIONS:

A. Lobby, Corridor, and Entry Way Heating:

New hot water convectors, cabinet unit heaters, and fin tube radiation heating equipment shall be installed to provide heating to building entry way and stairwell areas. Corridors shall be ventilated from adjacent air handling unit systems. Main Corridor and Lobby areas shall be heated and dehumidified by the displacement ventilation systems. For HVAC Option 4 VRF System – Electric terminal heating equipment shall be provided.

B. Utility Areas:

Utility areas will be provided with exhaust air fan systems for ventilation and will typically be heated with horizontal type ceiling suspended hot water or electric unit heaters.

The Main Electric Rooms and IDF rooms will be air conditioned by high efficiency ductless AC cooling units.

C. Testing, Adjusting, Balancing & Commissioning:

All new HVAC systems shall be tested, adjusted, balanced and commissioned as art of the project scope.

D. Automatic Temperature Controls – Building Energy Management System:

A new DDC (direct digital control) Automatic Temperature Control and Building Energy Management System shall be installed to control and monitor building HVAC systems. Energy metering shall be installed to monitor the energy usage of building HVAC systems and utilities (electric, water). The new DDC/ATC system shall be capable of being integrated into the Town Wide Central energy management system.

7. TESTING REQUIREMENTS:

A. The Mechanical Contractor shall provide testing of the following systems with the Owner and Owner's Representative present:

- Heat pump chiller plant system
- Condenser (Ground-Source) water plant system
- Back up boiler plant
- Air handling unit systems including all rooftop units, indoor air handling systems and exhaust air systems
- Terminal heating and cooling devices
- Variable Refrigerant Flow and Ductless AC Systems
- Automatic temperature control and building energy management system

B. Testing reports shall be submitted to the Engineer for review and approval before providing to the Owner.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85891/Page 7/August 25, 2023

8. **OPERATION MANUALS AND MAINTENANCE MANUALS**

When the project is completed, the Mechanical Contractor shall provide operation and maintenance manuals to the owner.

9. **RECORD DRAWINGS AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS**

When the project is completed, an as-built set of drawings, showing all mechanical system requirements from contract and addendum items will be provided to the owner.

10. **COMMISSIONING**

The project shall be commissioned per Section of the specifications.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 1/August 25, 2023

ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

NARRATIVE REPORT

The following is the Electrical Systems narrative, which defines the scope of work and capacities of the Power and Lighting System, as well as the Basis of Design. The Electrical Systems shall be designed and constructed for **LEED BD+C for Schools** where indicated on this narrative.

1. CODES

All work installed under Section 260000 shall comply with the Massachusetts State Building Code and all local, county, and federal codes, laws, statutes, and authorities having jurisdiction.

2. DESIGN INTENT

The work of Section 260000 is as described in this Narrative. All work is new and consists of furnishing all materials, equipment, labor, transportation, facilities, and all operations and adjustments required for the complete and operating installation of the Electrical work and all items incidental thereto, including commissioning and testing.

3. SEQUENCE OF OPERATIONS AND INTERACTIONS

- A. Interior lighting will be controlled by a networked lighting control system (NLCS) utilizing distributed load controllers (switching and dimming) actuated by signals from occupancy/vacancy sensors, daylight sensors, keypads, touchscreens, and auxiliary override inputs from the fire alarm, security, building management (BMS), and emergency power systems; BACnet/IP or contact closure output interfaces will be utilized from each system. Timed schedules following daily facility schedules with overrides will be employed for initial control of all common areas. Lighting will be fed from normal or life safety source panels; refer to item C below.
- B. Exterior lighting will be controlled by a networked lighting control system (NLCS) utilizing distributed load controllers or centralized panels (switching+dimming) actuated by signals from occupancy sensors, daylight sensors, keypads, touchscreens, and auxiliary override inputs from the fire alarm, security, building management, and emergency power systems; BACnet/IP or contact closure output interfaces will be utilized from each system. Pole-mounted area lighting will be provided with wireless load controller nodes integrated into each fixture allowing for individual or zoned control. Timed control following dusk-to-dawn schedules with overrides will be employed for initial control of all exterior lighting. Lighting will be fed from normal or life safety source panels; refer to item C below.
- C. Designated emergency and egress lighting will be wired to life safety source panels and be controlled by the NLCS when normal utility source power is available and brought to full "ON" through system control UL924 listed by-pass functions when normal utility source power is lost. Emergency exit signage shall be uncontrolled and remain "ON" constantly.
- D. Automatic control of receptacles based on occupancy will be provided for at least 50% of the receptacles installed in private offices, open offices, conference rooms, rooms used primarily for printing and/or copying functions, break rooms, classrooms, and individual workstations. Controlled receptacles will be marked per NEC 406.3 (E).
- E. Demand response shedding of lighting loads will be capable in accordance with associated LEED requirements.

Oakdale Elementary School
 Dedham, MA
 J#680
 L#85892/Page 2/August 25, 2023

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEMS

A. Utilities:

1. The new building will be supplied with utility power from the utility company Eversource. The new service will be fed via an underground primary duct bank to a pad mounted utility company owned liquid filled transformer.
2. The service electrical transformer will be furnished, installed, owned and maintained by Eversource, and it will be located adjacent to the building as shown in the civil drawings. The transformer will be of the pad-mounted type with a primary voltage of 13.8 kV and a secondary voltage of 480Y/277 volts. The transformer will be sized by the utility company based on the load data provided by The Design team.
3. Concrete pad and grounding grid for the pad-mounted transformer is provided by the Contractor per the National Grid standards.
4. Concrete encased duct bank of the two 4" PVC conduits will be provided by the Electrical Contractor for the primary feeder installation from a utility pole to the pad-mounted transformer. Pre-cast concrete manholes 5' x 5' will be provided by the Contractor to facilitate the primary cables field installation. The duct bank routing is shown in the civil drawings.
5. Utility company will provide a primary feeder cable from the utility manhole to the pad-mounted transformer via the new manhole and terminate the feeder cable on both ends.
6. Transformer secondary feeder of the copper conductors will be installed underground in the duct bank of six 4" PVC conduits from the pad-mounted transformer to the main electrical switchboard located in the main electrical room. The secondary feeder and terminations at the switchboard side will be provided by the Electrical Contractor and terminated at the transformer side by National Grid. The new service will be metered at the transformer secondary voltage.
7. National Grid metering CTs will be installed in a CT section of the switch board, the meter will be located at the direction of the utility company.
8. Telephone, Cable TV, and City Fiber will be fed underground into the building's Main Distribution Frame/Head End Room.
9. Copper conductors shall be utilized for all branch circuit and feeder wiring. Aluminum conductors will be allowed for feeders 100 amperes or over.
10. The building connected electrical load estimate is based on the preliminary building systems design:

Load Type	KVA
HVAC Loads (including AHU, Destratification Fans, DCU, Chiller, UH, VRF, Boilers, FCs, Pumps, RTUs, Exhaust Fans, DCU)	824 KVA
Elevator	31.7 KVA

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
 Dedham, MA
 J#680
 L#85892/Page 3/August 25, 2023

Load Type	KVA
Exterior Lighting	2.0 KVA
Interior Lighting	51 KVA
General Power	206 KVA
Kitchen	75 KVA
EV Charging	72 KVA
Plumbing/Fire Protection (Pumps, etc.)	150 KVA
Total Connected Load	1411.7 KVA

11. Electrical power distribution equipment will be installed in the main electrical room and in the electrical closets. There is one main electric room that also contains a 2-hour rated emergency electric room for life safety electrical switchgear. The main electric room shall be located on the First Floor. We anticipate four remote electrical rooms.
 12. Electrical power distribution equipment in each electrical room or closet will support lighting, power, and HVAC loads in the associated areas.
 13. A typical electric room will serve interior lighting, HVAC equipment and receptacle loads in the Academic Core areas. Each closet will house a 250 Amp 120/208-volt power panel (double tub) via a 75KVA dry-type transformer, a 100 Amp 277/480 panel for lighting, and a 150Amp 120/208-volt mechanical panel via a 45KVA transformer.
 14. The panels in the Gym electrical closet will serve local HVAC equipment, lighting, receptacles and Gym equipment. The closet will house a 225 Amp 277/480 volt power distribution panel to feed a lighting 100 Amp, 277/480 volt 3 phase panel and a dry-type 75 kVA transformer with a double-tub 250 Amp, 120/208 volt 3 phase receptacle panel. Provide 20-amp, 120-volt circuits for the basketball backboards, shot clocks, scoreboards, divider curtains and 20Amp, 208 volt, 3 phase circuit and disconnect for a mat lifter. Provide control stations and wiring for all Gym equipment.
 15. A dry-type 75 kVA transformer and 250 Amp, 120/208 volt, 3 phase panels will be provided for the Cafeteria and Kitchen loads. The kitchen refrigeration equipment will be power fed from the standby power panel.
 16. Roof-mounted HVAC equipment will be power fed from the 400 Amp, 480-volt, 3 phase power panels located in the nearest second floor electrical closets.
 17. HVAC equipment serving data communication rooms, boiler plant equipment including boilers and pumps, a sewage pump station and an elevator will be supported by the standby generator power panels.
- B. Electrical Distribution System:

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 4/August 25, 2023

1. The service capacity will be sized for 2,000 Amperes with a 100% rated main breaker. The main buss will be sized at 2,500 Amperes and will have an available breaker space provision at the end of the switchboard to accommodate a future grid connected photovoltaic array. The switchboard will be furnished with a service entrance surge protection device (SPD) rated at 240 kA and a digital metering unit to monitor voltage, current, power factor, demand KW with a data communication port for interface with BMS. Main switchboard's short circuit rating will be rated for 65 KAIC.
2. New lighting and power panels will be provided to accommodate respective loads. The equipment will be located in dedicated rooms or closets.

C. Interior Lighting System:

1. The lighting design intends to provide a visual environment for the students and faculty that supports the educational activities within the building. The lighting system will be designed in compliance with the applicable Energy Code and be eligible for the Utility company rebate program.
2. All lighting fixtures will incorporate LED sources and electronic control gear/power supplies meeting the latest Design Lights Consortium (DLC) qualified products listing requirements and Rhode Island Energy incentive requirements (as applicable to lighting selections).
3. Interior lighting illumination levels will meet the IESNA recommended values for applicable activity type, and be in compliance with the IECC 2021 energy allowances and LEED control requirements.
4. Daylight harvesting through continuous dimming will be provided for all general lighting zones near daylight openings; maintained foot-candle levels will comply with associated LEED requirements.
5. Classroom lighting fixtures will consist of pendant mounted direct/indirect luminaries with LED lamps and electronic dimmable drivers. The fixtures will be pre-wired for continuous dimming control where natural daylight is available and for multi-level switching. Two daylight dimming zones will be provided in each classroom.
6. Office lighting fixtures will consist of recessed mounted direct LED luminaries and dimming drivers for continuous level dimming capability. Offices on the perimeter with windows will have daylight dimming controls similar to classrooms.

In general, lighting power density will be 30% less than current ASHRAE 90.1. The power density reduction relates to **LEED credit EAC2: Optimize Energy Performance.**

7. Lighting levels will be approximately 30 foot-candles in classrooms and offices. The daylight dimming foot-candle level will be in compliance with **LEED Credit EQC6: Interior Lighting.**
8. Gymnasium lighting will be adjustable linear indirect fixtures with impact-resistant lensing zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy sensors, daylight sensors, and keypads. Sensors and keypads will be impact resistant or provided with field-applied covers and wire guards.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 5/August 25, 2023

9. Corridor lighting will combine recessed direct linear slot and indirect linear cove fixtures zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy sensors, daylight sensors, and keypads. Lighting will generally be scheduled for "ON" during normal school hours of operation with occupancy control of full "ON" overriding unoccupied dimmed levels and scheduled to "OFF" after normal business hours or other pre-determined time with occupancy sensor and keypad override.
10. Cafeteria lighting will be shielded flood lighting from top of the atrium for general illumination with a combination of recessed direct linear slot and indirect linear cove fixtures zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy sensors, daylight sensors, and keypads. Lighting will be generally be scheduled for "ON" during normal school hours of operation with occupancy control of full "ON" overriding unoccupied dimmed levels and scheduled to "OFF" after normal business hours or other pre-determined time with occupancy sensor and keypad override.
11. Kitchen and Servery lighting will be NSF listed recessed 2'x2' lensed troffers zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy sensors and keypads.
12. Media Center lighting will be a combination of recessed direct linear slot and indirect linear cove fixtures zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy sensors, daylight sensors, and keypads
13. Single occupant and "gang" bathroom lighting will be a combination of recessed linear wash wallslot and recessed linear direct linear slot zoned for switching and dimming control via the NLCS on response from occupancy and daylight sensors.
14. Each area will be locally switched and designed for multi-level controls. Each Classroom, Office space, and Toilet room will have occupancy sensors to turn lights off when unoccupied. Manual switches will be provided in each space. Classrooms and offices will have manual dimming capacities.
15. Interior lighting illumination levels will meet the IES recommended values for applicable activity type, be in compliance with the IECC energy allowances, and LEED for Schools control requirements.

PROPOSED ILLUMINATION LEVELS

Location	Average Illumination Levels
Classrooms	30 FC
Science Labs	40 FC
Offices, Conference Rooms, Library	30 FC
Kitchen	50 FC
Gymnasium	50 FC
Cafeteria	30 FC
Corridors	20 FC
Utility and Storage Rooms	20 FC

Oakdale Elementary School
 Dedham, MA
 J#680
 L#85892/Page 6/August 25, 2023

D. Exterior Lighting System:

1. Site area lighting will be pole-mounted fixtures featuring full-cutoff optics in the parking area and roadways with switching and dimming control via the NLCS. Pole heights will generally be 16 feet on 2.5' concrete mounting bases.
2. Building perimeter lighting will be wall-mounted sconces featuring full-cutoff optics over exterior doors with switching and dimming control via the NLCS. Fixtures will be served from life safety source panels.

PROPOSED ILLUMINATION LEVELS

Location	Average Illumination Levels
Parking	2 FC
Roadways	1 FC
Walkways	2 FC
Building Entry	10 FC
Building Egress Points	5 FC
Outdoor Activity Areas	10 FC

E. Emergency Standby System:

1. One exterior 500 kW diesel emergency generators with sound attenuated enclosures and a 48-hour base tanks with alarms will be provided. Integral 200 kW resistive load banks will be provided for generator testing under load. Light fixtures and LED Exit signs will be installed to serve all egress areas such as Corridors, Intervening Spaces, Toilets, Stairs, and Exit discharge exterior doors. The Administration area lighting and nurses' area will be connected to the emergency generator.
2. The generator power system has been sized to support emergency (life safety) and optional standby building loads. The life safety branch of the emergency system will be provided with a manual transfer switch on the emergency line side of the transfer switch in compliance with NEC 700.3(F).
 - a. All Exit signs and emergency lighting in the areas listed below are fed by Life Safety Emergency Power (required by code):
 - Corridors
 - Electrical/Mechanical Rooms
 - Gymnasium, Locker Rooms
 - Cafeteria/Commons
 - Media Center
 - Lobbies
 - Administration areas
 - Health Suite/Nurses Office
 - Toilets

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 7/August 25, 2023

- Auditorium
 - Stage
 - Data rooms "Head End Room & IDF Closets"
 - Kitchen/Servery
 - Exterior Building mounted lights over doors required for egress lighting
 - Where required by code (egress areas)
- b. Fire Alarm System
- c. Optional Standby Equipment:
- Equipment listed below is fed by Optional Standby Emergency Power:
 - Heating Systems
 - Water Pumps
 - MDF and IDF Cooling units
 - Refrigeration (Kitchen/Nurse)
 - Strategically located receptacles in the administration area.
 - Equipment within the Head End and IDF rooms including (served by UPS):
 - Paging/Intercom System (MDF)
 - Security System (IDF/MDF)
 - Telephone System (MDF)
 - Network electronics (IDF/MDF)
 - Servers (MDF)
 - Clock system (MDF)
 - Building Management System (MDF)
- d. Standby power loads:
- Heating system with associated pumps and controls
 - Telephone/data closets and associated A/C equipment
 - Communication systems (telephone and public address systems)
 - Building DDC system control panels
 - Kitchen refrigeration equipment
 - Lighting and power in the Nurse/Medical area
 - Security system equipment
- F. Metering:
1. Measurement devices shall be installed to monitor the electrical energy use for each of the following separately:
 - a. Total electrical energy

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 8/August 25, 2023

- b. Sub-metering in accordance with ASHRAE 90.1 para. 8.4.3.

Recording and Reporting:

- c. The electrical energy usage for all loads listed above shall be recorded a minimum of every 15 minutes and reported at least hourly, daily, monthly, and annually. The system shall be capable of maintaining all data collected for a minimum of 36 months.

G. Site Lighting System: **LEED Credit SSC6: Light Pollution Reduction**

1. Fixtures for area lighting will be pole mounted cut-off 'LED' luminaries in the parking area and roadways. Pole heights will be 20 feet. The exterior lighting will be connected to the automatic lighting control system for photocell "ON" and timed "OFF" operation. The site lighting fixtures will be dark sky compliant. The illumination level will be 0.5fc for parking areas in accordance with the Illuminating Engineering Society.
2. Building perimeter will be 'LED' wall mounted cut-off fixtures over exterior doors for Exit discharge.

H. Wiring Devices:

1. Each classroom will have a minimum of (2) duplex receptacles per teaching wall and (2) double duplex receptacles on dedicated circuits at classroom computer workstations. The teacher's workstation will have a double duplex receptacle also on a dedicated circuit.
2. Office areas will generally have (1) duplex outlet per wall. At each workstation a double duplex receptacle will be provided.
3. Corridors will have a cleaning receptacle at approximately 25–40-foot intervals.
4. Exterior weatherproof receptacles with lockable in-use enclosures will be installed at exterior doors.
5. A system of computer grade panelboards with double neutrals and surge protective devices will be provided for receptacle circuits.
6. All receptacles will be of the tamper resistant type.

I. Fire Alarm System:

1. A fire alarm and detection with mass notification system will be provided with 60 hours battery back-up standby, 15 minutes of alarm. The system will be of the addressable type where each device will be identified at the control panel and remote annunciator by device type and location to facilitate search for origin of alarms.
2. Smoke detectors will be provided in open areas, corridors, stairwells and other egress ways.
3. The sprinkler system will be supervised for water flow and tampering with valves.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 9/August 25, 2023

4. Speaker/strobes with white and amber colored strobes will be provided in egress ways, classrooms, assembly spaces, open areas, and other large spaces. Strobe only units will be provided in single toilets and conference rooms. Amber strobes will be initiated during a mass notification event in which a different district message will be played over the speakers.
 5. The system will be remotely connected to automatically report alarms to the Fire Department via an approved method by the Fire Department.
- J. Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS):
1. One (1) 30 KW, 3-phase centralized UPS systems will be provided with seven minutes of battery back-up.
 2. The system will provide conditioned power to sensitive electronic loads, telecommunication systems, bridge over power interruptions of short duration and allow an orderly shutdown of servers and communication systems during a prolonged power outage.
 3. The UPS system will also be connected to the stand-by generator.
- K. Level 2 AC Dual Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment (EVSE):
1. Conduit and wiring provisions will be provided to 10% of parking spots for future EV charging stations.
- L. Renewable Energy System Provisions:
1. Electrical provisions will be made for a ballasted roof mounted renewable energy system consisting of a grid connected Photovoltaic PV System intended to reduce the facilities demand for power.
- M. Two-Way Communications System:
1. A Two-Way Communications System will be provided at the elevator lobbies that do not have grade access.
- N. Distribution Antennae System (DAS):
1. A public safety radio distributed antenna system (DAS) which consists of bi-directional amplifiers (BDA), donor antennas, coverage antennas, coax cable, coax connectors, splitters, combiners, and couplers. These devices will be used as part of a system for in-building public safety 2-way radio system communication.
- O. Security and Communications System Provisions:
1. Electrical Contractor will provide Integrated Security System and Technology System provisions including outlet boxes, empty raceways, 120-volt power, cable trays, and grounding.
5. TESTING REQUIREMENTS

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85892/Page 10/August 25, 2023

- A. The Electrical Contractor shall provide testing of the following systems with the Owner and Owner's Representative present:
- Lighting and power panels for correct phase balance.
 - Emergency generator system.
 - Lighting control system (interior and exterior).
 - Fire alarm system.
 - Two-way communication system.
 - Distributed Antennae system.
- B. Testing reports shall be submitted to the Engineer for review and approval before providing them to the Owner.

6. OPERATION MANUALS AND MAINTENANCE MANUALS

When the project is completed, the Electrical Contractor shall provide operation and maintenance manuals to the Owner.

7. RECORD DRAWINGS AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS

When the project is completed, an as-built set of drawings, showing all lighting and power requirements from contract and addendum items, will be provided to the Owner.

8. COMMISSIONING

The project shall be commissioned per Commissioning Section of the specifications.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85893/Page 1/August 25, 2023

TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

NARRATIVE REPORT

The following is the Technology System narrative, which defines the scope of work and capacities of the Communications system infrastructure as well as the Basis of Design.

1. CODES

- A. All work installed under Section 270000 shall comply with the Massachusetts Building Code and all local, county, and federal codes, laws, statues, and authorities having jurisdiction.

2. DESIGN INTENT

- A. All work is new and consists of furnishing all materials, equipment, labor, transportation, facilities, and all operations and adjustments required for the complete and operating installation of the Technology work and all items incidental thereto, including commissioning and testing.

3. TECHNOLOGY

- A. The data system infrastructure will consist of fiber optic backbone cabling horizontal wiring will consist of Category 6A UTP Plenum rated cabling for both data and telephone systems for gigabit connectivity. The telephone infrastructure will accommodate VOIP based voice systems.
- B. Each classroom will have 2 data outlets for student computers. Two data, one voice with video and audio connections to an LCD monitor will be provided at teacher's station with interconnectivity to a interactive LCD touch screen monitor. A wall phone outlet with 2-way ceiling speaker will be provided for communications with administration. Wireless access points will be provided in all classrooms and other spaces and consist of (2) CAT6A cables.
- C. A central paging system will be provided and integrated with the telephone system.
- D. A wireless GPS/LAN based master clock system will be provided with 120V wireless remote clocks that act as transceivers.
- E. The Main Distribution Frame (MDF) will contain all core network switching and IP voice switch. Intermediate Distribution Frames (IDFs) will serve each floor/wing of the school. A fiber optic backbone will be provided from each IDF to MDF. The backbone will be designed for 10 Gbps Ethernet.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85893/Page 2/August 25, 2023

- F. Two-way communication call boxes will be provided adjacent to each elevator that is above or below grade level. The base station will be located at a control point on the first floor.

4. TESTING REQUIREMENTS

- A. The Technology Contractor shall provide testing of the following systems with the Owner and Owner's Representative present:
- Telephone and data cabling
 - Fiber optic backbone cabling
 - Paging system
 - Wireless clock system
 - A/V wiring for classrooms
- B. Testing reports shall be submitted to the Engineer for review and approval before providing to the Owner.

5. OPERATION MANUALS AND MAINTENANCE MANUALS:

- A. When the project is completed, the Technology Contractor shall provide operation and maintenance manuals to the Owner.

6. RECORD DRAWINGS AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS:

- A. When the project is completed, an as-built set of drawings, showing all tel/data requirements from contract and addendum items, will be provided to the Owner.

7. COMMISSIONING

- A. The project shall be commissioned per Section 019113 of the specifications.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85894/Page 1/August 25, 2023

SECURITY SYSTEMS

NARRATIVE REPORT

The following is the Security Systems narrative, which defines the scope of work and capacities of the Integrated electronic security system (IESS), as well as, the Basis of Design.

1. CODES

- A. All work installed under Section 280000 shall comply with the Massachusetts State Building Code and all local, county, and federal codes, laws, statutes, and authorities having jurisdiction.

2. DESIGN INTENT

- A. The work of Section 280000 is as described in this Narrative. All work is new and consists of furnishing all materials, equipment, labor, transportation, facilities, and all operations and adjustments required for the complete and operating installation of the IESS work and all items incidental thereto, including commissioning and testing.

3. MAIN ENTRY SEQUENCE OF OPERATIONS

- A. The main entry is controlled by the electronic access control system to allow entry of staff via card access with a credential, scheduled unlocking for morning student arrival and remote control and communications via the security office. The main entry is a covered by CCTV video, and contains a video intercom system for visitor access.

Sequences:

Morning Student arrival;

The main vestibule both inner and outer will automatically unlock at a pre-determined time programmed into the access control system to allow supervised student arrival into the school. CCTV cameras will be recording and school staff will be supervising this process. The doors will then automatically lock at a predetermined time once the students have completed the arrival process and school begins.

During School hours (Main entry doors both inner vestibule and outer vestibule will be locked)

Credentialed staff; School Staff will be provided with a card or fob with credentials to allow for electronically unlocking access control doors. A staff member entering the main entry will present their card/fob to the exterior proximity reader to unlock the outer vestibule door. They will then present their card/fob again to the interior card reader to unlock the inner vestibule door. At this point they will have access to the building.

Visitor; A visitor will utilize the video intercom to communicate with school staff in the security office. The staff member in the security office will then be able to unlock the outer vestibule door to allow the visitor into the vestibule. Once in the vestibule they can communicate directly through glazing with talking holes and sign the visitor in and determine what the next action is where they can either unlock the door to the administration area or unlock the inner vestibule door to allow access to the school.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85894/Page 2/August 25, 2023

4. SYSTEM INTEGRATION

- A. Interface and Integration between Access Control, CCTV, Intrusion Alarm, Public Address, Telephone System and Mass notification system.
1. Access Control System Keypads, Readers, etc. shall provide ability to Arm and Disarm the entire Intrusion Alarm System or specific zones.
 2. Access Control System Keypads, Readers, etc. shall provide ability to Arm and Disarm any individual areas in the Intrusion Alarm System.
 3. Intrusion Alarm System devices (i.e. motion sensors, door contacts, glass break detectors, etc.) shall be graphically displayed on the Access Controls System's browser based Graphical Designer software for display on associated PC Workstation.
 4. Arm, Disarm & Alarm status condition of the Intrusion Alarm System devices (i.e. motion sensors, door contacts, glass break detectors, etc.), shall be graphically displayed on the Access Controls System's built-in Graphical Designer software for display on associated PC Workstation.
 5. When Intrusion Alarm System devices (i.e. motion sensors, door contacts, glass break detectors, etc.) are in alarm, provide ability to turn-on or go to full motion video, the CCTV Camera Recorder in associated area.
 6. Activate alarm over the mass notification speakers when Intrusion Alarm System is in alarm by providing an output signal to the mass notification system.
 7. When Access Control System Keypads, Readers, etc. are used, provide ability to turn-on or go to full motion video, the associated CCTV Camera Recorder.
 8. When door release is detected on entry or exit, provide ability to turn-on or go to full motion video, the associated CCTV Camera Recorder.
 9. CCTV Camera devices and locations shall be graphically displayed on the Access Controls System's built-in Graphical Designer software for display on associated PC Workstation.
 10. When exterior door intercom station is activated, provide ability to turn-on or go to full motion video, the associated CCTV Camera Recorder.
 11. Access Control System Keypads, Readers, Door Lock, etc.. locations shall be graphically displayed on the Access Controls System's built-in Graphical Designer software for display on associated PC Workstation.
 12. Special Entry: If a person needs a one-time entry to the facility for a particular time and day, a Access Control Keypad entry code number can be given to that person that will only work for the specific time frame; in addition, the code can automatically disarm associated intrusion alarm zone or zones in the system.
 13. Emergency Codes can be used via Access Control System Keypad Entry, with capabilities to automatically notify authorities of a emergency situation, a hostage type entry, etc.
 14. Photo ID Bagging Capabilities Built-in to Access Control System, allowing owners the capability to develop their own Photo ID Badges.
 15. Access Control Systems can interface with LAN's & WAN's to provide seamlessly integrated solutions when additional facilities add access control solutions.
 16. When Exterior Door Intercom Stations are properly interfaced to the Telephone System Display Telephones for unique call-in ID and two-way communications, and the telephone system provides output closures (one for each controlled door) when "door release codes" are entered via the telephone's keypad, provide ability to interface these door release code closures to Access Control System for release of each associated door.
 17. The CCTV system shall provide "Recording-on-Motion" feature for every camera in the CCTV System. Only recording when the system detects motion in the view of each camera.
 18. Interface with fire alarm and mass notification system for lock down/shelter in place events.
 19. interfacing to Elevator Door Access.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85894/Page 3/August 25, 2023

3. CCTV

- A. A Closed Circuit TV system is proprietary by exacqVision and will consist of computer servers with image software, computer monitors, and IP based closed circuit TV cameras. The head end server will be located in the head end (MDF) room and will be rack mounted. The system can be accessed from any PC within the facility or externally via an IP address. Each camera can be viewed independently. The network video recorders (SAN) will record all cameras and store this information for 45 days at 30 images per second (virtual real time).
- B. The location of the exterior cameras is generally on the building perimeter which consist of multiple 360 degree panoramic type cameras mounted to the building corners. At each entry with access control a fixed single lens camera will be mounted in the doors vicinity to be able to identify the person entering/exiting the door. The exterior cameras are fixed type. There will be two pole mounted cameras one at each entrance.
- C. The location of interior cameras is generally in public spaces and assembly use spaces. All corridors, stairwells, and general assembly spaces will be covered with CCTV cameras.
- D. The system will fully integrate with the access control system to allow viewing of events from a single alarm viewer. Camera images and recorded video will be linked to the access system to allow retrieval of video that is associated with an event.
- E. The VMS system will be integrated with the access control system. Cameras will be positioned to view general activity within the designated field of view. Large format LCD monitor displays, that allow uninterrupted viewing of live video feeds from the VMS, will be placed in the Administrative Office, Principals Office and Assistant Principals Office. Network Video Recorders (NVR) will be placed in the Main Distribution Frame (MDF) closet to ensure all live and recorded video feeds are controlled can be viewed by authorized viewers. Access to the VMS software will be accessible to Hingham's emergency response personnel. Currently, their main server is located at the Hingham High School.

4. INTRUSION SYSTEM

- A. An intrusion system is proprietary by Digital Monitoring Products and will consist of security panel, keypads, motion detectors and door contacts. The system is addressable which means that each device will be identified when an alarm occurs. The system is designed so that each perimeter classroom with grade access will have dual tech sensors along the exterior wall and corridors, door contacts at each exterior door.
- B. The system will include a digital transmitter to summons the central station in the event of an alarm condition.
- C. The intrusion system will be connected to the automated lighting control system to automatically turn on lighting upon an alarm.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85894/Page 4/August 25, 2023

5. CARD ACCESS

- A. A card access system includes a card access controller, door controllers and proximity readers/keypads. Proximity readers will be located at various locations. Each proximity reader will have a distinctive code to identify the user and a log will be kept in memory. The log within the panel can be accessed through a computer. In general access control door locations will be at all building entry points and within the building to partition assembly space use from classroom wings.
- B. The alarm condition will also initiate real time recording on the Integrated CCTV System. The system may be programmed with graphic maps allowing the end-user to quickly identify alarm conditions and lock/unlock doors.
- C. The system is modular and may be easily expanded to accommodate any additional devices.
- D. Access control identification cards are issued by school district personnel; all card readers will be compatible with HID cards. ACS locations will include all primary and secondary exterior access doors, Administrative Suite entrances, stairwells and any areas containing critical assets. System software will be configured and programmed to meet districts requirements for access control. In addition, the system will be configured to allow for easy activation of lockdown.

6. INTERCOM SYSTEM

- A. An Intercom System (IS) allows staff to monitor and limit access to the school to only those individuals who are authorized to enter the school. The IS will be equipped with live video and capable of direct two-way communication. The IS will be designed to be capable of momentarily unlocking designated door stations individually. The IS will also provide an output to the VMS to allow for recording of video from the intercom door station(s).
- B. Through this system, office personnel can speak with, and view anyone at the door prior to releasing the door through the master unit. The IS will be located at the main entrance for visitors and the receiving/cafeteria entrance.
- C. The IS for the main entrance will place a master unit in the Administrative Office, Principals Office and Assistant Principals Office. The IS for the receiving/cafeteria entrance will place the master unit in an secure area that is accessible to cafeteria staff so as to ensure deliveries are not delayed.

7. ALTERNATE:

- A. A proprietary cloud based Verkada system for access control, video surveillance and visitor management.

8. OPERATION MANUALS AND MAINTENANCE MANUALS

- A. When the project is completed, the Security Contractor shall provide operation and maintenance manuals to the Owner.

9. RECORD DRAWINGS AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS

- A. When the project is completed, an as-built set of drawings, showing all lighting and power requirements from contract and addendum items, will be provided to the Owner.

GGD Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA
J#680
L#85894/Page 5/August 25, 2023

10. COMMISSIONING

- A. The project shall be commissioned per Commissioning Sections 019113 of the specifications.

3.7 Total Project Budget and Cost Estimate

UPDATE - The proposed construction budget for the preferred new construction option D is \$87.1 million. The team estimates a total additional cost of \$26.1 million for all the soft costs including architect fees, OPM fees, permitting fees, FF&E, etc. which brings the total project budget to \$113.2 million without accounting for MSBA reimbursement. It is important to note that at this time the SBRC had previously decided to approve demolition of the existing 1902 building and that is still the decision at this time. At this early stage we do know that some items categorically are likely ineligible or will exceed the cost caps on eligibility. These include site costs, building costs, FF&E, and Technology costs. The Town of Dedham maintains a healthy balance sheet and its current debt load is well within the recommended level.

The updated PSR Cost Estimate dated 4/18/24 follows.

Dedham Elementary School Project

PSR Cost Estimate

4/30/24



Executive Summary

Option Descriptions

Options have been developed for Base Repair, Add / Reno, and New Construction for each of the 3 enrollment options approved by the MSBA, and located on the corresponding 3 sites currently home to the existing Oakdale School, Riverdale School, and Greenlodge School.

Please see attached matrix describing all 13 Options

Code Upgrade / Base Repair Options O-BR, R-BR, and G-BR

Required by the MSBA for comparison purposes, these 3 estimates include scope upgrades to meet current codes. This would require the students to move into temporary swing space, and would not accommodate any of the proposed enrollments. They would also not meet the current MSBA space standards or approved program, so would likely not be eligible for MSBA reimbursement.

Add / Reno Options

Option O-O-A/R

Phase 1) Move Oakdale students to swing space

Phase 2) Demolish Existing 1950s and 1970 wings, renovate existing 1902 building, build new additions to the north and south of the 1902 building, complete site work.

Options O-R-A/R and O-G-A/R

Phase 1) Build new addition to North of existing building. Move existing Oakdale Students into the new wing

Phase 2) Demolish Existing 1950s and 1970 wings, renovate existing 1902 building, Build new addition to the south of the 1902 building

Phase 3) Move Riverdale or Greenlodge students into the new school

Options R-R-A/R and G-G-A/R

Phase 1) Move students to swing space

Phase 2) Renovate existing building, build new additions, complete site work.

New Construction Options O-O-N, O-R-N, O-G-N, R-R-N, G-G-N,

Phase 1) New Construction on current playfields. Students move into new school with temporary playspace

Phase 2) Demolish existing building and build new open play space.

Note: All add / reno and new construction cost estimates include scope necessary to achieve the MSBA's updated sustainability prerequisites and additional reimbursement percentage points. This affects all options regardless of site selection.



PM&C LLC
20 Downer Avenue, Suite 5
Hingham, MA 02043
(T) 781-740-8007
(F) 781-740-1012

PSR Submission Estimate

Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

Prepared for:

Jonathan Levi Architects

April 18, 2024



Oakdale Elementary School

18-Apr-24

Dedham, MA

PSR Submission Estimate

INTRODUCTION

NOTE: The costs for the various PSR Options indicated above are intended to be an analysis of the relative costs between options and NOT a prediction of the actual final cost of any individual option. Major variables such as geotechnical, site grading, structural system and final MEP systems have yet to be designed and costs will vary significantly from the benchmark cost estimating included as part of this PSR cost analysis. The costs outlined in this report should not be represented as the FINAL construction budget.

This PSR Design Submission cost estimate was produced from narratives and outline drawings received July 13th, 2023 prepared by Jonathan Levi Architects and their design team.

This estimate includes all direct construction costs, construction managers overhead and profit and design contingency. Cost escalation assumes start dates indicated.

Bidding conditions are expected to be public bidding under 149a of the Massachusetts General Laws to pre-qualified construction managers, and pre-qualified sub-contractors, open specifications for materials and manufacturers.

The estimate is based on prevailing wage rates for construction in this market and represents a reasonable opinion of cost. It is not a prediction of the successful bid from a contractor as bids will vary due to fluctuating market conditions, errors and omissions, proprietary specifications, lack or surplus of bidders, perception of risk, etc. Consequently the estimate is expected to fall within the range of bids from a number of competitive contractors or subcontractors, however we do not warrant that bids or negotiated prices will not vary from the final construction cost estimate.

ITEMS NOT CONSIDERED IN THIS ESTIMATE

Items not included in this estimate are:

- All professional fees and insurance
- Building Permit costs
- Removal of contaminated soils
- Rock excavation
- Land acquisition, feasibility, and financing costs
- All Furnishings, Fixtures and Equipment
- Items identified in the design as Not In Contract (NIC)
- Items identified in the design as by others
- Owner supplied and/or installed items (e.g. draperies, furniture and equipment)
- Utility company back charges, including work required off-site
- Work to City streets and sidewalks, (except as noted in this estimate)



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

OPTION	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
O-BR - Oakdale Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option	53,524	\$753.14	\$40,310,803
OPTION O-O-N - OAKDALE ONLY - OPTION D	91,100	\$955.97	\$87,089,285
OPTION O-O-A/R - OAKDALE ONLY ADDITION/PARTIAL RENOVATION	95,100	\$958.84	\$91,185,629
OPTION O-R-N - OAKDALE RIVERDALE	109,100	\$919.15	\$100,279,264
OPTION O-R-A/R - OAKDALE RIVERDALE	113,100	\$889.30	\$100,580,316
OPTION O-G-N OAKDALE GREENLODGE NEW	126,400	\$886.78	\$112,088,872
OPTION O-G-A/R OAKDALE GREENLODGE ADDITION/RENOVATION	130,400	\$855.90	\$111,609,005
OPTION R-BR Riverdale Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option	40,500	\$799.81	\$32,392,357
OPTION R-R-N RIVERDALE SITE - OAKDALE RIVERDALE NEW	109,100	\$904.53	\$98,684,355
OPTION R-R-A/R RIVERDALE SITE - OAKDALE RIVERDALE ADD/RENO	112,100	\$863.13	\$96,757,168
OPTION G-BR Greenlodge Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option	38,950	\$811.77	\$31,618,391
OPTION G-G-N GREENLODGE SITE - OAKDALE GREENLODGE NEW	126,400	\$913.84	\$115,509,471
OPTION G-G-A/R OAKDALE GREENLODGE SITE - OAKDALE ADD/RENO	129,400	\$878.98	\$113,740,334
ALTERNATE: Add to Each Option Above for Artificial Turf Field ILO Grass w/ Irrigation		ADD	\$570,000

Note: Updated Sustainability Scope:

Additional scope has been added to target the MSBA's new incentives linked to the new energy code for a full 4% additional funding of eligible costs, which were released after the PDP estimates. These include geothermal, triple, glazed windows, additional insulation, etc. It should be noted that this premium would be added to all PDP estimates, regardless of site selection.

Value of Updated Sustainability Scope included in the PSR costs above

\$6,000,000



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
O-BR - Oakdale Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option				
SELECTIVE REPAIR	Apr-26	53,524	\$338.48	\$18,116,703
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITework - Allowance				\$950,000
SUB-TOTAL		53,524	\$389.44	\$20,844,403
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$2,501,328
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$2,188,662
SUB-TOTAL				\$25,534,393
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS		48	MTHS	\$7,680,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$1,021,376
PHASING PREMIUM INCLUDING 2ND SHIFT IN SUMMER MTHS	4.5%			\$1,149,048
BONDS	0.9%			\$229,810
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$280,878
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$35,895,505
CM FEE	2.5%			\$897,388
GMP Contingency	2.0%			\$717,910
ALLOWANCE FOR MODULAR SWING SPACE AND ASSOCIATED SITework		8	Classrooms	\$2,800,000
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		53,524	\$753.14	\$40,310,803



PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-O-N - OAKDALE ONLY - OPTION D				
NEW CONSTRUCTION - 360 STUDENTS				
NEW BUILDING	Apr-26	91,100	\$540.00	\$49,194,000
DEMOLITION		53,524	\$10.00	\$535,240
1902 BUILDING		27,456	\$10.00	\$274,560
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITework				\$8,820,315
SUB-TOTAL		91,100	\$665.22	\$60,601,815
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$7,272,218
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$6,363,191
SUB-TOTAL				\$74,237,224
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Building	20	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,200,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Demo + Site	14	MTHS	\$100,000	\$1,400,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,227,117
BONDS	0.9%			\$668,135
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$816,609
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$82,549,085
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,063,727
GMP Contingency	3.0%			\$2,476,473
TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS				NR
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		91,100	\$955.97	\$87,089,285



PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-O-A/R - OAKDALE ONLY ADDITION/PARTIAL RENOVATION				
ADDITION + RENOVATION - 360 STUDENTS				
NEW ADDITION	Apr-26	66,000	\$555.00	\$36,630,000
RENOVATION		29,100	\$475.00	\$13,822,500
PARTIAL DEMOLITION		24,900	\$15.00	\$373,500
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITWORK				\$8,820,315
SUB-TOTAL		95,100	\$645.89	\$61,424,015
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$7,370,882
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$6,449,522
SUB-TOTAL				\$75,244,419
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS		36	MTHS	\$160,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,257,333
PHASING PREMIUM	2.0%			\$1,665,235
BONDS	0.9%			\$677,200
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$827,689
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$86,431,876
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,160,797
GMP Contingency	3.0%			\$2,592,956
TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS				NR
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		95,100	\$958.84	\$91,185,629



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-R-N - OAKDALE RIVERDALE				
NEW CONSTRUCTION - 360 STUDENTS				
NEW BUILDING	Apr-26	109,100	\$540.00	\$58,914,000
DEMOLITION		53,524	\$10.00	\$535,240
1902 BUILDING		27,456	\$10.00	\$274,560
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITework				\$8,820,315
SUB-TOTAL		109,100	\$644.56	\$70,321,815
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$8,438,618
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$7,383,791
SUB-TOTAL				\$86,144,224
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Building	20	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,200,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Demo + Site	14	MTHS	\$100,000	\$1,400,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,584,327
BONDS	0.9%			\$775,298
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$947,586
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$95,051,435
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,376,286
GMP Contingency	3.0%			\$2,851,543
TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS				NR
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		109,100	\$919.15	\$100,279,264



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-R-A/R - OAKDALE RIVERDALE				
ADDITION + RENOVATION - 560 STUDENTS				
NEW ADDITION	Apr-26	84,000	\$540.00	\$45,360,000
RENOVATION		29,100	\$475.00	\$13,822,500
DEMOLITION		53,524	\$10.00	\$535,240
1902 BUILDING		27,456	\$10.00	\$274,560
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITWORK				\$8,820,315
SUB-TOTAL		113,100	\$624.14	\$70,590,315
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$8,470,838
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$7,411,983
SUB-TOTAL				\$86,473,136
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Building	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - Demo + Site	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,594,194
BONDS	0.9%			\$778,258
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$951,204
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$95,336,792
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,383,420
GMP Contingency	3.0%			\$2,860,104
TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS				NR
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		113,100	\$889.30	\$100,580,316



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-G-N OAKDALE GREENLODGE NEW				
NEW CONSTRUCTION - 665 STUDENTS				
NEW SCHOOL	Apr-26	126,400	\$540.00	\$68,256,000
DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING		54,000	\$10.00	\$540,000
REMOVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				\$1,777,700
SITework				\$9,100,000
SUBTOTAL TRADE COSTS BUILDING and SITework		126,400	\$630.33	\$79,673,700
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$9,560,844
ESCALATION	10.5%			\$8,365,739
PHASING & LOGISTICS				Not Required
SUBTOTAL with CONTINGENCIES		126,400	\$772.15	\$97,600,283
GENERAL CONDITIONS - BUILDING	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - DEMO + SITework	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,928,008
BONDS	1.00%			\$976,003
INSURANCE	1.10%			\$1,166,487
PERMIT				By Owner
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,680,270
GMP CONTINGENCY	2.0%			\$2,197,821
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		126,400	\$886.78	\$112,088,872



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION O-G-A/R OAKDALE GREENLODGE ADDITION/RENOVATION				
ADDITION + RENOVATION - 665 STUDENTS				
NEW ADDITION	Apr-26	101,300	\$540.00	\$54,702,000
RENOVATION		29,100	\$475.00	\$13,822,500
PARTIAL DEMOLITION		24,424	\$15.00	\$366,360
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,777,700
SITWORK				\$5,516,320
SUB-TOTAL		130,400	\$584.24	\$76,184,880
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$9,142,186
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$7,999,412
SUB-TOTAL				\$93,326,478
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS		36	MTHS	\$160,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	3.0%			\$2,799,794
PHASING PREMIUM	2.0%			\$2,037,725
BONDS	0.9%			\$839,938
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$1,026,591
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$105,790,526
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,644,763
GMP Contingency	3.0%			\$3,173,716
TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS				NR
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		130,400	\$855.90	\$111,609,005



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION R-BR Riverdale Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option				
SELECTIVE REPAIR	Apr-26	40,500	\$320.00	\$12,960,000
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,336,500
SITWORK - Allowance				\$950,000
SUB-TOTAL		40,500	\$376.46	\$15,246,500
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$1,829,580
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$1,600,883
SUB-TOTAL				\$18,676,963
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS		48	MTHS	\$160,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$747,079
PHASING PREMIUM INCLUDING 2ND SHIFT IN SUMMER MTHS	4.5%			\$840,463
BONDS	0.9%			\$168,093
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$205,447
PERMIT				WAIVED
SUB-TOTAL				\$28,318,045
CM FEE	2.5%			\$707,951
GMP Contingency	2.0%			\$566,361
ALLOWANCE FOR MODULAR SWING SPACE AND ASSOCIATED SITWORK		8	Classrooms	\$2,800,000
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		40,500	\$799.81	\$32,392,357



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION R-R-N RIVERDALE SITE - OAKDALE RIVERDALE NEW				
NEW CONSTRUCTION - 560 STUDENTS				
NEW BUILDING	Apr-26	109,100	\$540.00	\$58,914,000
DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING		40,500	\$10.00	\$405,000
REMOVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				\$1,336,500
SITework				\$8,400,000
SUBTOTAL TRADE COSTS BUILDING and SITEWORK		109,100	\$632.96	\$69,055,500
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$8,286,660
ESCALATION	10.5%			\$7,250,828
PHASING & LOGISTICS				Not Required
SUBTOTAL with CONTINGENCIES		109,100	\$775.37	\$84,592,988
GENERAL CONDITIONS - BUILDING	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - DEMO + SITEWORK	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$3,383,720
BONDS	1.00%			\$845,930
INSURANCE	1.10%			\$1,026,989
PERMIT				By Owner
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,359,741
GMP CONTINGENCY	2.0%			\$1,934,987
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		109,100	\$904.53	\$98,684,355



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION R-R-A/R RIVERDALE SITE - OAKDALE RIVERDALE ADD/RENO				
ADDITION + RENOVATION - 560 STUDENTS				
NEW ADDITION	Apr-26	71,600	\$540.00	\$38,664,000
RENOVATION		40,500	\$475.00	\$19,237,500
DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING				
REMOVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				\$1,336,500
SITework				\$8,400,000
SUBTOTAL TRADE COSTS BUILDING and SITEWORK		112,100	\$603.37	\$67,638,000
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$8,116,560
ESCALATION	10.5%			\$7,101,990
PHASING & LOGISTICS				Not Required
SUBTOTAL with CONTINGENCIES		112,100	\$739.13	\$82,856,550
GENERAL CONDITIONS - BUILDING	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - DEMO + SITEWORK	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$3,314,262
BONDS	1.00%			\$828,566
INSURANCE	1.10%			\$1,006,933
PERMIT				By Owner
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,313,658
GMP CONTINGENCY	2.0%			\$1,897,199
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		112,100	\$863.13	\$96,757,168



PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION G-BR Greenlodge Code Upgrade/ Base Repair Option				
SELECTIVE REPAIR	Apr-26	38,950	\$320.00	\$12,464,000
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL ABATEMENT				\$1,285,350
SITework - Allowance				\$950,000
SUB-TOTAL		38,950	\$377.39	\$14,699,350
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$1,763,922
ESCALATION	10.50%			\$1,543,432
SUB-TOTAL				\$18,006,704
NON TRADES SUB BONDS				Included In Rates
GENERAL CONDITIONS		48	MTHS	\$160,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$7,680,000
PHASING PREMIUM INCLUDING 2ND SHIFT IN SUMMER MTHS	4.5%			\$720,268
BONDS	0.9%			\$810,302
GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE	1.1%			\$162,060
PERMIT				\$198,074
SUB-TOTAL				WAIVED
				\$27,577,408
CM FEE	2.5%			\$689,435
GMP Contingency	2.0%			\$551,548
ALLOWANCE FOR MODULAR SWING SPACE AND ASSOCIATED SITework		8	Classrooms	\$2,800,000
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		38,950	\$811.77	\$31,618,391



Oakdale Elementary School
Dedham, MA

18-Apr-24

PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION G-G-N GREENLODGE SITE - OAKDALE GREENLODGE NEW				
NEW CONSTRUCTION - 665 STUDENTS				
NEW SCHOOL	Apr-26	126,400	\$540.00	\$68,256,000
DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING		38,950	\$10.00	\$389,500
REMOVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				\$1,285,350
SITWORK				\$9,500,000
SITWORK Premiums for grading + ledge				\$2,000,000
SUBTOTAL TRADE COSTS BUILDING and SITWORK		126,400	\$644.23	\$81,430,850
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$9,771,702
ESCALATION	10.5%			\$8,550,239
PHASING & LOGISTICS				Not Required
SUBTOTAL with CONTINGENCIES		126,400	\$789.18	\$99,752,791
GENERAL CONDITIONS - BUILDING	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - DEMO + SITWORK	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$3,990,112
BONDS	1.00%			\$997,528
INSURANCE	1.10%			\$1,202,085
PERMIT				By Owner
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,762,063
GMP CONTINGENCY	2.0%			\$2,264,892
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		126,400	\$913.84	\$115,509,471



PSR Submission Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Gross Floor Area	\$/sf	Estimated Construction Cost
OPTION G-G-A/R OAKDALE GREENLODGE SITE - OAKDALE ADD/RENO				
ADDITION + RENOVATION - 665 STUDENTS				
NEW ADDITION	Apr-26	90,450	\$540.00	\$48,843,000
RENOVATION		38,950	\$475.00	\$18,501,250
DEMOLISH EXISTING BUILDING				
REMOVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				\$1,285,350
SITWORK				\$9,500,000
SITWORK Premiums for grading + ledge				\$2,000,000
SUBTOTAL TRADE COSTS BUILDING and SITWORK		129,400	\$619.24	\$80,129,600
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	12.0%			\$9,615,552
ESCALATION	10.5%			\$8,413,608
PHASING & LOGISTICS				Not Required
SUBTOTAL with CONTINGENCIES		129,400	\$758.57	\$98,158,760
GENERAL CONDITIONS - BUILDING	24	MTHS	\$160,000	\$3,840,000
GENERAL CONDITIONS - DEMO + SITWORK	7	MTHS	\$100,000	\$700,000
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	4.0%			\$3,926,350
BONDS	1.00%			\$981,588
INSURANCE	1.10%			\$1,183,674
PERMIT				By Owner
CM FEE	2.5%			\$2,719,759
GMP CONTINGENCY	2.0%			\$2,230,203
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		129,400	\$878.98	\$113,740,334

3.8 Permitting Requirements

Dedham Zoning Board of Appeals

The team anticipates having to bring the project to the Zoning Board of Appeals for review of the overall building height which exceeds the current Town bylaws. The designer will start the ZBA process during the Design Development phase and all feedback will be incorporated into the plans as they progress.

Dedham Planning Board

The SBRC has already taken the first steps of introducing the proposed project to the Planning Board by attending multiple meetings and incorporating some of the feedback into the design plans. The project team will coordinate closely with the planning board on the issues of traffic, parking, landscaping, and lighting. The project will be formally presented to the Planning Board for review during the Design Development phase and all feedback will be incorporated into the developing plans as appropriate.

Dedham Historic Commission

It has been determined that the existing building does not fall on any historic registers and will not require any special permitting through the historic commission.

Dedham Public Works

The project team will review the site plans with the Department of Public works for conformance with Town standards. The project may require a permit through the DPW for a Stormwater Permit as well as Street Opening Permits as required during construction. These will be the responsibility of the contractor. The team has also been working with the Dedham DPW to receive feedback on the traffic study and to review Capital Improvements scheduled for the streets surrounding the existing Oakdale School.

Dedham Fire Department and Public Safety

During design development the project team will meet with both the Fire Department and the Public Safety department to review emergency vehicle access as well as any safety concerns/requirements within the building. The team has taken the initiative to meet with both departments preliminarily to incorporate any requirements into the site design.

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)

We do not anticipate any proposed construction that will trigger a Mass DEP Review.

US EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

It is anticipated that this project will disturb more than 1 acre of land and will require filing for a permit with the NPDES. That will be the responsibility of the contractor once they have mobilized on site.

Wetlands Protection Act

We do not anticipate that the project will require any wetlands redevelopment.

Land Disturbance Permit

Due to the size of the project, we anticipate needing to apply for a Land Disturbance Permit and the team will do so during Design Development. The design team will work with the required Town department to incorporate any stormwater requirements into the final site plans.

Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program Designation

The location of the Oakdale School, the selected site for the new school, does not appear to be located within an estimated proprietary habitat of rare species and it is not anticipated that the project will require this permit.

PERMIT	PERMITTING AUTHORITY	ANTICIPATED FILING DATE	ANTICIPATED APPROVAL DATE
Zoning Board of Appeals	Town of Dedham Zoning Board of Appeals	During Design Development	Prior to Construction Documents
Planning Board Site Plan Review	Town of Dedham Planning Board	During Design Development	Prior to Construction Documents
DPW	Town of Dedham DPW	To be consulted during Design Development	Prior to Construction Documents
Dedham Fire Dept. & Public Safety	Town of Dedham FD & Police Department	To be consulted during Design Development	Prior to Construction Documents
NPDES	NPDES/EPA	2 weeks prior to construction starting	Start of construction

3.9 Schedule

UPDATE - Once the project receives town approvals in Fall 2024, the design team will roll right into the Design Development phase and from there into the Construction Documents phase. The Design Development phase is expected to start in the Fall of 2024 and conclude with an MSBA submission in March 2025. The designers will then start the Construction Documents phase of design which will complete by the end of 2025. Construction will start in Late February 2026 with an anticipated building completion in June 2027. The teachers will then vacate the existing school at the end of the 2026/2027 school year and the construction team can abate and demo the existing building. The students will attend the new school in the Fall 2027 and the remaining site work will be complete by the end of December 2027.

3.10 Preliminary Design Pricing

UPDATE - List of Options and Design Pricing per Option follows.

LIST OF OPTIONS

Dedham Options

Site	Option	Enrollment		All New or Add Reno	New GSF	Reno GSF	Demo GSF
Oakdale	O-BR	Oakdale Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	53,524	0
	O-O-N	Oakdale Only	360 Students	New	91,100	0	53,524
	O-O-A/R	Oakdale Only	360 Students	Add Reno	66,000	29,100	24,900
	O-R-N	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	New	109,100	0	53,524
	O-R-A/R	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	Add Reno	84,000	29,100	24,900
	O-G-N	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	New	126,400	0	53,524
	O-G-A/R	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	Add Reno	101,300	29,100	24,900
Riverdale	R-BR	Riverdale Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	40,500	0
	R-R-N	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	New	109,100	0	40,500
	R-R-A/R	Oakdale Riverdale	560 Students	Add Reno	71,600	40,500	0
Greenlodge	G-BR	Greenlodge Only	Existing	Base Repair	0	38,950	0
	G-G-N	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	New	126,400	0	38,950
	G-G-A/R	Oakdale Greenlodge	665 Students	Add Reno	90,450	38,950	0

Table 1 - Summary of Preliminary Design Pricing

SUMMARY OF DESIGN PRICING BY OPTION

Site	Option	Total GSF	Square Feet of Renovated Space (cost*/sf)	Square Feet of New Construction (cost*/sf)	Site, Building, Takedown, Hazmat Cost*	Estimated Total Construction** (cost*/sf)	Estimated Total Project Costs
Oakdale	O-BR (Repair)	53,525 SF	53,525 SF \$740 /SF	0 SF	\$3,709,672	\$39,592,893 \$740 /SF	\$52,400,000
	O-O-N*** (New)	91,100 SF	0 SF	91,100 SF \$734 /SF	\$15,514,628	\$84,612,812 \$929 /SF	\$113,200,000
	O-O-A/R (Add/Reno)	95,100 SF	29,100 SF \$646 /SF	66,000 SF \$755 /SF	\$14,921,260	\$88,592,673 \$932 /SF	\$118,500,000
	O-R-N (New)	109,100 SF	0 SF	109,100 SF \$734 /SF	\$15,514,628	\$97,427,721 \$893 /SF	\$130,400,000
	O-R-A/R (Add/Reno)	113,100 SF	29,100 SF \$646 /SF	84,000 SF \$734 /SF	\$15,514,628	\$97,720,212 \$864 /SF	\$130,800,000
	O-G-N (New)	126,400 SF	0 SF	126,400 SF \$734 /SF	\$15,528,072	\$109,891,051 \$869 /SF	\$145,700,000
	O-G-A/R (Add/Reno)	130,400 SF	29,100 SF \$646 /SF	101,300 SF \$734 /SF	\$10,418,117	\$108,435,289 \$832 /SF	\$145,100,000
Riverdale	R-BR (Repair)	40,500 SF	40,500 SF \$786 /SF	0 SF	\$3,109,640	\$31,825,996 \$786 /SF	\$42,100,000
	R-R-N (New)	109,100 SF	0 SF	109,100 SF \$734 /SF	\$13,792,440	\$96,749,368 \$887 /SF	\$128,300,000
	R-R-A/R (Add/Reno)	112,100 SF	40,500 SF \$646 /SF	71,600 SF \$734 /SF	\$13,241,640	\$94,859,969 \$846 /SF	\$125,800,000
Greenlodge	G-BR (Repair)	38,950 SF	38,950 SF \$798 /SF	0 SF	\$3,040,076	\$31,066,843 \$798 /SF	\$41,100,000
	G-G-N (New)	126,400 SF	0 SF	126,400 SF \$734 /SF	\$17,917,796	\$113,244,579 \$896 /SF	\$150,200,000
	G-G-A/R (Add/Reno)	129,400 SF	38,950 SF \$646 /SF	90,450 SF \$734 /SF	\$17,388,076	\$111,510,131 \$862 /SF	\$147,900,000

* Marked Up Construction Costs

** Does not include Construction Contingency

*** District's Preferred Solution

4 Preferred Solution

4.1 Educational Program

UPDATE - An updated Educational Program dated April 2024 follows.

Two copies provided as requested:

- (1) redlined copy - April 2024
- (1) clean copy - April 2024



DEDHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Oakdale Elementary School

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

April 2024

Submitted By :

Nan Murphy

Superintendent of Schools



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
OUR STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS	3
PROJECT NEED	6
GRADE AND SCHOOL CONFIGURATION	7
EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY	8
KEY DESIGN IMPLICATIONS	10
TEACHING METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE	12
CORE CURRICULUM	15
VISUAL ARTS	20
PERFORMING ARTS	23
HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION	25
STUDENT SERVICES & SPECIAL EDUCATION	27
EDUCATOR PLANNING, COLLABORATION & DEVELOPMENT	42
FOOD SERVICES	44
TECHNOLOGY & INFRASTRUCTURE	46
HEALTH SERVICES	48
OUTDOOR LEARNING & PLAY	50
LIBRARY / MEDIA PROGRAM	51
TRANSPORTATION & STUDENT ARRIVAL/DISMISSAL	53
SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS & KEY ADJACENCIES	54
SECURITY & ACCESS	55

INTRODUCTION

To the Massachusetts School Building Authority:

The Dedham Public Schools is proud to present its Educational Program to the MSBA. This document reflects the collective wisdom and wishes of the community for a new facility that meets the needs of Dedham's young people today and well into the future.

This Educational Program is the product of many hundreds of hours of work invested by the District's central office team, building leaders, educators, support staff, families, and community members. In January and February of 2023 a team of 35 representatives from the community engaged in a visioning process facilitated by the owner's project manager. The visioning team met on four separate occasions to consider and articulate a bright and exciting future for educational opportunities in Dedham. This team's work was captured in a 33 page report that gives focus and shape to the Educational Program.

On behalf of the Dedham Public Schools, I want to thank the Visioning Team for the many hours that they volunteered and for their creative thinking and insight that has been essential in guiding the formulation of this report.

Sincerely,

Nan Murphy
Superintendent of Schools
Dedham, MA

OUR STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS

Dedham is a thriving suburb of Boston situated just south of the city and surrounded by Westwood, Needham, and Canton. The community of just over 25,000 residents is composed of residential neighborhoods, a quaint downtown, and thriving commercial zones along the Route 1 corridor. Today, the Town supports seven public schools educating approximately 2,699 students. Dedham is incredibly proud of its schools and especially fond of its place in the history of public education in the United States as the first tax funded, free public school system established in 1645.

Deleted: 500


The student population of just over 2,699 is served in seven schools by approximately 600 employees. Dedham's young people bring increasingly complex learning needs to our schools. Figure 1 provides a detailed look at high needs populations within the Dedham Public Schools. To support the increasingly diverse and intensive needs of the student population the District and School Committee have made concerted and sustained efforts to maintain class sizes of 16-18 at the elementary level and to provide robust intervention, Special Education, and related services to all students. As the needs of the student body increase it is critical that the design of new facilities accommodate adequately the space and configuration necessary to deploy effective programming and methods to support student learning and growth.

Deleted: 500

44.9% of Dedham's students fall into the high needs category established by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The needs of Dedham's young people are best met when all children in grades 1-5 are assigned to a dedicated home classroom. These homeroom cohorts establish a critical sense of welcoming, belonging, stability, and inclusion for all students.

Deleted: 2

Figure 1: DPS SELECTED STUDENT POPULATIONS



Deleted: March

Many of our students (~ 1150 or 45%) have the opportunity to attend school in modern facilities that readily accommodate current best practices in teaching and learning. The Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC), Avery Elementary, and Dedham Middle School are new facilities, each replaced since 2006. The four remaining facilities range in age from 64 years to 121 years. These facilities not only present challenges to enacting best practices in teaching and learning but have issues associated with escalating maintenance costs, structural integrity, and overall security.

Three of [the District's](#) aging facilities, the Oakdale, Riverdale, and Greenlodge schools, [were](#) considered through the [initial phases of the](#) feasibility study to determine if the Oakdale will be replaced by a facility to accommodate [360](#) students (Oakdale only), [560](#) students (Oakdale/Riverdale consolidation), or [665](#) students (Oakdale/Greenlodge consolidation).

- Deleted: these
- Deleted: are being
- Deleted: 235
- Deleted: 450
- Deleted: 550
- Deleted: A detailed overview of each of the three schools follows:

DEDHAM SCHOOL FACILITIES AND GRADE SPAN CONFIGURATION

SCHOOL	GRADE SPAN	ENROLLMENT		
		T	YEAR OPENED	AGE
ECEC	PK-K	344	2019	4
AVERY	1 - 5	322	2013	10
GREENLodge	1 - 5	310	1955	68
OAKDALE	1 - 5	256	1902	121
RIVERDALE	1 - 5	193	1920	103
DMS	6 - 8	543	2006	17
DHS	9 - 12	731	1959	64

- Deleted: 307
- Deleted: 297
- Deleted: 277
- Deleted: 248
- Deleted: 174
- Deleted: 0
- Deleted: 715

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY

The Oakdale Elementary School serves [256](#) students in grades 1-5. There are currently three sections in grades 1, 2, 3, and 5 and two sections in grade 4 for a total of 14 sections with an average class size of approximately 18 students. The Oakdale school is situated just to the east of Dedham's center close to the Boston city line. It is in very close proximity to the Avery Elementary, Dedham Middle, and Dedham High Schools (within 1 mile) and is approximately 1.5 miles from the Greenlodge Elementary School.

- Deleted: 248
- Deleted: March

The school day begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:00pm. During school hours children engage in core academics, unified arts programming, and social and emotional learning opportunities. Core content areas include literacy (reading and writing), math, social studies and science. Dedicated time to address social emotional health and wellness is also embedded into the schedule. A one hour lunch and recess block prioritizes giving ample time for students to engage in healthy play and social engagement.

Oakdale Elementary shares core values known as the “Standards of Behavior”. These values are respect, reliability, cordiality, and hard work. Students at Oakdale are held to high expectations regarding their work ethic and their community ownership. As a result, students experience an environment that feels safe, consistent and is conducive to learning. Teachers mirror our core values in their classrooms via classroom rules and constitutions, morning meetings and closing circles that facilitate connection and communication.

Learning is a blend of hands-on, interactive experiences that highlights the variety of student strengths and interests present at Oakdale. Dedham is a 1:1 school district and as such, students use their Chromebooks to access a variety of learning and practice programs throughout the day as well as using this tool for online collaboration with peers.

Oakdale Elementary offers enrichment programming after school three times a year which blends students and teachers from different parts of the building. These six week after school programs are teacher led courses based on staff areas of expertise and interest. They have included topics such as Mystery Theater, Sign Language, Basketball, Run Club, Arts and Crafts, Harry Potter Fan Club and so much more.

PROJECT NEED

The Oakdale Elementary school is a beautiful and historic part of the Dedham Community. Unfortunately the aging facility lacks adequate space that is appropriately arranged and outfitted to meet the educational needs of Dedham’s elementary student population; presents safety, accessibility, and equity challenges, compromising the adequacy of programming across schools; and, thirdly, is increasingly costly to maintain and operate.

The learning spaces and configurations at Oakdale are unsatisfactory primarily due to the fact that requirements for effective learning environments —particularly around special education, ELL and remedial education service delivery—have changed since the building opened in 1902. The existing facility is an inadequate learning and work environment for students and faculty. These spaces vary significantly in space and have no adjacencies to

Deleted: GREENLIDGE ELEMENTARY¶

The Greenlodge Elementary School serves 277 students in grades 1-5. There are currently three sections at each grade level for a total of 15 classes with an average class size of approximately 19 students. The Greenlodge school is situated in the south east corner of Dedham near the Canton and Westwood town lines.¶

The school day begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:00pm. During school hours children engage in core academics, unified arts programming, and social and emotional learning opportunities. Core content areas include literacy (reading and writing), math, social studies and science. Dedicated time to address social emotional health and wellness is also embedded into the schedule. A one hour lunch and recess block prioritizes giving ample time for students to engage in healthy play and social engagement. ¶

Deleted: RIVERDALE ELEMENTARY¶

The Riverdale Elementary School serves 184 students in grades 1-5. There are currently two sections at each grade level for a total of 10 sections with an average class size of approximately 18 students. The Riverdale school is situated in the northern section of Dedham in close proximity to Needham and Boston and is the only school facility north of the Route 1 corridor. It is affectionately referred to as being “on the island” as it is technically surrounded by the natural boundaries of the Charles River and a small canal connecting different sections of the River. The school is geographically the most distant from the other elementary schools that are clustered south of Route 1. ¶

The school day begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:00pm. During school hours children engage in core academics, unified arts programming, and social and emotional learning opportunities. Core content areas include literacy (reading and writing), math, social studies and science. Dedicated time to address social emotional health and wellness is also embedded into the schedule. A one hour lunch and recess block prioritizes giving ample time for students to engage in healthy play and social engagement. ¶

Deleted: the

Deleted: school

Deleted: March

intervention services, special education services, and English Learner services. This creates situations in which the increasingly diverse student population is regularly segregated into different areas of the building to receive services that should ethically and educationally be provided within or in direct proximity to the child's primary learning setting.

Structurally, the facility presents accessibility, maintenance, and safety concerns for the community. ADA compliance is a major issue throughout the building and there are barriers to accessibility that exclude or substantially limit many members of the community from the benefits of programming within the building. The building's envelope and mechanical systems are aging, inefficient, and costly to maintain and repair. The facility lacks the infrastructure for economically feasible, modern security systems (i.e. comprehensive, integrated PA, interior and exterior surveillance, controlled entry, etc.).

Deleted: March

GRADE AND SCHOOL CONFIGURATION

CLASS SIZE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The Dedham Public Schools have dedicated strategic energy and resources over time to maintain optimal class sizes in the elementary grade span. Low student:teacher ratios, particularly, in the earlier grades are critical to student achievement. Students in the elementary grade span require high levels of individual attention as they acclimate to the structure and duration of the school day, establish foundational early literacy and numeracy skills and concepts, and develop independence in the school setting. As such, the Dedham Public Schools and the Dedham School Committee intend to maintain class sizes between 16-18 in grades one through five.

SCHOOL SCHEDULING

The current school day schedule at [all Dedham elementary schools, including Oakdale](#), is directly linked to Dedham's commitment to academic excellence, social emotional wellness and health, equity for all learners and meaningful opportunities for educators to collaborate and plan together. The school day is generally distributed across the core content areas of reading, writing, math, science, and Social Studies. Additional time during the day is focused on the District's priorities of Social and Emotional Learning, meaningful play and social interaction, and creating a well rounded educational experience via the Unified Arts. A detailed breakdown of time allocations to these educational priorities is provided below:

DAILY INSTRUCTIONAL TIME ALLOCATION (MIN) IN GRADES 1-5

GRADE	READING	WRITING	MATH	SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES	SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING	UNIFIED ARTS	LUNCH AND RECESS
1	90	45	55	25	20	40	60
2	90	45	60	25	20	40	60
3	60	60	60	40	20	40	60
4	60	60	60	40	20	40	60
5	60	60	60	40	20	40	60

The school day schedule is also structured to ensure that all students are able to access supplemental literacy and numeracy intervention services, special education instruction, related services, guidance and counseling, and English Language instruction as needed.

Deleted: the

Deleted: Greenlodge, and Riverdale Elementary schools ...

Deleted: March

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

MISSION

The mission of the Dedham Public Schools, in partnership with the community, is to promote excellence in learning, self-discipline, and motivation.

This mission statement reflects the most fundamental goals of the community for its young people. At this time the district and community are working in partnership to develop a new, modern learning facility to replace the outdated Oakdale school building. Anticipated to impact an expected 360 students. the educational program and vision for the future is clear and articulated. Fundamentally, Dedham's vision for a new facility ensures that our young learners have access to a space that is warm, welcoming, bright, and conducive to excellence in learning, self-discipline, and motivation.

Deleted: determine if this new facility will

Deleted: as a standalone

Deleted: or if it will replace a combination of either the Oakdale and Greenlodge or the Oakdale and Riverdale Schools

Deleted: While the ultimate enrollment and school configuration is still in process

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

The educational philosophy of the Dedham Public Schools is grounded in the Instructional Core (Elmore, 2009). The Instructional Core positions the interaction between students, teachers, and content at the heart of the educational enterprise and suggests that (a) all actions of the organization should be focused on the instructional core and (b) there are only three ways to improve students learning at scale: (1) increase the teacher's instructional knowledge and skill, (2) increase the level of complexity of the content students must learn and (3) change the role of the student in the instructional process.

STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Dedham's educational philosophy gives purpose and shape to the district's strategic improvement efforts. These efforts include (1) ensuring a safe, supportive, and equitable learning environment where all students feel welcome and find success, (2) ensuring that students have voice and choice in a robust, student centered learning experience, (3) ensuring that the District's PK-12 curriculum is rigorous, relevant, and aligned to state standards and community expectations, and (4) ensuring that all faculty and staff have the resources necessary to support their ongoing professional learning, development, and success.

Deleted: March

EDUCATIONAL, ARCHITECTURAL, AND COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

The District's mission, educational philosophy, and strategic improvement efforts inform broad considerations for the design of a new elementary facility and are linked directly to the educational, architectural, and community priorities identified by Dedham's visioning team.

The visioning team identified seven major design principles and patterns that are critical considerations in the design of a new facility. to the way it provides education to all students. The intent is that the design of the new school should both reflect and facilitate these principles.

1. **SAFE AND WELCOMING** - Creating a physical and psychological environment that is safe, secure and welcoming is the foundation of an effective learning environment
2. **SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING, COMMUNITY, AND BELONGING** - Creating safe, caring and culturally responsive community in our classrooms and schools
3. **STUDENT CENTERED, SOCIAL LEARNING** - Creating a space that facilitates student voice and choice in learning opportunities and collaborative, social learning experiences
4. **PROJECT BASED LEARNING** - Engaging students in real-world and personally meaningful projects.
5. **INCLUSION AND UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING** - Providing inclusive instruction, accessibility, and a welcoming physical plant.
6. **CO-TEACHING** - Building a service delivery model based on "push-in" services and the careful and intentional design of co-teaching.
7. **EDUCATOR COLLABORATION AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY** - Building a comprehensive MTSS model that allows teachers and specialists to devote substantial time to teacher collaboration.

KEY DESIGN IMPLICATIONS

The District's strategic direction and the priorities established by the visioning committee suggest the following broad design patterns that should be considered as project development moves forward. While these are stated specifically here they are woven throughout this educational program and serve as the basis for other design implications that are more specifically geared towards the needs of specific programs and functions in the new facility.

Honoring The Past And Embracing The Future.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should incorporate historical elements of existing facilities and reflect the unique nature of the communities that the school serves. The physical structure of the facility should reflect the community and, simultaneously, clearly demonstrate its function, utility, and benefit to faculty, children and the broader community.

School As A Community Resource.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider and incorporate adjacencies and functionality that ensures the building is able to serve the community year round. Before, after, and summer school programs will operate in the building. Youth sports, community program uses, and adult education should also be considered as design proceeds.

Enhancing Community Connections.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider how the building might enhance existing or create potential for new community partnerships. The District is very interested in creating opportunities for high school internships and service learning opportunities while also expanding the potential for use by community groups and organizations during non-school hours.

Outdoor Spaces And Play.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider the creation of welcoming and functional outdoor spaces that enhance the school and surrounding community. Outdoor learning spaces are critical in supporting inquiry and project based learning models deployed in the Dedham Public Schools. Playing fields to support physical activity during the school day through the District's physical education program and recess and physical activity beyond the school day through youth sports programs are a high priority for the community.

Security And Welcome.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should incorporate state of the art design principles and technologies for ensuring the safe and secure operation of the school without compromising the look and feel of an elementary school.

Classroom Neighborhoods.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should consider classroom neighborhoods as a key design pattern to support the communities overarching goals and strategic priorities. The sense of community, welcoming, and belonging for students is key at the elementary level and the clustering of small groups of classrooms around learning commons supports collaborative, project based learning opportunities for children, invites inclusivity and integration of students with special needs, and encourages high levels of professional collaboration necessary to effectively implement Dedham’s educational vision.

Agile Classrooms.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should ensure that all classrooms are sufficiently well-sized and outfitted to facilitate student-centered, differentiated, culturally responsive, and inquiry-based teaching and learning. For students to learn how to think critically, solve complex problems, create, and communicate effectively, they should have opportunities to engage in a wide range of learning activities that include direct instruction, small group work, independent learning, project-based learning, and hands-on learning.

Flexible and modular furniture should be easy to rearrange as needed to support varied instructional strategies, team teaching, and the delivery of MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support). Technology should be consistent and robust to facilitate the use of varied digital devices and platforms that enhance student engagement and learning. Adequate storage should provide easy access to books and instructional materials, and adjacent breakout and extended learning (commons) spaces should be provided to ensure that all students have access to varied venues for differentiated and dynamic teaching and learning.

Professional Collaboration, Learning, And Work.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should recognize that teaching is a complex, dynamic, and social process. Just as students must be supported in their work and learning, teachers must also be provided with well outfitted common planning and storage spaces that enable them to work effectively as professional learning communities. Professional workspaces should be located in close proximity to classroom neighborhoods, support independent and collaborative planning, and provide teachers with areas to work, socialize, and recharge.

Deleted: March

TEACHING METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE

DEDHAM'S INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Dedham's instructional framework consists fundamentally of (1) a guaranteed and viable curriculum, (2) universal screening and common assessments, (3) shared resources for teaching, (4) time to collaborate with colleagues on tasks relating directly to improving the instructional core, and (5) high quality, sustained professional learning opportunities that are grounded directly in day to day work with students.

Guaranteed And Viable Curriculum. A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the bedrock upon which the rest of the district's work is situated. Guaranteed suggests that (a) the curriculum is understood, accepted, and enacted by all responsible for its implementation and (b) all students, regardless of their teacher or school, will have access to the same content, knowledge, skills, and opportunity to learn. Viable suggests that the content is (a) relevant to the short and long term success of children, (b) aligned to support the development of skills and concepts over time, and (c) able to be taught and learned within the time permitted during a given school year. In the years ahead, Dedham will begin to shift its curriculum so that it aligns with state guidance on high quality instructional materials.

Universal Screening And Common Assessments. Universal screenings and common assessments are designed to (a) assess and monitor student learning and progress relative to established standards and learning outcomes, (b) generate student performance data that teams of professionals can plan and differentiate instruction effectively and (c) provide timely, meaningfully performance information using tools that are efficient and maintain high levels of time in learning. In Dedham, District Data Teams consisting of central office administration, principals, coaches and elementary team leaders convene bi-weekly to review elementary student learning assessments in the core academic content areas of reading, writing, and numeracy. School leaders take the data sets back to the building level, where principals, coaches, and teachers gather to analyze the data and make instructional decisions about how to make adjustments to practice.

Shared Resources And Common Language For Teaching. Shared resources and language represent the third element of Dedham's instructional framework. A guaranteed and viable curriculum coupled with common curriculum based assessments set the stage for powerful practice and high levels of student learning. With these elements in place, we can then begin the process of identifying resources that are (a) consistent with our instructional vision and (b) effective in supporting student learning. As we identify shared resources that meet these

basic criteria we must also build a shared language for teaching and learning. Shared resources ensure that (a) faculty and staff have a dedicated and vetted set of tools to draw from as they plan and execute learning opportunities for students (b) faculty and staff are able to focus less time on tracking down resources/materials and more time thinking about differentiating for and engaging all students, and (c) students throughout DPS have similar experiences and build a shared understanding of and language for learning.

Time For Collaboration That Focuses On Tasks Directly Relating To The Instructional Core.

The first three elements of the framework are driven by professional teams who have the time and training to engage with colleagues in evaluating (a) student performance (b) the overall efficacy of our curriculum, and (c) the resources we use to deploy that curriculum. Collaboration happens throughout the day but is guaranteed during “common planning times” where grade level teams meet during a scheduled time of day at least once per week to discuss teaching and learning. During these dedicated times of day, teachers work with an instructional leader to look at student work in service of making adjustments to practice that respond to student needs.

High Quality, Sustained Professional Learning Opportunities That Are Grounded Directly In Day To Day Work With Students.

The preceding elements of the district’s instructional framework are predicated on the assumption that there is a robust and systematic professional development structure. Dedham’s professional development structure is driven by and responsive to the needs of students and teachers as identified by rich, multi-faceted sources of performance data and reflect research based practices that sustain professional learning over time.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

The following guiding principles reflect the methodology employed by teachers across core academic content areas: (1) learning must be student-centered, (2) instruction should be evidence-based, (3) teachers work as coaches or “facilitators” of student learning, (4) inquiry leads to deeper learning for all, (5) curriculum must have multiple access points and (6) learning is a collaborative, social process.

Learning Must Be Student-Centered. In Dedham, we believe that deep learning must position the learner at the center of the classroom. In order to accomplish this, teachers must have a deep understanding of how to analyze student assessments to make informed decisions about instruction and design learning targets for each individual student.

Instruction Should Be Evidence-Based. In order for teachers to implement district curricula in service of helping students meet learning objectives, teachers must employ a broad-range of instructional strategies that are appropriate to the task at hand and also provide opportunities for all students to access the curriculum. In content areas such as reading, for example, there is a body of research and knowledge that informs “best practices” for

Deleted: March

reading instruction. In this instance, teaching students how to read requires explicit and systematic instruction as learning science tells us that students acquire the ability to read on a developmental continuum.

Teachers Work As Coaches Or “Facilitators” Of Student Learning. In order to prepare students for an “innovation” economy where students need to know how to be critical thinkers who can solve complex problems, think flexibly, and communicate effectively, it’s important that we teach students how to become independent learners. In order to support students taking ownership of their own learning, teachers can act as a “guide on the side” or “facilitator” of student learning. This model of education, which posits the student at the center of the learning process, challenges more traditional views upon the relationship between teacher and student.

Inquiry Leads To Deeper Learning For All. Inquiry remains especially critical to student learning in Science, Technology, and Engineering as well as History and the Social Sciences. In these content areas, inquiry is central to how DPS students engage with district curriculum. “The ability to develop focused research questions in history and social science or define the dimensions of a particular policy problem is central to learning in these disciplines” (MA Frameworks for History/Social Science, 2018) and, likewise, in the sciences “investigation, experimentation, design, and analytical problem solving are central to an effective science and technology/engineering program” (MA Science and Technology Engineering Framework, 2016).

Curriculum Must Have Multiple Access Points. In order for students to access a culturally responsive curriculum that provides opportunities for voice and choice, teachers must provide students with multiple access points. Universal design for learning provides a framework by which teachers employ multiple strategies in order to provide students with opportunities for engagement, representation, action and expression.

Learning Is A Collaborative, Social Process. Research resoundingly supports the notion that learning is a complex and dynamic social process. To that end, the Dedham Public Schools believes that students must have opportunities throughout the day to engage in high-quality social interactions with peers and adults.

CORE CURRICULUM

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Dedham's elementary students engage in a cohesive, vertically aligned continuum of learning experiences in reading, writing, speaking, listening, phonics, and phonemic awareness. These experiences are aligned closely to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for English Language arts and are delivered using a workshop methodology. The workshop model of instruction reflects and embeds Dedham's instructional framework and guiding principles discussed earlier.

The workshop model is an approach to teaching reading and writing that allows children to develop independence and confidence in their reading, to fall in love with books, and support agency as writers. In the Dedham Public Schools, we use the Teachers College Units of Study for Reading and Writing to guide our practices in the workshop model. There is a predictable structure to each workshop.

Workshops for reading and writing range from 60 - 90 minutes daily and consist of a whole group mini-lesson (10-15 minutes), independent practice of reading and writing skills (40-45 minutes), and a whole group wrap up of the day's learning (5-10 minutes). During the mini lesson and whole group wrap up students convene in shared space for a teacher directed discussion of content. This is usually accompanied by reading texts or student work aloud, drafting anchor charts and rubrics for work on a teacher workstation, and 1:1 or small group student conversations. During independent work students move to individual or small group spaces throughout the classroom to engage in direct practice of skills and concepts from the day's lesson. Students need ample room to spread out and work in spaces that are conducive to their learning and work styles. While students practice independently, teachers and other educational faculty circulate the room to confer with students and provide feedback or pull small groups for review, reteaching, or extension of skills and concepts. In short, the workshop methodology requires ample space in each classroom for whole group instruction, independent practice, and multiple, concurrent small instructional groups. Given the regular movement of students and faculty throughout the school day, additional design consideration must be given to traffic patterns within learning spaces.

The workshop model for reading and writing instruction relies heavily on students having access to thousands of texts. In the elementary grade spans two primary factors drive the maintenance of robust classroom libraries. First and foremost, children must have access to ample selections of texts that are at their independent reading level. Reading levels vary widely in the early elementary grade span and the texts they are accessing range from

wordless picture books to complex chapter books. In addition to the range of reading levels and text complexity are the varied interests of children. Classroom libraries must account for reading levels, text complexity, and student interest. In considering these variables, classroom libraries at the elementary level are composed of thousands of texts. All classroom spaces in the new facility must be designed with spaces that allow for appropriate storage and display of these libraries as well as student access to the print materials.

MATHEMATICS

Dedham Public Schools currently use Everyday Math 4 (EDM4) which is a research-based program developed by The University of Chicago Mathematics Project. It is closely aligned to The Common Core and like The Common Core is aimed at developing all students' mathematical power - their ability to reason, communicate, and solve problems. EDM4 also works to help students develop the belief that math is worthwhile and confidence in their own mathematical abilities.

There are a number of features that distinguish EDM4 curriculum and they include:

- An emphasis on the application of mathematics to real world situations that are relevant to everyday life.
- A variety of learning opportunities that balance teacher-directed instruction with opportunities for open-ended, hands-on explorations, long-term projects, and on-going practice.
- A variety of methodologies for basic skills practice that include written and oral fact drills, mental math routines, practice with fact triangles, daily review problems (Math Boxes), home work (Home Links) and a variety of math games for in school and at home practice.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING

Dedham's science curriculum is aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), incorporating all standards for the science and engineering practices, and core disciplinary ideas. The District employs an inquiry based, experiential curriculum developed by Carolina Biological Sciences called Building Blocks of Science (BBS). BBS is composed of three units of study per grade level and are taught sequentially over the course of the school year.

BBS uses a constructivist approach to learning in which students engage in active processes of hands-on inquiry, investigation of resources, and class discussion to develop conceptual understandings and construct knowledge. The curriculum follows an instructional model that consists of five phases (also called the 5Es):

- **Engagement:** students draw upon prior knowledge to make connections to new concepts or topics

- **Exploration:** students are provided with an activity related to a concept or topics and are encouraged to make claims and observations, collect evidence, and ask questions
- **Explanation:** students use observations and discussion to construct an explanation for a concept or topic they are studying
- **Elaboration:** students draw upon their experiences and apply knowledge to a new situation to demonstrate understanding
- **Evaluation:** students assess their knowledge and review what they have learned

All of the BBS units use examples of science phenomena in the real world to make student learning relevant and meaningful. Each day in science, students participate in hands-on activities that provide opportunities to build their growing conceptual understanding of science concepts and make connections to how this helps them better understand the world around them. They make these connections in class discussions, in design challenges, and as they write in their science notebooks. The literacy components of BBS (Literacy Readers, Literacy Articles, Science in the News Article Reports) also contribute to student growth by building vocabulary, content understanding, and developing cross curricular connections as well.

HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Presently, the district is transitioning to a new History/Social Sciences curriculum. The district is currently using Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt’s Into Social Studies but is undergoing a pilot for InquirEd’s Inquiry Journeys. This curriculum was designed to meet the demands for inquiry in the Massachusetts History and Social Science Framework.

In Inquiry Journeys, students investigate History, Geography, and Civics by exploring complex questions. They gather evidence from books, pictures, artifacts, and other sources – and use their learning to make an impact on their community.

At the core of Inquiry Journeys is the opportunity for students to engage in an inquiry-question. Each unit culminates in taking informed action - providing opportunities for civic engagement and service learning.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING

In alignment with the goal of creating safe, caring and culturally responsive classrooms and schools, the District strives to create time and space for individual students to carve out their own place and path in a school and classroom community where each student feels affirmed, valued and included.

Dedham makes a consistent effort to support programs that address social-emotional learning so students feel valued, known, and included. Core to this effort is building a strong sense of community and connection among students and adults in each classroom and school. This takes the form of teaching social skills directly with such programs as Responsive Classroom and Second Step. Teachers use a common language throughout the school as they promote partnered learning, cooperative groups, and an array of community-building activities.

Major activities applied by most teachers include the morning meeting and closing (end-of-day) meeting, as well as classroom problem-solving meetings to address issues in the classroom.

- Morning meetings in particular involve whole-group activities, such as greeting exchanges or short games, so that students get to know each other and build a sense of community.
- Each of the meeting structures within Responsive Classroom begins with students seated in a circle so that everyone can see each other and there is a sense of equality among students.

To build empathy, Dedham educators prioritize building personalized classroom communities through social-emotional learning. The goal is for every student to have a personal relationship and sense of connection with teachers and classmates and to recognize themselves as valuable and contributing members of their school community. This includes morning, class, and closing meetings that build a sense of community within the classroom.

Design Implications for Teaching and Learning in Core Content Areas

Community Gathering and Connection Space. Seating space and a stage are needed for the school assemblies that involve skits and recognitions. Additionally, breakout learning areas within the neighborhood commons, as well as extended learning areas such as the cafeteria and media center, should also support community gathering and connection.

Direct Instruction. Special attention is needed for the placement of technology within the room (specifically projectors and document camera), which should be positioned to allow teachers and students to share their thinking and their work

Collaboration. Classrooms in a grade level grouped together, with common planning/PLC spaces and student common breakout spaces (neighborhood commons)

Classroom Libraries & Independent Reading. Large area with spacious bookshelves that border two adjacent edges of a large rug; Bookshelves that fit underneath windows and technology/whiteboards; allowing students to reach materials independently

Small-Group Work & Flexible Groups. Small-group rooms distributed among the grade-level classrooms and neighborhood learning commons will support small-group work, intervention programming, and the provision of special education and related services.

- Flexible and modular seating for students to work collaboratively and independently
- Students need access to spaces where they can play “math games” with their peers

Fostering Independence. Ensuring that classroom spaces are designed to ensure that learning materials are accessible to students and promote independence and self-direction.

Outdoor Learning Spaces. Adjacency and access to outdoor learning spaces is a critical design consideration that will support the project based, experiential nature of the District’s instructional methodology.

Storage. The hands-on, project based approach to teaching and learning at the elementary level is materials intensive and requires teachers to maintain large collections of texts, manipulatives, and consumables. Every classroom and classroom neighborhood needs ample individual and shared storage spaces to support Dedham’s pedagogical model.

Book Room(s). Create shared access to small group reading materials, which are designed to be shared by educators within and across grade level teams. Book rooms should include space for collaboration among educators, professional texts, and space for small-group lessons. These rooms can double as the instructional coaches’ offices, giving these teachers access to the resources.

Furniture Flexibility & Mobility. The classroom should be equipped with furniture that offers flexibility and mobility so that elementary students can assist in creating and manipulating spaces as needed for specific activities. Flexible furnishings can promote student teamwork while other furnishings encourage independence, consistent with a Universal Design approach.

Deleted: March

VISUAL ARTS

The Dedham Public Schools art program for grades 1-5 provides an inquiry-based approach to visual art education allowing students to explore 2D and 3D materials. All students in the K-5 span engage in 40 minutes of visual arts each week. Classes are designed to be inclusive environments for all abilities and skill levels. The visual art curriculum provides students with both 2-D and (limited) 3-D projects that have students focus on the elements and principles of design, introduction to art history, and current trends in the art world. Unit and lesson plans are designed intentionally to allow students to explore materials and engage with the subject matter in unique ways.

Students currently access a wide range of materials to express their creativity. Materials may include, but are not limited to: ceramic clay, plasticine clay, model magic, paper, paint (acrylic, tempera, and watercolor) markers, crayons, yarn, fabric, papier mache, cardboard, canvas, wood, printmaking materials.

OAKDALE

The current Oakdale art room is a retrofitted classroom located on the second floor of the original school building. This classroom is consistently hot due to the weather or radiator heat causing the art teacher to run fans and open windows all year long to get the room to a semi-comfortable temperature. There is no sink in the room. The water source is in the hallway and one needs to go through two sets of doors to get to it. The sink is located outside two regular education classrooms. This causes the art teacher to have a water bucket system in her art room to allow students to do wet media-based projects. The lack of a water source affects the caliber and variety of student projects. There are 6 tables, a teacher's desk, and a rug in the room which allows students to have a proper workspace. The storage space for materials is limited and most storage cabinets are broken. There is limited technology, only a desktop computer and projector. There is no kiln on-site requiring the teacher to travel to fire clay work for students.

Design Implications for Visual Arts

Creating visual arts spaces that enhance the experience and creative capacity of Dedham's students is critical to the design of a new facility for the District. Dedham envisions a space that has robust technology that supports modern pedagogical methods and 21st century tools that promote and enhance creative expression. This space also has the capacity to accommodate traditional visual art media: painting, drawing, collage, printmaking and sculpture.

Deleted: GREENLODGE¶

The current Greenlodge art room is a retrofitted classroom at the end of the hallway of the original school building. This is a large room with a small sink and limited storage space. Most of the storage space is teacher-provided cabinets and shelves. There is a door that leads to the back of the school allowing for outdoor access for students. This allows for opportunities for students to interact with nature for different art projects. For example, looking for clouds to learn about organic shapes or observational drawings of flowers in the spring. There is a water source in the classroom however very small which limits the projects students can successfully complete. There is a document camera, computer, projector, and a set of ipads in the room. There is a broken kiln in the basement of the school. It has been about 20 years since he has been fired. The teacher needs to travel to fire clay work for students. ¶

¶ RIVERDALE ¶

The current Riverdale art room is a retrofitted classroom located on the second floor of the school building. In the Fall and Spring, the room gets very hot and humid due to the old brick building and the position of the sun. Temperatures can reach over 100 degrees. The art room is used by all students and some staff members use it as a small group instruction area on non-art days. There is room for small fitting 4 tables, a small area rug, and a teacher's desk. There is built-in storage space and a large sink. There is a document camera, computer, projector, and a set of ipads in the room. The current technology setup allows for whole-group instruction, access to videos, and research that enhances the art teacher's teaching. There is no kiln on site, the art teacher needs to drive clay work across town to the middle school or Avery elementary school to fire projects. ¶

Deleted: March

As imagination and creativity are at the heart of elementary art programs the ability to plan and implement improved two and three- dimensional projects with proper prep, storage, kiln, and drying area will enhance the art programming offered at this level. A properly designed dedicated space for the visual arts will allow better student engagement, improved instruction, and an increase in the production of student projects.

Safety. A safe learning environment for art instruction that has proper equipment will allow the art teacher to plan for multimedia projects that reflect 21st-century learning skills. Allowing students to create and explore the visual arts in the safe and inviting art classroom will provide improved student engagement and student outcomes (projects) for the next generation of students in the Dedham Public Schools (DPS).

Storage. Materials will be stored properly, in line with the manufacturer's instruction which will prolong the lifespan of many art materials. The room would also have ample counter space for project storage and provisioning of supplies. A large materials storage room accessed from the art room area should provide adequate storage for art materials.

- A teacher prep table to store materials, house the paper cutter, and access to an electrical outlet for hot glue/lightbox access.
- Kiln will have its own separate storage in the kiln room

Display Space. Proper display space for student work will allow the student to showcase their work which is a cornerstone of the new Massachusetts State Visual Art Standards.

Project-Based Learning Space. The project-based area contains storage for ongoing projects;

Whole Group Learning Area. The new Art room contains a whole-group learning area for instruction that is centered around a smartboard and document camera for demonstrations on a large-screen display, as well as a whiteboard and bulletin board.

Sinks. Multiple large sinks (2), a clay sink (with clay trap), and a ceramics area, with, and one for mixed media materials.

Kiln. The kiln is housed in a separate well-vented area that is an accessible area to the instructional space and is able to be secured to avoid potential danger when firing and cooling. This area will have proper storage for ceramic work.

Counter Space. The room would also have ample counter space for project storage and provisioning of supplies.

Light. The room should be designed to allow for ample natural and interior lighting. Both sources of light should have readily available controls to adjust the volume of light in the space.

Adjacencies. In order to maximize collaborative teaching and program adjacencies, the Visual Art space would ideally be accessible to the Makerspace area and library allowing for collaboration and increased project-based learning throughout the school building.

Deleted: March

Deleted: March

PERFORMING ARTS

The Performing Arts curriculum is a sequential program of study building skills, concepts, and competencies in grades one through five. The units of study and lesson plans deliver the curriculum are aligned with and driven by the Massachusetts State Music Frameworks. The learning opportunities include singing, playing instruments, improvisation and composition, reading and notation, and critical response. Students in grades 1-5 receive 40-minutes of general music instruction per week with their class.

In addition to this music class, Dedham's fourth and fifth grade classes participate in grade-level chorus for 40-minutes each week. Music classes and chorus rehearsals are held in a designated music space equipped with a keyboard or piano, and a variety of percussion instruments (pitched and unpitched), class sets of drums, Orff instruments, ukuleles, and student keyboards. Fourth and fifth graders at each elementary school have the opportunity to learn a beginning band instrument in group lessons that are conducted on a rotating basis one day each week in the designated music space by the music teacher. Lesson sizes range from 5 to 18 students and are 30 minutes in length.

Oakdale does not currently have ample space for movement or storage of all instruments. As a result, class time is used to reconfigure the space for various activities that should be happening in each music class. Also, teachers are limited in what they can plan because of space limitations. Young students need to move in order to truly experience the performing arts, restrictions on the child's ability to actively engage with performing arts content can create discipline issues as students are not given the types of motor input and channels for output needed to fully experience music and express themselves. While each school presents movement elements (Laban movement efforts and folk dance), the limited space creates classroom management issues as teachers address behaviors that arise from insufficient space to move freely and safely through the room.

Concerts And Performances. In addition to the core program, each elementary school presents two concerts annually which feature performances by combined grade levels (1-5), choruses of 4th and 5th graders, and band students. These take place in the winter and spring and are well attended by parents, families, and caregivers. Dedham's young people look forward to these opportunities to display their hard work and skills. Performances at Oakdale are held in gymnasiums with stages that significantly limit the educator's ability to showcase student learning and for the audience to fully enjoy the performances. The level floor, height of the stage, acoustics and lighting do not support the breadth of performance that the program is able to accomplish in a sloped floor auditorium like Riverdale's.

Design Implications for Performing Arts

- Deleted: Riverdale
- Deleted: has
- Deleted: as well as
- Deleted: ; however Greenlodge and Oakdale do not
- Deleted: sometimes
- Deleted: movement
- Deleted: movement

Deleted: Performances at Riverdale are held in a sloped floor auditorium providing full visibility for the stage and surrounding performance area. The sound and lighting system along with a sizable area in front of the stage ensure all elements of performance are possible (dances, a broad range of instrumental accompaniment, etc). ¶

Deleted: Greenlodge and

Deleted: March

The District believes that a stand alone space for the Performing Arts program would best suit the needs of students and the community. General music classes for all students, choral programs, instrumental music lessons, and community performances and concerts compose the core program and require dedicated, stable space and storage for success. Beyond the core program Dedham's facilities are used by the broader community to host evening and summer events and programs. The Dedham Public Schools seeks to enhance and extend its capacity to operate its facilities as community centers. Additionally the District is also currently in the process of expanding its before, after, and summer school programming for all students. A dedicated performing arts space is central to the long term success of core programming, extended school day/year programming, and community programming.

Capacity. The ideal music room for a new elementary school in Dedham would need to be larger than a regular classroom to accommodate the choral program, dancing, instrumental music, and direct instruction.

Storage. Ample storage for the Performing Arts program in the new facility is critical. The program requires instruments, movement props, and associated teaching materials. These items are generally larger than traditional teaching equipment and are not able to be stacked and stored neatly in traditional storage areas.

Small Group/Break-Out Space. Spaces for the performing arts should have adjacent and adjoining small group breakout spaces where educators and students can work in small group settings to collaborate and practice skills and concepts.

Practice Rooms. In addition to the adjoining instrumental room, several practice rooms/dressing rooms should be included, along with designated storage spaces for sets, props and costumes for our growing theater programming.

Performing Area. The performance area should be situated adjacent to the music classroom, and should be large enough to accommodate band and theater programs. The space should readily accommodate choral risers (and their storage), dance showcases, and cast and crew for theater. Appropriate space to the left and right of the stage should be part of the design to support mobile sets and stage entry for performers. The stage should be high enough for visibility from the audience, yet low enough for optimal acoustics and lighting.

Ambiance. The design of the performance space should be well ventilated, sound-proofed, and provide for complete and easy control of interior and exterior lighting.

Deleted: March

HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Dedham Public Schools Wellness Department focuses on providing all students with age and grade appropriate Fitness and Health programming at the Elementary level. It is our goal to teach students about the importance of and health benefits of enjoying an active and healthy lifestyle while encouraging students to adopt a routine of daily movement. Dedham's Health and Physical Education curriculum is closely aligned to the Massachusetts Comprehensive Health Education Frameworks, National Health Education Standards, the National Physical Education Standards and Shape America Grade Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.

Fitness and health education are essential elements of the Department's instructional program. Each Elementary School has at least one designated instructor certified in both Health and Physical Education. All students at the Elementary Schools receive two forty minute physical education classes each week and these classes combine elements of Health and Physical education. In the structure of the physical education class, students receive mini health lessons that introduce topics on SEL, safety, nutrition, heart health, communication, emotional management and decision making to name a few.

Skills and concepts embedded within each unit of study are reinforced through game play, situational opportunities and physical activity. Additionally, each spring, all Dedham Public School students in Grade 5 receive a unit on Human Growth and Development taught collaboratively by the Wellness faculty, Nurses, and Elementary School Counselors in the different buildings.

The current instructional spaces for health and physical education at Oakdale, are less than equitable and often serve a number of purposes not related to health and physical education. The gymnasium is part of the stage or "auditorium", which often results in loss of the classroom space for speakers, presentations, concerts, assemblies and weekly choir classes for students in grades 4 and 5. Additionally, due to the open space, the gymnasium has been used to house book fairs as well as class and individual school photos for the students consuming multiple dates in the calendar year.

At present, the gymnasium space is the only space where the entire school can gather indoors. As a result, the health and physical education classes are directly impacted by the inadequate infrastructure and instructional space which is limited in functionality, due to both the size of the gymnasium, the lack of storage space, and additional usage during the school year. The outdoor space is adequate in size and could benefit from additional storage dedicated to Physical Education classes.

Both the Middle School and Avery Elementary have provided insight on how scheduling, class size and the number of classes simultaneously using the instructional space impact

- Deleted: the
- Deleted: Riverdale and Greenlodge Elementary Schools ...
- Deleted: In two schools, t
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: have
- Deleted: in two of the buildings
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: at each of the buildings
- Deleted: m
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: March

instruction and student learning. In each case, the facility may have multiple classes with upwards to 60 students using the space together. Although some relief is offered in that joint classes have recently been scheduled within the same grade, the large number of students impact participation, skill development, and choice of activities.

Design Implications for Health and Physical Education

Moving forward with a new design for instructional space, essential elements should include:

Dedicated Space: a large area that is designated for use as a gymnasium alone. This space should be large enough to host multiple classes where students can move freely, safely and without restriction.

Classroom Teaching Space: Health and Physical education at the elementary level. Classroom for health classes. This could also double as a PD space

Outdoor Space: Adjacency to the gymnasium.

STUDENT SERVICES & SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Dedham Public Schools Student Services team provides evaluations, consultation, and direct services to approximately 570 students with disabilities (~20% of enrollment) via Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), approximately 144 students with disabling conditions (~6% of enrollment), students with medical needs, students for whom English is a second language, students with mental and behavioral health challenges, homeless students, and students who require accommodation plans. Some of our elementary schools also house district programs for children with autism, language-based learning disabilities, and mental-behavioral health challenges.

STUDENT SERVICES STAFFING

As planning for the new facility proceeds, the designers will need to understand the types of student services and special education programs operated in the building as well as the number of students served, the number of staff, and the necessary adjacencies to ensure high levels of students learning and professional collaboration. The chart below provides a comprehensive summary of student services staffing for (a) current enrollments at the Oakdale, Riverdale, and Greenlodge schools and (b) projected enrollments of 360, 560, and 665, as per MSBA models.

PERSONNEL	Current Configuration			New Building Enrollments		
	OAK	RIV	GRNL	360	560	665
Special Education Teachers	5	6	6	5	6	7
Special Education Teacher (STAR)	0	0	2	0	0	2
Paraprofessionals	9	8	11	8	20	25
Speech & Language Pathologist (SLP)	1	1	1.2	1	2	2
Occupational Therapist (OT)	1	1	0.8	1	1.5	2
Physical Therapist (PT)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Education Team Leader (ETL)	.5	.5	.5	.5	1	1

Deleted: 235
 Deleted: 450
 Deleted: 5650

Deleted: 235
 Deleted: 450
 Deleted: 550

SPECIAL EDUCATION CLINICS, OFFICES, AND MEETING SPACES

Deleted: March

Currently, the Oakdale elementary school serves 46 students with special needs. Each of these students is provided with a wide range of specially designed instruction and therapeutic services articulated in an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP is a contract between the family and the school system that identifies in clear and specific terms the needs of the child, the goals for the child's programming, the specific interventions and supports that the child needs, and the timelines for review and revision of the IEP.

Deleted: while Greenlodge serves 60 and Riverdale 51.

Deleted: 157

Every Elementary School in Dedham is staffed with an Education Team Leader (ETL) who is primarily responsible for evaluation timelines, IEP development timelines, compliance and special education regulations, scheduling and monitoring of services, parent consultation, and teacher consultation. Supporting the student services associated with the implementation and maintenance of 157 IEPs is essential to family engagement and students' success. To do so, the ETL meets regularly with families, service providers, and other stakeholders to monitor student progress and plan for services moving forward. ETL's host mandated eligibility determination, annual reviews, and three year reviews for all students on their caseloads. In addition to IEP mandated meetings, ETLs meet regularly with their staff to provide policy/legislative updates, case consultation, and other professional training. As a result, the design of the new facility must include consideration for a confidential office space for the ETL as well as a meeting space that is centrally located, confidential, and able to accommodate up to 20 adults.

Deleted: Each

Deleted: school

Special educators, speech language therapists, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and board certified behavioral analysts are clinicians that support students and the services they receive through their IEPs. These clinicians engage in consultation relating to children on their caseload, provision of direct clinical services to students in 1:1 and small group settings, and psychoeducational evaluations to assess and monitor student acquisition of skills and concepts. Each clinician requires a confidential office space that can accommodate these activities.

Design Implications for Special Education Clinics and Offices

- The ETL requires an office space to conduct confidential meetings and phone calls.
 - The design of the ETL's office space should include an adjacent storage/work room to accommodate confidential special education records that must be maintained in accordance with state and federal statutes.
 - The design of the ETL's office space should include an adjacent conference room that is large enough for up to 20 adults to accommodate IEP team meetings, professional consults, and training.

Deleted: March

- Special educators and related service providers each require confidential office spaces that can accommodate consultation, psychoeducational assessment, and provision of direct services to individual and small groups of students.

INCLUSION AND PARTIAL INCLUSION CLASSROOMS

Inclusion classrooms. Services include push-in from itinerant specialists, pull-out for reinforcement of skills, co-teaching, evaluation, and consultation. In the current context, Black and Hispanic students are about 30% more likely to be identified for special education. They are also more likely to be identified for behavior (eg., ADHD) and mental health-related challenges than White students. Moreover, there are economic disparities between schools.

There are lasting impacts on students who are misidentified. Regardless of race, children who are identified may have less access to rigorous content standards and curricula, less access to typically developing peers, and less access to expert content teachers (US Department of Education, 2016). Thus it is important to address issues of overidentification in situations with and without disproportionality. High-leverage instructional practices and teacher professional development have a significant positive impact on student performance (Hattie, 2008). It is important to offer a variety of on-ramps in the general curriculum, high-quality instruction, and alternative service delivery methods such as co-teaching so that students with disabilities are not excluded and so that students without disabilities can receive support without being referred. Inclusion classrooms are regular education classes where students with educational disabilities are educated along with their nondisabled peers.

In Dedham, most students receive services in inclusion or partial inclusion settings, and our goal is to remove barriers for traditionally marginalized groups by expanding in-class support by increasing “push-in” services and by providing a comprehensive co-teaching model consistent with our Student Services Strategic Plan.

Within a co-taught general education setting, students with special needs participate as much as possible in a general education classroom with typically developing peers. A strong partnership between the general education teacher and special educator provides a setting that fosters a deeper understanding of various learning styles, exposes students with disabilities to typical role models, and an opportunity to receive diverse instructional strategies.

Accommodations and/or modifications are made for students to access grade level curriculum as well as the involvement of specialists and clinicians who provide services in mainstream settings. In general, all programming for students is designed on an individual case-by-case basis (per the Individual Education Program) and provided in an integrated model.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Lora, Bold, Italic

Deleted: March

Partial Inclusion Classrooms. Partial inclusion programs, which Massachusetts regulations define as the student being in the special program between 21 percent and 60 percent of the day, require flexibility, professional collaboration, and co-teaching. The Greenlodge School serves 10 students in partial inclusion and the Riverdale school currently serves 7 students in partial inclusion settings.

Partial inclusion service delivery models are designed to meet the unique needs of children with developmental delays in more than one area of functioning. Mild developmental delays, global language challenges, and delayed social development may impact ability to access the reading, writing and math curriculum in the general education setting. The curriculum is modified for more specific targeting and review of essential skills.

Classroom emphasis is on full-engagement and internalization of classroom material. Students are highly motivated to learn, but typically have difficulty with longer term retention of material and require frequent review, repetition and re-application of skills. In addition, students in this model often require a high level of support, as well as a significantly slower pace compared to their grade-level peers.

Students who are identified for partial inclusion programming are included in general education classes as much as possible, but they have a wide variety of needs and require individualized services as well. They all share the need for a "home base," a place for pull-out services, and a place to receive explicit instruction in social skills. The students' language impairments often impact social functioning and comprehension of materials. Within this model, lessons and discussions are highly teacher-mediated for language development. Teachers continually model language and questioning techniques, and frequently cue students for elaboration of their responses.

Design Implications for Partial Inclusion Classrooms

Breakout Spaces: Breakout spaces adjoining classrooms provide opportunities for pre-teaching, teaching, and reteaching within the inclusion classrooms. Breakout spaces could be accessed by ELL teachers, instructional coaches, interventionists, special education teachers, speech/language pathologists and classroom teachers who require a quiet space and who are serving students in the two classrooms.

Learning Lab: Massachusetts law requires that students be educated with peers whose ages fall within a 48-month range. The ACCESS program requires one lower and one upper learning lab large enough for up to 12 students. Learning labs should be equipped with the same furniture, technology and storage as other classrooms.

[Specialized Teaching and Readiness Program \(S.T.A.R.\)](#)

Deleted: ACCESS. ACCESS is a "partial inclusion" program at the Riverdale school. ACCESS is designed to meet the unique needs of children with developmental delays in more than one area of functioning. An ACCESS student requires support in three or more domains: Cognitive, Language, Academic, Student Skills, and/or Social Skills.¶
Cognitive Profile ... [1]

Deleted: SUBSTANTIALLY SEPARATE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS...

Deleted: March

The Specialized Teaching and Readiness Program (S.T.A.R.) provides intensive support and instruction for students diagnosed with Autism Spectrum and related disorders. This program offers robust systematic and structured behavioral teaching approaches, complementing academic instruction, social pragmatic and social emotional support.

Deleted: at the Greenlodge Elementary

Deleted: School

Highly specialized curriculum, related services and therapies, and a wide range of interventions are provided within the STAR program model. Among many, these include:

1. Intensive speech and language support
2. Assistive and augmentative communication devices
3. Small group, multi-sensory instruction
4. Peer modeling through inclusive experiences and support
5. Provision of multi-sensory academic instruction
6. Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)
7. Behavior management systems and Board Certified Behavioral Analyst (BCBA) services
8. Provision of significant adult support for addressing academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs
9. Physical and occupational therapy

A primary goal of the STAR program is to provide inclusion opportunities that support the generalization and transfer of skills, participation as appropriate in the general curriculum, and participation to the greatest extent possible with nondisabled peers. These focus areas ensure opportunities for STAR students to increase their independent skills in all areas including academics, recreation, social, communication skills, self-care, motor skills, and behavior management.

Consultation and coordination between special educators, related service providers, BCBA's and classroom teachers serving the STAR program ensures that consistent approaches are utilized across settings to promote student growth and learning. Collaboration in planning amongst professionals is critical to the program's success and ensures a robust co-teaching model in which students experience a combination of supported inclusion, discrete trial training and/or 1:1 instruction, small-group activities, incidental teaching and community learning. The program is based on the principles of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) with a focus on individualized reinforcement systems and consistent behavior management programs.

Presently the STAR program lacks sufficient space that is appropriately configured to support the program goals and associated methodologies specified above. Special educators

Deleted: March

and related service providers share office and work spaces which creates efficacy issues for direct support to students, distractions for students during clinical/therapeutic sessions, and compromises the privacy and confidentiality of these spaces.

The lack of adequate and appropriately configured space for the program also presents long term fiscal and statutory compliance issues for the District. The current STAR spaces do not allow for additional enrollment thus preventing the district from bringing students back from highly restrictive out-of-district placements. Statutorily the current program lacks ADA compliant amenities and, because there is only one space available, the age range within the program exceeds the 48 month maximum allowed by law.

Design Implications for the STAR Program

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham's newest elementary facility should include two classrooms for the STAR program to accommodate increased enrollments and the need to ensure statutory compliance with age span limits and ADA.

Students and staffing. The design of STAR classrooms should consider the need for maintenance of required student:teacher ratios. By law, the maximum student-teacher ratio in a substantially separate classroom is 8:1 or 12:2. Each STAR classroom will serve up to 12 students; and the general staffing pattern requires 1:1 or 2:1 instruction. As such, the STAR classroom must accommodate 12 students and 12 adults at all times.

Highly specialized instructional spaces. The design of STAR classrooms should include individualized study carrels for Discrete Trial (ABA) instruction.

Restrooms and sinks. The design of STAR classrooms must include handicap-accessible sinks and bathrooms for students who require support with self-care. This is a critical element because many STAR students require toileting support and other students are working on Activities of Daily Living (ADL) skills that are critical to independence and self-care.

Breakout Spaces. The design of STAR classrooms must include adjoining breakout spaces to facilitate the provision of highly specialized instructional methodologies for individual and small groups of students.

Sensory room. The design of STAR classrooms must include an adjoining sensory room to best meet the needs of students. Students with autism and autism spectrum disorders experience extreme sensitivity to sensory experiences. Sensory rooms will allow service providers to provide children with necessary sensory intervention and relief from the classroom conditions that at times overwhelm children's capacity for sensory input and integration.

Deleted: March

Key adjacencies. The design of the STAR classrooms should consider key adjacencies to all related service providers including speech, occupational, and physical therapists and BCBA.

Storage. Each classroom needs ample storage for instructional materials. Students with sensory-seeking behaviors may crash into shelving units, attempt to climb them, and ingest small non-food items. For safety reasons, storage options need to be out of sight and inaccessible to students.

Soundproofing. Sound field adaptations are strongly recommended and may include rubberized flooring, cork, or Flotex tiles and furniture with rubberized legs to reduce sensory overload for students. Soundproofing also includes sound deadening wall panels and rooms with solid walls and doors to reduce noise from students who become distressed or students who make frequent loud noises due to vocal stereotypes.

Sensory-friendly lighting. Sensory-friendly lighting is essential. For example, fluorescent lighting may be too harsh visually and creates a buzzing sound due to ballasts that regulate current to the lamps in fluorescent lighting systems. These systems have a high-pitched hum that children with autism may find so intolerable they cannot focus or engage.

Ambient noise. Auditory conditions of the classroom must be considered. Children may fixate on the hum from mechanical systems such as HVAC and be unable to concentrate. Other children may benefit from steadily modulated “white noise” machines.

Clearly defined classroom space. Changes to routine may cause duress, so classroom spaces need to be free from distractions and clearly defined by function.


Color. Color can have a substantial impact on learning.

- Harsh colors should be avoided. For students with autism, subdued colors with gray undertones, particularly those with blue/green hues are preferred.
- Clear contrast between ceilings and floors assists students with proprioceptive delays with spatial and proprioceptive challenges.
- Color used in tonal blocks and color-coding doors or hallways by function is often helpful for navigation, independence, and feelings of security.

Student Pathways. Attention must be paid to the paths students use to move through the building.

- Hallways that are too large or long can be intimidating, and hallways that are too enclosed can cause discomfort. These structures can encourage escape-avoidance behaviors that are unsafe.
- Patterned floors are confusing, disorienting, and increase anxiety.
- Exits that are open to children’s field of vision can cause fight/flight responses, large and imposing facades as well as soaring porticos can be frightening, and open staircase designs can be disorienting; therefore, travel options in the form of circulation spaces are preferable.

- Curved hallways without blind corners, and points of interest such as seating nooks, can help children to understand, predict, and navigate the environment.
- Passive seclusion opportunities built into the spaces would assist students with sensory and social-emotional challenges to self-manage and escape in safe and socially appropriate ways.
- Another design implication might be to make the school smaller and more welcoming by dividing it into “neighborhoods” or sections with enclosed common areas and by providing alternative pathways for getting from one place to another.



Example of ABA/Discrete Trial Training (DTT) side of double classroom.

ELEMENTARY COMPLEX LEARNER PROGRAM

Delays in language skills may impact a student’s ability to access the Reading, Writing and Math curriculum in the general education setting. The curriculum is modified for more specific targeting and review of essential skills. Classroom emphasis is on full-engagement and internalization of classroom material, as opposed to mere memorization. Students are highly motivated to learn, but typically have difficulty with long-term retention of material and require frequent review, repetition and re-application of skills. In addition, students in this model often require a high level of support, as well as a slower pace compared to their grade level peers.

The student’s language impairments often impact social functioning and comprehension of materials. Within this model, lessons and discussions are highly teacher-mediated for language development. Teachers continually model language and questioning techniques, and frequently cue students for elaboration of their responses.

Key Components of Student Profile

Deleted: March

- Primary diagnosis of Developmental Delay, Communication, Neurological, or Autism. Students that fit this model typically would not have a specific learning disability given the cognitive profile of the cohort as noted below.
- The student requires a higher level of coordination of care than the typical special education student.
- There have been multiple systematic interventions utilized in an effort to help the student access the curriculum. These have been well documented.
- The student typically requires support in three or more of the following domains:
 - Academics
 - Student Skills
 - Behavior
 - Communication
 - Social Skills

Cognitive Profile	Language Profile	Academic Profile	Student Skills Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Student is functioning at a significantly slower pace compared to grade level peers</u> ○ <u>The student is likely to have a cognitive level below 85, or there is a difficulty in determining the cognitive level due to splits in the testing profile or impaired language.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Delays in language impact ability to function in reading, and math in the general education setting</u> ○ <u>Language impairment often impacts the student's social skills (particularly at elementary level)</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Student requires high levels of support in all academic areas, either in the small group setting or in the general education setting</u> ○ <u>Student presents with comprehension deficits</u> ○ <u>Rate of skill acquisition is diminished</u> ○ <u>Significant pre-teaching and/or re-teaching is required</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Requires direct teaching of student skills</u> ○ <u>Slow to respond to instruction/intervention</u> ○ <u>Requires support to generalize student skills across the day. The special education teacher shares the student skill of the week with classroom teacher.</u>

Deleted: March

THE EDUCATIONAL TEAM

The model comprises a multi-disciplinary team, which may include::

- o Special education teachers*
- o Highly trained Instructional assistants*
- o Board certified behavior analyst (BCBA)*
- o Speech therapists*
- o Occupational therapists*
- o Physical therapists*
- o Adaptive physical education teachers*
- o Assistive technology consultation to the model*

Design Implications for the Complex Learner Program

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham's newest elementary facility should include two classrooms for the Complex Learner program to accommodate increased enrollments and the need to ensure statutory compliance with age span limits and ADA.

Students and staffing. The design of Complex Learner classrooms should consider the need for maintenance of required student:teacher ratios. By law, the maximum student-teacher ratio in a substantially separate classroom is 8:1 or 12:2. Each classroom will serve up to 12 students.

Breakout Spaces. The design of Complex Learner classrooms must include adjoining breakout spaces to facilitate the provision of highly specialized instructional methodologies for individual and small groups of students.

Key adjacencies. The design of the Complex Learner classrooms should consider key adjacencies to all related service providers including speech, occupational, and physical therapists.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY AND PHYSICAL THERAPY

Occupational therapists (OTs) and occupational therapy assistants (COTAs) support children with motor and sensory development, as well as the academic implications of visual-spatial and visual-motor processing deficits. Occupational therapists conduct both motor and processing assessments, direct therapy, and consultative support.

Physical therapists and physical therapy assistants in school settings provide assessments and direct therapy to students with gross motor delays, physical mobility challenges, and loss of mobility due to physical injury, brain damage, stroke, or other medical conditions.

Both OTs and PTs provide significant support to students with sensory needs. These supports may include vestibular therapy, direct desensitization, sensory diet management,

or consultation. Currently, the OT and PT programs at Oakdale are housed in a converted classroom on the ground level. The spaces can be loud, and are not set up for a comprehensive OT program. Students have to travel through an open area to access services. As a result, the space does not meet DESE or IDEA standards. At Greenlodge school, there is no OT space.

Children with developmental disorders such as autism may show significant delays in the development and integration of sensory experiences throughout their lifespan. The way the brain processes these experiences can be a major source of distress and discomfort. In some cases, the brain may overreact to these sensory stimuli. Other times, it may not react enough. An inability to regulate sensory stimuli can cause a variety of negative behaviors such as acting out, fighting, meltdowns, spinning, rocking or hand-flapping, as well as problems with information processing and development.

Sensory regulation is an integral part of the school day for students who have needs relating to sensory regulation. Sensory services and intervention require access to specialized equipment and associated therapies. Children with sensory processing deficits may respond to stimuli in the environment in unpredictable, maladaptive, and even dangerous ways. For example, unmodulated sensory experiences such as touch, bright light, noise, or other sensory experiences can cause avoidance behaviors such as running away from the area, hand-flapping, spinning, rocking and severe tantrums, as well as self-injurious behaviors such as head banging and crashing into obstacles at a high rate of speed.

Sensory experiences are cumulative. For example, a child may be able to handle a morning meeting with several children, yet be unable to progress through the rest of the day without direct intervention. A trained Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) and an Occupational Therapist (OT) may prescribe treatment called a “sensory diet,” which is a series of progressively tolerable sensory experiences that are carried out in controlled conditions for safety reasons. Sensory diets also include a menu of calming activities that are designed to mitigate an overactive arousal system. These activities include equipment such as a therapy swing, aroma therapy, special lighting and white noise systems, weighted blankets, and body socks.

Design Implications for Occupational Therapy And Physical Therapy

Sensory room. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility must include a sensory room. A sensory room is a therapeutic space designed to help children regulate their sensory responses and develop coping skills. Sensory rooms are designed to provide a place for individuals with sensory issues to decompress and confront a variety of sensory issues in a way that will ultimately help them learn to cope. Other benefits include increased communication and socialization, increased attention and stamina for learning, and

improved motor and cognitive development. Sensory rooms often include aromatherapy diffusers, soundproofing, white noise machines, adaptable lighting, therapy swings, and other calming tools. There is no current space at Oakdale to support sensory integration for these students.

Deleted: , Greenlodge, or Riverdale

Flexible spaces and furnishings. The design of the sensory room should include flexible spaces and furnishings. Occupational and physical therapists require flexible space to provide direct therapy to support sensory integration and motor system development.

Adjacent office space. The design of the sensory room should consider adjacent office spaces for occupational and physical therapists. These related service providers conduct direct services within the sensory room and in adjacent office spaces, conduct all related evaluations, and provide professional consultation to colleagues and families.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY

Speech-language pathologists (SLPs) work on a variety of communication disorders, including social and pragmatic deficits displayed by students with autism, structural deficits impacting speech and intelligibility, functional deficits impacting receptive or expressive communication, and fluency disorders impacting intelligibility and reading. SLPs conduct evaluations, provide direct therapy, provide push-in services to support academics, and provide consultation. Currently Oakdale has one full time SLP for 20 students.

Formatted: Justified, Space Before: 4 pt, After: 6 pt

Design Implications for Speech & Language Therapy

Privacy. Therapy rooms require quiet and privacy so that SLPs can conduct sound-sensitive evaluations of auditory perception and processing, oral-motor examinations, and communication evaluations.

Space. Therapy rooms also require space for individual and small-group therapy sessions. The increased population projected will require at least two general speech-language therapy rooms and one STAR speech-language room.

Location. The STAR SLP therapy room should be located adjacent to the STAR classrooms.

Deleted: Riverdale also has one full time SLP for a similar caseload. Greenlodge has a part time SLP for the STAR program and one full time SLP for the general special education population.]]

AUGMENTATIVE AND ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION

An Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) specialist is a specialized speech-language pathologist who works with students who do not use verbal communication. AAC services may include direct 1:1 assessment of a student, consultation, parent communication, trials of AAC equipment in individual and group settings, and development and programming of communication platforms.

Deleted: March

Design Implications for AAC Services

The AAC service requires an office with a small instructional space for testing devices and programming devices..

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

Assistive Technology (AT) specialists are professionals who conduct evaluations, provide staff training, and offer direct student consultation on the use of high- and low-tech solutions for a wide variety of student challenges involving input or the presentation of information (e.g., color-coding, text-to-speech, etc.) and output or modalities for sharing learning (e.g., speech-to-text). These specialists are skilled in the application of both technology devices (e.g., smart pens, magnification) and software options (e.g., screen masking, PDF conversion, dictation).

Design Implications for Assistive Technology Services

Assistive Technology specialists are itinerant. They need access to spaces such as a small conference room where they can work with students and staff in trying various technology and software options.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY SERVICES

The Dedham Public Schools Department of Student Services provides evaluations, consultation, and direct services to students with a wide variety of mental and behavioral health challenges in specialized programs and in the general classroom setting. The department is composed of 26 school psychologists, licensed social workers, guidance counselors, and school adjustment counselors. Beyond services provided to students with Individual Education and Section 504 plans, the department provides ongoing support to all students within the Dedham Public Schools.

School psychologists conduct cognitive, social-emotional, and academic assessments to inform eligibility determinations and provide ongoing monitoring of student progress towards identified goals. Student assessments require intense concentration and the application of auditory processing and discrete visual processing skills. In addition to assessment, School psychologists provide direct consultation to other staff, students, and families on mental health and other issues relating to student development and well being.

Design Implications for School Psychology Services

Confidential and private office space. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility should include a confidential and private office space for the school psychologist. This office space should allow for evaluations, consultation, and small group intervention/meetings for up to 6 people. 360 student enrollment will require one office while enrollments of 560 and 665 will require two offices.

- Deleted: 235
- Deleted: 450
- Deleted: 550

BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS (BCBA) SERVICES

Dedham schools are currently served by contracted Board Certified Behavior Analysts who work with students exhibiting mental and behavioral health challenges. One BCBA is .8 FTE and serves students in the BRIDGE program through weekly consultations. The other BCBA is .6 FTE and serves the rest of the school’s student body. BCBA consultation includes any combination of the following: observations of the student; developing data collection systems, behavior plans or skills development programming; data analysis; teacher/team meetings; teacher/team training.

Typically, the BCBA helps classroom staff to identify and isolate a targeted behavior that needs to be extinguished and then collaborates with staff to develop a system of positive reinforcement that will produce the appropriate behavior. The CBAs are assisted by 2.0 FTE Registered Behavior Technicians (RBT). These RBTs assist the CBAs in the direct application and implementation of services. The RBTs may take data (sometimes every two or three minutes), complete observations, carry out behavior plans, and perform other duties assigned by the CBAs. The Bridge classrooms have a dedicated BCBA of their own.

Design Implications for BCBA Services

Therapy rooms. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a designated space for the delivery of BCBA evaluations, consultation, and therapy.

Location. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that the BCBA space is directly adjacent to the STAR classroom.

Deleted: March

EDUCATOR PLANNING, COLLABORATION & DEVELOPMENT

Dedham’s curriculum and pedagogical models require and, simultaneously, support a high degree of professional collaboration, planning, and coordination.

DATA-REFLECTIVE CULTURE

Every Dedham elementary school operates data teams in which teachers and administrators meet regularly to review assessment results and student work samples. The information gleaned from these meetings helps to drive changes in instruction at the school, classroom, and student levels with the goal of improving student performance. The major assessment instruments currently in place include MCAS, STAR360, EarlyBird, MCLASS, Foundations Unit assessments, and Lexia. All of this information provides multiple perspectives on students’ reading and math performance and allows teachers to diagnose strengths and areas of concern and plan individualized lessons accordingly.

Monitoring progress in the social skill development of students and in the culture and climate of schools is important to making progress in social-emotional learning. In 2017 the district began using surveys from Panorama Education to collect and reflect on data in these areas. Currently, the District is building a targeted universal mental health screening program.

Data teams offer another specific example of how teacher collaboration can be integral to the improvement of student performance. Through each school’s data team meetings, teachers have regularly scheduled time for professional collaboration with colleagues to focus on analysis of student work and assessment of instructional practices. This collaborative work requires a focus on using evidence of student understanding to adjust instruction and on providing direct and just-in-time feedback to students about how to advance their own learning.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

In addition, teachers need to be able to form professional learning communities(PLCs) around topics of mutual interest and work together to further their own professional development. Unless it is a professional development release time scheduled by the district or stipends are available for after-school work, PLCs meet during the school day. The media center and other spaces are scheduled for continual use by students during the school day and so are not available for PLC meetings. A PLC meeting typically involves 4-10 faculty members.

Deleted: March

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

Instructional coaches provide direct support to educators and students. Their primary responsibility is to support educators with real time, job embedded coaching. Much of the coaches' work takes place in the 1-5 classrooms throughout the school. For example, an academic coach may introduce a lesson, setting the stage for the teacher with student motivation and prompts; demonstrate a specific activity; model how to teach an entire lesson; or co-teach one lesson with the classroom teacher.

The coaches' offices are primarily used to confer with teachers before and after the activities that take place in the classroom. For example:

- A teacher may describe to the literacy coach a challenge with the effective teaching of syllables; they review student work or assessment data to more clearly pinpoint the problem area; the coach presents a lesson in the classroom; later the teacher and coach meet in the office to discuss how the lesson was delivered and how the students reacted; the next day, the coach observes the teacher presenting a continuation of the lesson; later they confer again about what worked and what didn't and what the teacher might do differently next time.
- The math coach and teacher may co-administer an assessment of students' skills with fractions; the next day, they may meet in the office to grade and record the assessments; the next day they may review the data and identify the students having difficulty; at their next meeting, they would strategize on an intervention to assist those students.

Each coach will be in and out of classrooms and the office area multiple times during the course of each day. Most of the time blocks spent in the office will be about 45 minutes in length, corresponding to the teachers' scheduled planning periods. Under the coaching model every classroom teacher receives coaching during the year in order to improve their practice.

CO-TEACHING MODELS

Several co-teaching models have been planned and taught with the classroom teacher and the Instructional coach or the classroom teacher and a special educator. Co-teaching requires focused collaboration that involves reviewing student work and/or formative assessments and using that data to plan instruction.

Currently, the only space to collaborate is in the classrooms, which results in at least one or two teachers carrying necessary materials to another space. When this level of collaboration takes place during the day, there is limited time before students return to the classroom, which means all the materials need to be picked up and put away, most likely when teachers are getting to the heart of the work.

Design Implications for Teacher Collaboration

Teacher collaboration conference room. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a dedicated conference room that can accommodate up to 12 adults for the purposes of teacher collaboration and planning. The room should be configured and outfitted to support high levels of collaboration.

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should consider implications for real time, job embedded coaching for educators. All classrooms should incorporate design patterns that facilitate the close collaboration of two or more educators at any given time.

Instructional coach office. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a dedicated office space for the instructional coach. This office should be directly adjacent to the teacher collaboration conference room and able to accommodate up to 5 adults.

FOOD SERVICES

Dedham’s Food Services Department is a self-operated program dedicated to students' health, well-being, and ability to learn. The primary goal of the Food Services Department is to serve delicious and healthy meals to as many children as possible ensuring that they have the nutrition necessary to fuel high levels of learning and growth. This endeavor is increasingly important as the percentage of income-eligible families in Dedham has risen substantially in recent years. As of the 2022 - 2023 school year, 29.8% of our student population qualifies as economically disadvantaged.

The Dedham Food Service program participates in the National School Lunch and Breakfast program and adheres closely to federal and state guidelines for free and reduced-price meals, including breakfast and lunch. Students are always offered five components at lunch: grains, protein, fruits, vegetables, and milk. For breakfast, they are offered fruit, grains, milk and protein. All students receive wholesome and nutritious meals that meet the USDA dietary guidelines.

The current systems and structures for food service at the Oakdale school, delivers nutritious meals to students each day and successfully achieves the department’s fundamental goal. That being said, the current systems and structures are inefficient and disruptive to teaching, learning, and the effective operation of the District.

The first and most pressing issue with the current systems and structures for food service is the burden it places on teaching and learning. Unnecessary instructional and administrative time are consumed in the daily logistics associated with ensuring that the food that children wish to eat is prepared and delivered on time for lunch. In addition to

Deleted: , Riverdale, and Greenlodge

Deleted: s

Deleted: se

Deleted: March

this inefficiency Dedham's students at the Oakdale school miss a critical opportunity for socialization and interpersonal skill development that come with eating lunch together in a school cafeteria. Over five years students miss 450 hours of social skill building that occurs when children learn how to share space, engage in conversation, and care for one another in the space that is the social space of the meal. This is a major equity issue.

Deleted: , Riverdale, and Greenlodge schools

Inefficiencies in food preparation and distribution are another major issue for the Food Services Department. Each day educators collect lunch orders from their students first thing in the morning. These lunch orders are compiled and relayed to the kitchen staff at Dedham High School who then prepare the meals and pack them in warming and cooling bags for distribution to the elementary schools. Food services then deliver meals to Oakdale where they wait for distribution from a centralized location. Students and educators retrieve the meals and return to the classrooms where students eat with one another. Costs associated with the logistics are unnecessary and create a situation in which the duration between meal preparation and consumption impacts the quality of the food that children experience.

Deleted: each of the schools

Finally, these antiquated systems and structures create issues for the management and operations of the District's buildings. Lunch in the classrooms creates an unnecessary scheduling and supervision burden. More adults are necessary to supervise the many spaces in which children eat and, as a result, creates significant human resource inefficiencies. There is a parallel inefficiency and burden placed on custodial resources who must divert attention daily from the care and maintenance of school facilities to support educators in cleaning up after student meals in many locations throughout the building.

Design Implications for Food Services

To address inefficiencies and their impact on teaching and learning, the design of a new elementary school facility for the Dedham Public Schools must consider the following:

Cafeteria. The new facility should have a centrally located, spacious, open, and bright space for children to commune and share meals throughout the school year. This common experience connects children and provides critical time for social skill development.

Full Service Kitchen. The new facility should have a spacious, full service kitchen that allows for the preparation of breakfast and lunch onsite for students and staff throughout the school year. The kitchen should meet modern food preparation standard and be designed in close coordination with

Sensory Aware. The cafeteria design should consider the social, emotional, and sensory needs of all children. Designing the cafeteria from the perspective of the young people who are using it is critical. For some young people, the cafeteria can be an overwhelming and anxiety producing space. Navigating large numbers of people, sound volume, and the logistics associated with finding your place and getting your lunch can stress a young

Deleted: March

person's resources. Designing a large communal space that provides for large and small group gathering would benefit these youngsters. Small group gathering spaces might include some degree of visual separation from the larger cafeteria, sound buffering, sensory-friendly supports such as a lower ceiling, and diffused and/or natural lighting.

Acoustics. The cafeteria design should incorporate sound absorption panels on walls or sound-absorbing walls and ceiling panels.

Connection To And Support For Teaching And Learning. The cafeteria design should incorporate connections to and extensions of the curriculum and content that students engage in. Displays for students' work and exhibitions that demonstrate the cultural connections to food that is being served or to the math and science concepts associated with cooking and baking should be considered.

Size. The cafeteria should be designed to accommodate up to half of the projected enrollment at any given time. This space would provide the scheduling flexibility necessary to accommodate a two or three lunch service model depending on initial and future enrollments at the school.

Traffic And Circulation. Careful consideration should be given to safe and efficient traffic and circulation patterns within the cafeteria. Entrance to and exit from, circulation to and from the food service area and point of sale, and supervision of the space all must roll into the design of the space.

Restrooms. An appropriate number of gender neutral bathrooms should be directly adjacent to the school's cafeteria.

TECHNOLOGY & INFRASTRUCTURE

The Dedham Public Schools has developed a robust teaching and learning experience for students and technology is a critical tool in delivering and enhancing that experience for all students. Dedham operates a 1:1 environment in grades 1-12 and relies heavily on digital assessment, learning management, and enrichment applications and software. Effective use of technology is always evolving as the District continuously reviews its programs, refines its curriculum, and provides resources and training for teachers to support technologically enhanced learning environments. New technologies and associated pedagogies provide opportunities to improve student-centered learning through deeper learning strategies and Universal Design principles.

In addition to teaching and learning, the management and operation of the District's school facilities relies heavily on robust technological infrastructure, hardware, and software/applications. Managing student enrollment and demographic data, management

of student records and maintenance of FERPA and HIPAA compliance, monitoring mechanical systems, procurement and fiscal operations, and ensuring safety and security are just a few examples of key management and operations systems that are almost exclusively dependent on current technology.

Design Implications for Technology

Infrastructure

Data. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include data retrieval and connectivity capabilities in all spaces.

Audio. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include sound fields with audio enhancements to support effective teaching and learning practices.

Wireless internet. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include robust, redundant wireless access to ensure that all systems that support teaching, learning, management and operations remain connected and operational at all times.

Building configuration

Classrooms. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should give careful consideration to furnishings that accommodate the technology infrastructure and hardware necessary to support and enhance Dedham’s teaching and learning model.

Educator workstations. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that all instructional and office spaces are equipped with workstations that integrate necessary technological infrastructure to support the hardware and software necessary to support the District’s systems for teaching and learning and management and operations.

Conference and meeting spaces. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that all conference and meeting spaces integrate technological infrastructure to support the hardware and software necessary to enact the District’s professional learning model and the District’s systems for teaching and learning and management and operations.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Health Services Department provides direct care and support to all students in the Dedham Public Schools. All schools are staffed with at least one nurse who provides all clinical care of students and medication management; assists with screenings and ensures compliance with vaccination and health documentation requirements; attends all health-related IEP meetings; creates medication plans and health care plans; offers emergency allergy and OSHA training for all staff; handles health-related parent communications; and plays an integral role in overall health education.

In addition to these services, Dedham also serves its students and families with a case management model that is supervised by the District's Nurse Case Manager. This individual provides both clinical and social-work based support for families with children who have complex medical needs throughout the district. These children typically have Health Care Plans and require ongoing and changing support and liaison work between school health and multiple private providers.

The District's School Nurse Assistant Program (SNAP) maintains a comprehensive database that tracks all activity in health clinics across the district. Recent SNAP data indicates a significant increase in the number of students visiting [school health offices](#).

- Oakdale has seen an increase in Health Office visits from SY 21 of 432 students to 985 in SY 2022. As of 2/14/2023 they already had 656 visits.

This data does not include students seeking nursing support for somatic complaints and emotional support without a diagnosis. This increase in medically complex and fragile students has direct implications for staffing and space needs at our elementary school facilities

The current health suite at the Oakdale school is not appropriately designed and outfitted for effective school health practices in today's post pandemic context. Clinics are not equipped to house confidential records, provide separate and secure medication and refrigeration facilities, hold private consultation with students and families, for adequate private exam space. The clinic currently sees an average of 10 medical visits per day and additional medication visits during the lunch period, leaving the clinic over-crowded and students waiting in line to be evaluated.

Design Implications for Health Services

Elementary children have not yet developed a strong immune system. They become ill more frequently than adults do. They are also prone to react to stress by exhibiting headaches and stomachaches. Based on current data, Dedham projects an average of 30 students per

Deleted: the

Deleted: <#>Greenlodge had 1636 visits in SY2021 compared to 3126 in SY 2022 with 2037 visits as of 2/24/2023. ¶
Riverdale has also seen a 65% increase in student visits to the Health Office from SY21 to SY 22. ¶

Deleted: s

Deleted: , Greenlodge, and Riverdale S

Deleted: s

Deleted: are

Deleted: March

day visiting the clinic, not including medication and treatment visits throughout the day and consults with faculty, staff, and families.

Central Location. The health suite should be centrally located and directly adjacent to the main office. This adjacency is critical to safe and efficient day to day operations of the school and in response to emergency situations.

Office Space. A separate, confidential space for the school nurse to conduct necessary paperwork and processing, maintain records, and hold meetings/consultation is a key design consideration. The office space design should include interior windows that maintain line of sight access to the health suite. The number of offices necessary will be a function of final enrollment determination. Design should be closely coordinated with the District's Director of Health Services and Assistant Superintendent for Student Services.

Examination Areas. The design of the health suite should include a number of examination areas that are consistent with and provide appropriate service to the selected enrollment model. Examination areas should be private and consideration given to making these spaces multifunctional. These spaces should be designed for use in meeting screening requirements and should be well ventilated in the event an individual must be quarantined.

General Care and Treatment. The design of the health suite should incorporate a spacious, general area that allows for the school nurse to provide general care and treatment to students who report for regular medication or somatic, non medical related care/treatment.

Waiting and Receiving. The design of the health suite should include a comfortable waiting/receiving area for students and families who must wait to see a school nurse. This area should be in line of sight from the nursing office(s) and separate from examination rooms to protect the privacy of students and families.

General Storage. The design of the health suite should include ample storage for all materials and supplies associated with the medical care of students. This includes additional storage for clean changes of clothing and secured dry and refrigerated storage for prescription medications and epi-pens.

Specialized Storage. The design of the health suite should include storage for emergency and specialized medical equipment. Backboards, wheelchairs, screening instruments, and other specialized equipment all require storage that is secured and directly adjacent to the health suite.

Emergency Access. The design of the health suite should incorporate efficient and discreet access for emergency responders. Children who are experiencing an acute medical emergency must be efficiently and safely transported from the building through intentional design that also allows for discretion that ensures privacy and ensures that the remainder of the school community is not unnecessarily alarmed by the presence of emergency responders and vehicles.

Restrooms. The design of the health suite should incorporate gender neutral, ADA compliant restrooms directly adjacent to the health suite. This is critical for privacy and treatment. The number of restrooms in the health suite will be a function of the final enrollment determination.

OUTDOOR LEARNING & PLAY

Outdoor learning and play are central to Dedham’s overall educational program. Opportunities for hands-on experiential learning, physical activity and exercise, and socializing with peers are essential considerations for the design of Dedham’s new elementary facility.

OUTDOOR LEARNING

Dedham’s curriculum and instructional model encourages and supports a high level of experiential, hands-on learning that promotes inquiry and social learning. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include outdoor learning spaces that are accessible to all students and community members while enhancing the current instructional model. Shaded areas for whole group instruction, gardens, and other means by which children can engage in the study of environmental phenomena within their community are important design considerations.

RECESS

Children in grades 1-5 spend 30 minutes daily at recess. Over five years in elementary school every child spends 450 hours at recess. This is the equivalent of 70 school days. Recess is essential, unstructured learning time and the design of outdoor play spaces must consider the physical, social, and emotional skill practice that takes place during this time. Accessible play structures that encourage movement and exercise are a centerpiece of the play area along with accessible areas for team sports, small group, and partner play are all important considerations in the design process.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Physical education classes are scheduled outdoors when weather permits. Outdoor play areas should be directly adjacent to the gymnasium to support physical education outdoors whenever possible.

Design Implications for Outdoor Learning and Play Areas

Accessible. The design of outdoor learning and play areas must keep accessibility at the forefront. Beyond access for children and community members with mobility needs, these areas should also be designed with an eye for language barriers, sensory needs, etc.

Safety. The design of outdoor learning and play areas must keep safety at the forefront. Primary design considerations include the location/placement of the primary play area in close proximity to the building and directly adjacent to the cafeteria. This play area should have a fully enclosed perimeter to define the play space and maintain safety. The play area should also include a poured in place surface to minimize opportunity for injuries.

Outdoor learning. The design of Dedham's new elementary school facility should incorporate outdoor learning spaces. These spaces should facilitate whole and small group learning in a safe space directly adjacent to the building. The incorporation of a community garden would further the District's partnership with the Endicott Estate and support hands-on learning opportunities throughout the school year.

LIBRARY / MEDIA PROGRAM

The mission of the Dedham Public School Library Media Program is to empower students to become enthusiastic readers, information seekers, and creative problem solvers, prepared to participate in an evolving world. Through collaborative teaching, curriculum integration, and classroom support, we cultivate curious, independent, lifelong learners with the inquiry skills needed to be ethically responsible and successful in our global community. We equitably connect learners to diverse materials and learning opportunities in an environment that supports cooperation, collaboration, and a love of literature.

The mission of the Dedham Public Schools Library/Media Program is lofty, commendable, and hindered by structural limitations and constraints. The Oakdale school is home to a beautiful and historic school library that is situated on the third floor of the 120 year old facility. This space is not ADA accessible and prevents many students and community members from accessing the benefits and beauty of this space.

Furthermore, the static fixtures and furnishings limit the utility of the space, compounding ADA accessibility issues and use of these wonderful learning spaces.

Design Implications for Library / Media Program

The Library/Media center for Dedham's newest elementary facility should be centrally located, accessible to all members of the community, and serve as a learning commons for

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Font color: Black

Deleted: <#>The Riverdale school houses a school library that is centrally located and occupies the equivalent of two classroom spaces. While the space is adequate, the fixtures and furnishings are fixed and do not allow for creative and flexible use of this space. ¶

The Greenlodge school houses a library/media center that occupies one classroom. Due to increasing enrollments and other facilities limitations the library was recently reduced in size by half which has significantly impacted the programming the District is able to provide Oakdale students. ¶ While each facility has unique limitations they all share...

Deleted: <#>which

Deleted: <#> and

Deleted: <#>that further limit

Deleted: <#>access to

Deleted: March

the students, faculty, and community. The library or media center should be a flexible space with mobile furnishings and walls to allow for multiple uses within and beyond the school day/year. Technology infrastructure should facilitate large and small group learning for children and adults. Specifically, design implications include:

Multifunctional. This library/media center should be designed as a multifunctional space that is able to support all elements of the District’s educational program as well as extended school day/year programming, and community programming in the evenings and summers.

Small Group/Breakout Spaces. This library/media center should be designed to incorporate small group/breakout spaces for children to engage in collaborative, hands-on learning, conduct research, and work in small intervention groups. These small group/breakout spaces will also serve similar functionality in before, after, and summer school programming and better support flexible community use during non-school hours.

Outdoor Learning Space. The library/media center should be designed to support outdoor learning opportunities that supplement and enhance the core academic curriculum. Ideally this space would be directly adjacent to an interior courtyard that would promote a comfortable and safe learning environment for students and faculty.

Storage. The library/media center should be designed to incorporate adequate storage for the materials and supplies necessary to manage and maintain a large collection of print materials and to engage students in experiential learning opportunities throughout the school year.

Deleted: March

TRANSPORTATION & STUDENT ARRIVAL/DISMISSAL

Elementary students in Dedham travel to and from school via school buses, vans, families, and walking/biking when weather permits. The following table provides a detailed overview of vehicle and foot traffic to and from each school on a daily basis.

	BUS AND VAN	PARENT AND FAMILY	WALK AND BIKE
Oakdale	60	130	50

Parents and families are the primary means of transport for students to and from [Oakdale Elementary](#). The school runs a live drop off and pick up process that allows faculty and staff to safely and efficiently welcome children to school and dismiss them to their caregivers at the end of each day. Currently only one bus transports students daily. The Oakdale community also has approximately 50 children who walk/bike to and from school each day.

Design Implications for Transportation, Arrival and Dismissal

Arrival and dismissal. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility should consider carefully a safe and efficient traffic pattern for school arrival and dismissal. The new facility, regardless of the enrollment decision, will run a live drop off and pick up process which will require ample room for parent/family vehicles. Bus/van arrival and dismissal areas should be separate from by adjacent to the live drop off area to ensure safety and supervision.

Bicycles. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility should incorporate safe and secure spaces for children to store bicycles and scooters. When weather permits, a large number of students elect to ride to school which supports social and physical development. The District encourages students to interact and exercise and having proper storage for their bikes/scooters promotes this healthy behavior.

Parking. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility must include sufficient parking to accommodate all faculty and visitors to the building. Parking should be in close

Deleted: Greenlodge ... [2]

Deleted: all three elementary schools

Deleted: Each

Deleted: .

Deleted: Each school c

Deleted: has

Deleted: that

Deleted: and Greenlodge school

Deleted: ies

Deleted: each have

Deleted: March

proximity to the facility with clear and safe walkways to the building. The design should also consider the potential for future installation of solar parking canopies.

SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS & KEY ADJACENCIES

SITE ADJACENCIES

Dedham’s new elementary facility should be designed to accommodate flexible, student centered learning in all spaces. A centrally located main office, health suite, cafeteria, auditorium, and library media center are both functionally and culturally important. Having these resources centralized creates a common hub for gathering, socializing, and connecting as a community. This is critical in any school and even more important should Dedham select a larger enrollment option.

Classroom neighborhoods that shape learning spaces into small communities within the larger school is a critical design consideration. The design of classroom neighborhoods should ensure that all students can access learning opportunities within the neighborhood. This would require multiple small group break out spaces for intervention, special education, related services, EL services and general collaboration.

COMMUNITY ADJACENCIES

Dedham’s school facilities serve the community well beyond the school day and year. It is critical that the new school be designed with this consideration in mind.

Community center. Dedham’s new elementary facility should be designed with community use in mind. Evening and summer recreation programs, adult learning and education programs, and youth sports are just a few types of programs that the District wishes the facility to accommodate.

Before and after care programming. The new facility will hold a before and after school care program operated by the District. This program will require office space for the site director and assistant site director. Additionally, common spaces such as the gymnasium, library/media center, and cafeteria should be designed for flexible use before, during, and after the school day.

SECURITY & ACCESS

The safety and security of students, faculty, and staff is Dedham's first priority. within and around its facilities is a top priority of the Dedham Public Schools. Currently, conditions and design at the Oakdale presents unique challenges to maintaining a safe and secure learning space for students and educators. Aging windows and doors must be monitored closely to ensure that latching mechanisms and hardware work properly. Keyless entry and modern surveillance systems are not economically feasible to install with the structural limitations and aging mechanical systems. These are just a small sample of the issues related to maintaining safe and secure environments.

The District maintains an interdepartmental safety team that meets monthly to review safety planning and needs throughout the district. This team includes representatives from the School, Police, and Fire Departments as well as other town agencies and community groups and is responsible for all emergency planning for the district. The last submission of the District's Medical Emergency Response Plan was in 2018 and these plans are currently under review for updating and resubmission to DESE. Members of the District Safety Team have met and continue to meet to discuss and inform design implications for the safety and security of Dedham's newest elementary school facility.

Design Implications for Security & Access

Controlled Entry. The new elementary school should be designed and equipped with a secure entry vestibule that ensures visual and verbal identification of all visitors. Controlled entrance to the new facility should provide for the safety and security with equal consideration given to making our faculty, students, community, and visitors feel welcome.

Protective Architectural Perimeter. The main entrance and other appropriate areas should be designed to include bollards that prevent vehicles from close proximity to the building.

Video Surveillance. The new facility should be equipped with appropriate external and internal video surveillance cameras to ensure safety and efficacy of any necessary emergency response. This video surveillance system should be spec'd to integrate seamlessly with the District's existing video surveillance infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Exterior Doors and Entry. The new facility should be equipped with an appropriate keyless entry system that ensures all faculty and staff are able to enter and exit the building with fob access. The keyless entry system should be spec'd to integrate with the District's existing infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Deleted: T

Deleted: , Greenlodge, and Riverdale facilities each

Deleted: March

Telecommunications. The new facility should be equipped with appropriate phone, PA, and radio communication systems to ensure efficient communication and secure operation of the building. These systems should be spec'd to integrate with the District's existing infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Wayfinding Mechanisms. Color and symbology can be used to define areas of the school or classroom that are intended for high-energy vs. reflective activities, welcome families whether or not their primary language is English, and to establish non-verbal cues for how the school functions.

Building Layout. The layout of the building can contribute to the students' sense of security and well-being. For example, long hallways leading outside can be anxiety-provoking for young students, but curvilinear in-between spaces with open areas can guide students from one location to another and help them to feel safe.

Page 30: [1] Deleted

Sara Errickson

4/2/2024 4:22:00 PM



Page 52: [2] Deleted

Sara Errickson

3/28/2024 7:04:00 PM





DEDHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Oakdale Elementary School

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

April 2024

Submitted By :

Nan Murphy

Superintendent of Schools



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
OUR STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS	3
PROJECT NEED	6
GRADE AND SCHOOL CONFIGURATION	7
EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY	8
KEY DESIGN IMPLICATIONS	10
TEACHING METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE	12
CORE CURRICULUM	15
VISUAL ARTS	20
PERFORMING ARTS	23
HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION	25
STUDENT SERVICES & SPECIAL EDUCATION	27
EDUCATOR PLANNING, COLLABORATION & DEVELOPMENT	42
FOOD SERVICES	44
TECHNOLOGY & INFRASTRUCTURE	46
HEALTH SERVICES	48
OUTDOOR LEARNING & PLAY	50
LIBRARY / MEDIA PROGRAM	51
TRANSPORTATION & STUDENT ARRIVAL/DISMISSAL	53
SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS & KEY ADJACENCIES	54
SECURITY & ACCESS	55

INTRODUCTION

To the Massachusetts School Building Authority:

The Dedham Public Schools is proud to present its Educational Program to the MSBA. This document reflects the collective wisdom and wishes of the community for a new facility that meets the needs of Dedham's young people today and well into the future.

This Educational Program is the product of many hundreds of hours of work invested by the District's central office team, building leaders, educators, support staff, families, and community members. In January and February of 2023 a team of 35 representatives from the community engaged in a visioning process facilitated by the owner's project manager. The visioning team met on four separate occasions to consider and articulate a bright and exciting future for educational opportunities in Dedham. This team's work was captured in a 33 page report that gives focus and shape to the Educational Program.

On behalf of the Dedham Public Schools, I want to thank the Visioning Team for the many hours that they volunteered and for their creative thinking and insight that has been essential in guiding the formulation of this report.

Sincerely,

Nan Murphy
Superintendent of Schools
Dedham, MA


OUR STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS

Dedham is a thriving suburb of Boston situated just south of the city and surrounded by Westwood, Needham, and Canton. The community of just over 25,000 residents is composed of residential neighborhoods, a quaint downtown, and thriving commercial zones along the Route 1 corridor. Today, the Town supports seven public schools educating approximately 2,699 students. Dedham is incredibly proud of its schools and especially fond of its place in the history of public education in the United States as the first tax funded, free public school system established in 1645.

The student population of just over 2,699 is served in seven schools by approximately 600 employees. Dedham’s young people bring increasingly complex learning needs to our schools. Figure 1 provides a detailed look at high needs populations within the Dedham Public Schools. To support the increasingly diverse and intensive needs of the student population the District and School Committee have made concerted and sustained efforts to maintain class sizes of 16-18 at the elementary level and to provide robust intervention, Special Education, and related services to all students. As the needs of the student body increase it is critical that the design of new facilities accommodate adequately the space and configuration necessary to deploy effective programming and methods to support student learning and growth.

44.9% of Dedham’s students fall into the high needs category established by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The needs of Dedham’s young people are best met when all children in grades 1-5 are assigned to a dedicated home classroom. These homeroom cohorts establish a critical sense of welcoming, belonging, stability, and inclusion for all students.

Figure 1: DPS SELECTED STUDENT POPULATIONS



Many of our students (~ 1150 or 45%) have the opportunity to attend school in modern facilities that readily accommodate current best practices in teaching and learning. The Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC), Avery Elementary, and Dedham Middle School are new facilities, each replaced since 2006. The four remaining facilities range in age from 64 years to 121 years. These facilities not only present challenges to enacting best practices in teaching and learning but have issues associated with escalating maintenance costs, structural integrity, and overall security.

Three of the District’s aging facilities, the Oakdale, Riverdale, and Greenlodge schools, were considered through the initial phases of the feasibility study to determine if the Oakdale will be replaced by a facility to accommodate 360 students (Oakdale only), 560 students (Oakdale/Riverdale consolidation), or 665 students (Oakdale/Greenlodge consolidation).

DEDHAM SCHOOL FACILITIES AND GRADE SPAN CONFIGURATION

SCHOOL	GRADE SPAN	ENROLLMENT	YEAR OPENED	AGE
ECEC	PK-K	344	2019	4
AVERY	1 - 5	322	2013	10
GREENLODGE	1 - 5	310	1955	68
OAKDALE	1 - 5	256	1902	121
RIVERDALE	1 - 5	193	1920	103
DMS	6 - 8	543	2006	17
DHS	9 - 12	731	1959	64

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY

The Oakdale Elementary School serves 256 students in grades 1-5. There are currently three sections in grades 1, 2, 3, and 5 and two sections in grade 4 for a total of 14 sections with an average class size of approximately 18 students. The Oakdale school is situated just to the east of Dedham’s center close to the Boston city line. It is in very close proximity to the Avery Elementary, Dedham Middle, and Dedham High Schools (within 1 mile) and is approximately 1.5 miles from the Greenlodge Elementary School.

The school day begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:00pm. During school hours children engage in core academics, unified arts programming, and social and emotional learning opportunities. Core content areas include literacy (reading and writing), math, social studies and science. Dedicated time to address social emotional health and wellness is also embedded into the schedule. A one hour lunch and recess block prioritizes giving ample time for students to engage in healthy play and social engagement.

Oakdale Elementary shares core values known as the “Standards of Behavior”. These values are respect, reliability, cordiality, and hard work. Students at Oakdale are held to high expectations regarding their work ethic and their community ownership. As a result, students experience an environment that feels safe, consistent and is conducive to learning. Teachers mirror our core values in their classrooms via classroom rules and constitutions, morning meetings and closing circles that facilitate connection and communication.

Learning is a blend of hands-on, interactive experiences that highlights the variety of student strengths and interests present at Oakdale. Dedham is a 1:1 school district and as such, students use their Chromebooks to access a variety of learning and practice programs throughout the day as well as using this tool for online collaboration with peers.

Oakdale Elementary offers enrichment programming after school three times a year which blends students and teachers from different parts of the building. These six week after school programs are teacher led courses based on staff areas of expertise and interest. They have included topics such as Mystery Theater, Sign Language, Basketball, Run Club, Arts and Crafts, Harry Potter Fan Club and so much more.

PROJECT NEED

The Oakdale Elementary school is a beautiful and historic part of the Dedham Community. Unfortunately the aging facility lacks adequate space that is appropriately arranged and outfitted to meet the educational needs of Dedham’s elementary student population; presents safety, accessibility, and equity challenges, compromising the adequacy of programming across schools; and, thirdly, is increasingly costly to maintain and operate.

The learning spaces and configurations at Oakdale are unsatisfactory primarily due to the fact that requirements for effective learning environments –particularly around special education, ELL and remedial education service delivery–have changed since the building opened in 1902. The existing facility is an inadequate learning and work environment for students and faculty. These spaces vary significantly in space and have no adjacencies to intervention services, special education services, and English Learner services. This creates situations in which the increasingly diverse student population is regularly segregated into

different areas of the building to receive services that should ethically and educationally be provided within or in direct proximity to the child's primary learning setting.

Structurally, the facility presents accessibility, maintenance, and safety concerns for the community. ADA compliance is a major issue throughout the building and there are barriers to accessibility that exclude or substantially limit many members of the community from the benefits of programming within the building. The building's envelope and mechanical systems are aging, inefficient, and costly to maintain and repair. The facility lacks the infrastructure for economically feasible, modern security systems (i.e. comprehensive, integrated PA, interior and exterior surveillance, controlled entry, etc.).

GRADE AND SCHOOL CONFIGURATION

CLASS SIZE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The Dedham Public Schools have dedicated strategic energy and resources over time to maintain optimal class sizes in the elementary grade span. Low student:teacher ratios, particularly, in the earlier grades are critical to student achievement. Students in the elementary grade span require high levels of individual attention as they acclimate to the structure and duration of the school day, establish foundational early literacy and numeracy skills and concepts, and develop independence in the school setting. As such, the Dedham Public Schools and the Dedham School Committee intend to maintain class sizes between 16-18 in grades one through five.

SCHOOL SCHEDULING

The current school day schedule at all Dedham elementary schools, including Oakdale, is directly linked to Dedham’s commitment to academic excellence, social emotional wellness and health, equity for all learners and meaningful opportunities for educators to collaborate and plan together. The school day is generally distributed across the core content areas of reading, writing, math, science, and Social Studies. Additional time during the day is focused on the District’s priorities of Social and Emotional Learning, meaningful play and social interaction, and creating a well rounded educational experience via the Unified Arts. A detailed breakdown of time allocations to these educational priorities is provided below:

DAILY INSTRUCTIONAL TIME ALLOCATION (MIN) IN GRADES 1-5

GRADE	READING	WRITING	MATH	SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES	SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING	UNIFIED ARTS	LUNCH AND RECESS
1	90	45	55	25	20	40	60
2	90	45	60	25	20	40	60
3	60	60	60	40	20	40	60
4	60	60	60	40	20	40	60
5	60	60	60	40	20	40	60

The school day schedule is also structured to ensure that all students are able to access supplemental literacy and numeracy intervention services, special education instruction, related services, guidance and counseling, and English Language instruction as needed.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

MISSION

The mission of the Dedham Public Schools, in partnership with the community, is to promote excellence in learning, self-discipline, and motivation.

This mission statement reflects the most fundamental goals of the community for its young people. At this time the district and community are working in partnership to develop a new, modern learning facility to replace the outdated Oakdale school building. Anticipated to impact an expected 360 students, the educational program and vision for the future is clear and articulated. Fundamentally, Dedham's vision for a new facility ensures that our young learners have access to a space that is warm, welcoming, bright, and conducive to excellence in learning, self-discipline, and motivation.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

The educational philosophy of the Dedham Public Schools is grounded in the Instructional Core (Elmore, 2009). The Instructional Core positions the interaction between students, teachers, and content at the heart of the educational enterprise and suggests that (a) all actions of the organization should be focused on the instructional core and (b) there are only three ways to improve students learning at scale: (1) increase the teacher's instructional knowledge and skill, (2) increase the level of complexity of the content students must learn and (3) change the role of the student in the instructional process.

STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Dedham's educational philosophy gives purpose and shape to the district's strategic improvement efforts. These efforts include (1) ensuring a safe, supportive, and equitable learning environment where all students feel welcome and find success, (2) ensuring that students have voice and choice in a robust, student centered learning experience, (3) ensuring that the District's PK-12 curriculum is rigorous, relevant, and aligned to state standards and community expectations, and (4) ensuring that all faculty and staff have the resources necessary to support their ongoing professional learning, development, and success.

EDUCATIONAL, ARCHITECTURAL, AND COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

The District’s mission, educational philosophy, and strategic improvement efforts inform broad considerations for the design of a new elementary facility and are linked directly to the educational, architectural, and community priorities identified by Dedham’s visioning team.

The visioning team identified seven major design principles and patterns that are critical considerations in the design of a new facility. to the way it provides education to all students. The intent is that the design of the new school should both reflect and facilitate these principles.

1. **SAFE AND WELCOMING** - Creating a physical and psychological environment that is safe, secure and welcoming is the foundation of an effective learning environment
2. **SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING, COMMUNITY, AND BELONGING** - Creating safe, caring and culturally responsive community in our classrooms and schools
3. **STUDENT CENTERED, SOCIAL LEARNING** - Creating a space that facilitates student voice and choice in learning opportunities and collaborative, social learning experiences
4. **PROJECT BASED LEARNING** - Engaging students in real-world and personally meaningful projects.
5. **INCLUSION AND UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING** - Providing inclusive instruction, accessibility, and a welcoming physical plant.
6. **CO-TEACHING** - Building a service delivery model based on “push-in” services and the careful and intentional design of co-teaching.
7. **EDUCATOR COLLABORATION AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY** - Building a comprehensive MTSS model that allows teachers and specialists to devote substantial time to teacher collaboration.

KEY DESIGN IMPLICATIONS

The District's strategic direction and the priorities established by the visioning committee suggest the following broad design patterns that should be considered as project development moves forward. While these are stated specifically here they are woven throughout this educational program and serve as the basis for other design implications that are more specifically geared towards the needs of specific programs and functions in the new facility.

Honoring The Past And Embracing The Future.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should incorporate historical elements of existing facilities and reflect the unique nature of the communities that the school serves. The physical structure of the facility should reflect the community and, simultaneously, clearly demonstrate its function, utility, and benefit to faculty, children and the broader community.

School As A Community Resource.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider and incorporate adjacencies and functionality that ensures the building is able to serve the community year round. Before, after, and summer school programs will operate in the building. Youth sports, community program uses, and adult education should also be considered as design proceeds.

Enhancing Community Connections.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider how the building might enhance existing or create potential for new community partnerships. The District is very interested in creating opportunities for high school internships and service learning opportunities while also expanding the potential for use by community groups and organizations during non-school hours.

Outdoor Spaces And Play.

The design of Dedham's newest elementary school facility should consider the creation of welcoming and functional outdoor spaces that enhance the school and surrounding community. Outdoor learning spaces are critical in supporting inquiry and project based learning models deployed in the Dedham Public Schools. Playing fields to support physical activity during the school day through the District's physical education program and recess and physical activity beyond the school day through youth sports programs are a high priority for the community.

Security And Welcome.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should incorporate state of the art design principles and technologies for ensuring the safe and secure operation of the school without compromising the look and feel of an elementary school.

Classroom Neighborhoods.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should consider classroom neighborhoods as a key design pattern to support the communities overarching goals and strategic priorities. The sense of community, welcoming, and belonging for students is key at the elementary level and the clustering of small groups of classrooms around learning commons supports collaborative, project based learning opportunities for children, invites inclusivity and integration of students with special needs, and encourages high levels of professional collaboration necessary to effectively implement Dedham’s educational vision.

Agile Classrooms.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should ensure that all classrooms are sufficiently well-sized and outfitted to facilitate student-centered, differentiated, culturally responsive, and inquiry-based teaching and learning. For students to learn how to think critically, solve complex problems, create, and communicate effectively, they should have opportunities to engage in a wide range of learning activities that include direct instruction, small group work, independent learning, project-based learning, and hands-on learning.

Flexible and modular furniture should be easy to rearrange as needed to support varied instructional strategies, team teaching, and the delivery of MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support). Technology should be consistent and robust to facilitate the use of varied digital devices and platforms that enhance student engagement and learning. Adequate storage should provide easy access to books and instructional materials, and adjacent breakout and extended learning (commons) spaces should be provided to ensure that all students have access to varied venues for differentiated and dynamic teaching and learning.

Professional Collaboration, Learning, And Work.

The design of Dedham’s newest elementary school facility should recognize that teaching is a complex, dynamic, and social process. Just as students must be supported in their work and learning, teachers must also be provided with well outfitted common planning and storage spaces that enable them to work effectively as professional learning communities. Professional workspaces should be located in close proximity to classroom neighborhoods, support independent and collaborative planning, and provide teachers with areas to work, socialize, and recharge.

TEACHING METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE

DEDHAM'S INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Dedham's instructional framework consists fundamentally of (1) a guaranteed and viable curriculum, (2) universal screening and common assessments, (3) shared resources for teaching, (4) time to collaborate with colleagues on tasks relating directly to improving the instructional core, and (5) high quality, sustained professional learning opportunities that are grounded directly in day to day work with students.

Guaranteed And Viable Curriculum. A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the bedrock upon which the rest of the district's work is situated. Guaranteed suggests that (a) the curriculum is understood, accepted, and enacted by all responsible for its implementation and (b) all students, regardless of their teacher or school, will have access to the same content, knowledge, skills, and opportunity to learn. Viable suggests that the content is (a) relevant to the short and long term success of children, (b) aligned to support the development of skills and concepts over time, and (c) able to be taught and learned within the time permitted during a given school year. In the years ahead, Dedham will begin to shift its curriculum so that it aligns with state guidance on high quality instructional materials.

Universal Screening And Common Assessments. Universal screenings and common assessments are designed to (a) assess and monitor student learning and progress relative to established standards and learning outcomes, (b) generate student performance data that teams of professionals can plan and differentiate instruction effectively and (c) provide timely, meaningful performance information using tools that are efficient and maintain high levels of time in learning. In Dedham, District Data Teams consisting of central office administration, principals, coaches and elementary team leaders convene bi-weekly to review elementary student learning assessments in the core academic content areas of reading, writing, and numeracy. School leaders take the data sets back to the building level, where principals, coaches, and teachers gather to analyze the data and make instructional decisions about how to make adjustments to practice.

Shared Resources And Common Language For Teaching. Shared resources and language represent the third element of Dedham's instructional framework. A guaranteed and viable curriculum coupled with common curriculum based assessments set the stage for powerful practice and high levels of student learning. With these elements in place, we can then begin the process of identifying resources that are (a) consistent with our instructional vision and (b) effective in supporting student learning. As we identify shared resources that meet these

basic criteria we must also build a shared language for teaching and learning. Shared resources ensure that (a) faculty and staff have a dedicated and vetted set of tools to draw from as they plan and execute learning opportunities for students (b) faculty and staff are able to focus less time on tracking down resources/materials and more time thinking about differentiating for and engaging all students, and (c) students throughout DPS have similar experiences and build a shared understanding of and language for learning.

Time For Collaboration That Focuses On Tasks Directly Relating To The Instructional Core. The first three elements of the framework are driven by professional teams who have the time and training to engage with colleagues in evaluating (a) student performance (b) the overall efficacy of our curriculum, and (c) the resources we use to deploy that curriculum. Collaboration happens throughout the day but is guaranteed during “common planning times” where grade level teams meet during a scheduled time of day at least once per week to discuss teaching and learning. During these dedicated times of day, teachers work with an instructional leader to look at student work in service of making adjustments to practice that respond to student needs.

High Quality, Sustained Professional Learning Opportunities That Are Grounded Directly In Day To Day Work With Students. The preceding elements of the district’s instructional framework are predicated on the assumption that there is a robust and systematic professional development structure. Dedham’s professional development structure is driven by and responsive to the needs of students and teachers as identified by rich, multi-faceted sources of performance data and reflect research based practices that sustain professional learning over time.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

The following guiding principles reflect the methodology employed by teachers across core academic content areas: (1) learning must be student-centered, (2) instruction should be evidence-based, (3) teachers work as coaches or “facilitators” of student learning, (4) inquiry leads to deeper learning for all, (5) curriculum must have multiple access points and (6) learning is a collaborative, social process.

Learning Must Be Student-Centered. In Dedham, we believe that deep learning must position the learner at the center of the classroom. In order to accomplish this, teachers must have a deep understanding of how to analyze student assessments to make informed decisions about instruction and design learning targets for each individual student.

Instruction Should Be Evidence-Based. In order for teachers to implement district curricula in service of helping students meet learning objectives, teachers must employ a broad-range of instructional strategies that are appropriate to the task at hand and also provide opportunities for all students to access the curriculum. In content areas such as reading, for example, there is a body of research and knowledge that informs “best practices” for

reading instruction. In this instance, teaching students how to read requires explicit and systematic instruction as learning science tells us that students acquire the ability to read on a developmental continuum.

Teachers Work As Coaches Or “Facilitators” Of Student Learning. In order to prepare students for an “innovation” economy where students need to know how to be critical thinkers who can solve complex problems, think flexibly, and communicate effectively, it’s important that we teach students how to become independent learners. In order to support students taking ownership of their own learning, teachers can act as a “guide on the side” or “facilitator” of student learning. This model of education, which posits the student at the center of the learning process, challenges more traditional views upon the relationship between teacher and student.

Inquiry Leads To Deeper Learning For All. Inquiry remains especially critical to student learning in Science, Technology, and Engineering as well as History and the Social Sciences. In these content areas, inquiry is central to how DPS students engage with district curriculum. “The ability to develop focused research questions in history and social science or define the dimensions of a particular policy problem is central to learning in these disciplines” (MA Frameworks for History/Social Science, 2018) and, likewise, in the sciences “investigation, experimentation, design, and analytical problem solving are central to an effective science and technology/engineering program” (MA Science and Technology Engineering Framework, 2016).

Curriculum Must Have Multiple Access Points. In order for students to access a culturally responsive curriculum that provides opportunities for voice and choice, teachers must provide students with multiple access points. Universal design for learning provides a framework by which teachers employ multiple strategies in order to provide students with opportunities for engagement, representation, action and expression.

Learning Is A Collaborative, Social Process. Research resoundingly supports the notion that learning is a complex and dynamic social process. To that end, the Dedham Public Schools believes that students must have opportunities throughout the day to engage in high-quality social interactions with peers and adults.

CORE CURRICULUM

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Dedham's elementary students engage in a cohesive, vertically aligned continuum of learning experiences in reading, writing, speaking, listening, phonics, and phonemic awareness. These experiences are aligned closely to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for English Language arts and are delivered using a workshop methodology. The workshop model of instruction reflects and embeds Dedham's instructional framework and guiding principles discussed earlier.

The workshop model is an approach to teaching reading and writing that allows children to develop independence and confidence in their reading, to fall in love with books, and support agency as writers. In the Dedham Public Schools, we use the Teachers College Units of Study for Reading and Writing to guide our practices in the workshop model. There is a predictable structure to each workshop.

Workshops for reading and writing range from 60 - 90 minutes daily and consist of a whole group mini-lesson (10-15 minutes), independent practice of reading and writing skills (40-45 minutes), and a whole group wrap up of the day's learning (5-10 minutes). During the mini lesson and whole group wrap up students convene in shared space for a teacher directed discussion of content. This is usually accompanied by reading texts or student work aloud, drafting anchor charts and rubrics for work on a teacher workstation, and 1:1 or small group student conversations. During independent work students move to individual or small group spaces throughout the classroom to engage in direct practice of skills and concepts from the day's lesson. Students need ample room to spread out and work in spaces that are conducive to their learning and work styles. While students practice independently, teachers and other educational faculty circulate the room to confer with students and provide feedback or pull small groups for review, reteaching, or extension of skills and concepts. In short, the workshop methodology requires ample space in each classroom for whole group instruction, independent practice, and multiple, concurrent small instructional groups. Given the regular movement of students and faculty throughout the school day, additional design consideration must be given to traffic patterns within learning spaces.

The workshop model for reading and writing instruction relies heavily on students having access to thousands of texts. In the elementary grade spans two primary factors drive the maintenance of robust classroom libraries. First and foremost, children must have access to ample selections of texts that are at their independent reading level. Reading levels vary widely in the early elementary grade span and the texts they are accessing range from

wordless picture books to complex chapter books. In addition to the range of reading levels and text complexity are the varied interests of children. Classroom libraries must account for reading levels, text complexity, and student interest. In considering these variables, classroom libraries at the elementary level are composed of thousands of texts. All classroom spaces in the new facility must be designed with spaces that allow for appropriate storage and display of these libraries as well as student access to the print materials.

MATHEMATICS

Dedham Public Schools currently use EveryDay Math 4 (EDM4) which is a research-based program developed by The University of Chicago Mathematics Project. It is closely aligned to The Common Core and like The Common Core is aimed at developing all students' mathematical power - their ability to reason, communicate, and solve problems. EDM4 also works to help students develop the belief that math is worthwhile and confidence in their own mathematical abilities.

There are a number of features that distinguish EDM4 curriculum and they include:

- An emphasis on the application of mathematics to real world situations that are relevant to everyday life.
- A variety of learning opportunities that balance teacher-directed instruction with opportunities for open-ended, hands-on explorations, long-term projects, and on-going practice.
- A variety of methodologies for basic skills practice that include written and oral fact drills, mental math routines, practice with fact triangles, daily review problems (Math Boxes), home work (Home Links) and a variety of math games for in school and at home practice.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING

Dedham's science curriculum is aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), incorporating all standards for the science and engineering practices, and core disciplinary ideas. The District employs an inquiry based, experiential curriculum developed by Carolina Biological Sciences called Building Blocks of Science (BBS). BBS is composed of three units of study per grade level and are taught sequentially over the course of the school year.

BBS uses a constructivist approach to learning in which students engage in active processes of hands-on inquiry, investigation of resources, and class discussion to develop conceptual understandings and construct knowledge. The curriculum follows an instructional model that consists of five phases (also called the 5Es):

- **Engagement:** students draw upon prior knowledge to make connections to new concepts or topics

- **Exploration:** students are provided with an activity related to a concept or topics and are encouraged to make claims and observations, collect evidence, and ask questions
- **Explanation:** students use observations and discussion to construct an explanation for a concept or topic they are studying
- **Elaboration:** students draw upon their experiences and apply knowledge to a new situation to demonstrate understanding
- **Evaluation:** students assess their knowledge and review what they have learned

All of the BBS units use examples of science phenomena in the real world to make student learning relevant and meaningful. Each day in science, students participate in hands-on activities that provide opportunities to build their growing conceptual understanding of science concepts and make connections to how this helps them better understand the world around them. They make these connections in class discussions, in design challenges, and as they write in their science notebooks. The literacy components of BBS (Literacy Readers, Literacy Articles, Science in the News Article Reports) also contribute to student growth by building vocabulary, content understanding, and developing cross curricular connections as well.

HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Presently, the district is transitioning to a new History/Social Sciences curriculum. The district is currently using Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt's Into Social Studies but is undergoing a pilot for InquirEd's Inquiry Journeys. This curriculum was designed to meet the demands for inquiry in the Massachusetts History and Social Science Framework.

In Inquiry Journeys, students investigate History, Geography, and Civics by exploring complex questions. They gather evidence from books, pictures, artifacts, and other sources – and use their learning to make an impact on their community.

At the core of Inquiry Journeys is the opportunity for students to engage in an inquiry-question. Each unit culminates in taking informed action - providing opportunities for civic engagement and service learning.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING

In alignment with the goal of creating safe, caring and culturally responsive classrooms and schools, the District strives to create time and space for individual students to carve out their own place and path in a school and classroom community where each student feels affirmed, valued and included.

Dedham makes a consistent effort to support programs that address social-emotional learning so students feel valued, known, and included. Core to this effort is building a strong sense of community and connection among students and adults in each classroom and school. This takes the form of teaching social skills directly with such programs as Responsive Classroom and Second Step. Teachers use a common language throughout the school as they promote partnered learning, cooperative groups, and an array of community-building activities.

Major activities applied by most teachers include the morning meeting and closing (end-of-day) meeting, as well as classroom problem-solving meetings to address issues in the classroom.

- Morning meetings in particular involve whole-group activities, such as greeting exchanges or short games, so that students get to know each other and build a sense of community.
- Each of the meeting structures within Responsive Classroom begins with students seated in a circle so that everyone can see each other and there is a sense of equality among students.

To build empathy, Dedham educators prioritize building personalized classroom communities through social-emotional learning. The goal is for every student to have a personal relationship and sense of connection with teachers and classmates and to recognize themselves as valuable and contributing members of their school community. This includes morning, class, and closing meetings that build a sense of community within the classroom.

Design Implications for Teaching and Learning in Core Content Areas

Community Gathering and Connection Space. Seating space and a stage are needed for the school assemblies that involve skits and recognitions. Additionally, breakout learning areas within the neighborhood commons, as well as extended learning areas such as the cafeteria and media center, should also support community gathering and connection.

Direct Instruction. Special attention is needed for the placement of technology within the room (specifically projectors and document camera), which should be positioned to allow teachers and students to share their thinking and their work

Collaboration. Classrooms in a grade level grouped together, with common planning/PLC spaces and student common breakout spaces (neighborhood commons)

Classroom Libraries & Independent Reading. Large area with spacious bookshelves that border two adjacent edges of a large rug; Bookshelves that fit underneath windows and technology/whiteboards; allowing students to reach materials independently

Small-Group Work & Flexible Groups. Small-group rooms distributed among the grade-level classrooms and neighborhood learning commons will support small-group work, intervention programming, and the provision of special education and related services.

- Flexible and modular seating for students to work collaboratively and independently
- Students need access to spaces where they can play “math games” with their peers

Fostering Independence. Ensuring that classroom spaces are designed to ensure that learning materials are accessible to students and promote independence and self-direction.

Outdoor Learning Spaces. Adjacency and access to outdoor learning spaces is a critical design consideration that will support the project based, experiential nature of the District’s instructional methodology.

Storage. The hands-on, project based approach to teaching and learning at the elementary level is materials intensive and requires teachers to maintain large collections of texts, manipulatives, and consumables. Every classroom and classroom neighborhood needs ample individual and shared storage spaces to support Dedham’s pedagogical model.

Book Room(s). Create shared access to small group reading materials, which are designed to be shared by educators within and across grade level teams. Book rooms should include space for collaboration among educators, professional texts, and space for small-group lessons. These rooms can double as the instructional coaches’ offices, giving these teachers access to the resources.

Furniture Flexibility & Mobility. The classroom should be equipped with furniture that offers flexibility and mobility so that elementary students can assist in creating and manipulating spaces as needed for specific activities. Flexible furnishings can promote student teamwork while other furnishings encourage independence, consistent with a Universal Design approach.

VISUAL ARTS

The Dedham Public Schools art program for grades 1-5 provides an inquiry-based approach to visual art education allowing students to explore 2D and 3D materials. All students in the K-5 span engage in 40 minutes of visual arts each week. Classes are designed to be inclusive environments for all abilities and skill levels. The visual art curriculum provides students with both 2-D and (limited) 3-D projects that have students focus on the elements and principles of design, introduction to art history, and current trends in the art world. Unit and lesson plans are designed intentionally to allow students to explore materials and engage with the subject matter in unique ways.

Students currently access a wide range of materials to express their creativity. Materials may include, but are not limited to: ceramic clay, plasticine clay, model magic, paper, paint (acrylic, tempera, and watercolor) markers, crayons, yarn, fabric, papier mache, cardboard, canvas, wood, printmaking materials.

OAKDALE

The current Oakdale art room is a retrofitted classroom located on the second floor of the original school building. This classroom is consistently hot due to the weather or radiator heat causing the art teacher to run fans and open windows all year long to get the room to a semi-comfortable temperature. There is no sink in the room. The water source is in the hallway and one needs to go through two sets of doors to get to it. The sink is located outside two regular education classrooms. This causes the art teacher to have a water bucket system in her art room to allow students to do wet media-based projects. The lack of a water source affects the caliber and variety of student projects. There are 6 tables, a teacher's desk, and a rug in the room which allows students to have a proper workspace. The storage space for materials is limited and most storage cabinets are broken. There is limited technology, only a desktop computer and projector. There is no kiln on-site requiring the teacher to travel to fire clay work for students.

Design Implications for Visual Arts

Creating visual arts spaces that enhance the experience and creative capacity of Dedham's students is critical to the design of a new facility for the District. Dedham envisions a space that has robust technology that supports modern pedagogical methods and 21st century tools that promote and enhance creative expression. This space also has the capacity to accommodate traditional visual art media: painting, drawing, collage, printmaking and sculpture.

As imagination and creativity are at the heart of elementary art programs the ability to plan and implement improved two and three- dimensional projects with proper prep, storage, kiln, and drying area will enhance the art programming offered at this level. A properly designed dedicated space for the visual arts will allow better student engagement, improved instruction, and an increase in the production of student projects.

Safety. A safe learning environment for art instruction that has proper equipment will allow the art teacher to plan for multimedia projects that reflect 21st-century learning skills. Allowing students to create and explore the visual arts in the safe and inviting art classroom will provide improved student engagement and student outcomes (projects) for the next generation of students in the Dedham Public Schools (DPS).

Storage. Materials will be stored properly, in line with the manufacturer's instruction which will prolong the lifespan of many art materials. The room would also have ample counter space for project storage and provisioning of supplies. A large materials storage room accessed from the art room area should provide adequate storage for art materials.

- A teacher prep table to store materials, house the paper cutter, and access to an electrical outlet for hot glue/lightbox access.
- Kiln will have its own separate storage in the kiln room

Display Space. Proper display space for student work will allow the student to showcase their work which is a cornerstone of the new Massachusetts State Visual Art Standards.

Project-Based Learning Space. The project-based area contains storage for ongoing projects;

Whole Group Learning Area. The new Art room contains a whole-group learning area for instruction that is centered around a smartboard and document camera for demonstrations on a large-screen display, as well as a whiteboard and bulletin board.

Sinks. Multiple large sinks (2), a clay sink (with clay trap), and a ceramics area, with, and one for mixed media materials.

Kiln. The kiln is housed in a separate well-vented area that is an accessible area to the instructional space and is able to be secured to avoid potential danger when firing and cooling. This area will have proper storage for ceramic work.

Counter Space. The room would also have ample counter space for project storage and provisioning of supplies.

Light. The room should be designed to allow for ample natural and interior lighting. Both sources of light should have readily available controls to adjust the volume of light in the space.

Adjacencies. In order to maximize collaborative teaching and program adjacencies, the Visual Art space would ideally be accessible to the Makerspace area and library allowing for collaboration and increased project-based learning throughout the school building.

PERFORMING ARTS

The Performing Arts curriculum is a sequential program of study building skills, concepts, and competencies in grades one through five. The units of study and lesson plans deliver the curriculum are aligned with and driven by the Massachusetts State Music Frameworks. The learning opportunities include singing, playing instruments, improvisation and composition, reading and notation, and critical response. Students in grades 1-5 receive 40-minutes of general music instruction per week with their class.

In addition to this music class, Dedham's fourth and fifth grade classes participate in grade-level chorus for 40-minutes each week. Music classes and chorus rehearsals are held in a designated music space equipped with a keyboard or piano, and a variety of percussion instruments (pitched and unpitched), class sets of drums, Orff instruments, ukuleles, and student keyboards. Fourth and fifth graders at each elementary school have the opportunity to learn a beginning band instrument in group lessons that are conducted on a rotating basis one day each week in the designated music space by the music teacher. Lesson sizes range from 5 to 18 students and are 30 minutes in length.

Oakdale does not currently have ample space for movement or storage of all instruments. As a result, class time is used to reconfigure the space for various activities that should be happening in each music class. Also, teachers are limited in what they can plan because of space limitations. Young students need to move in order to truly experience the performing arts. Restrictions on the child's ability to actively engage with performing arts content can create discipline issues as students are not given the types of motor input and channels for output needed to fully experience music and express themselves. While each school presents movement elements (Laban movement efforts and folk dance), the limited space creates classroom management issues as teachers address behaviors that arise from insufficient space to move freely and safely through the room.

Concerts And Performances. In addition to the core program, each elementary school presents two concerts annually which feature performances by combined grade levels (1-5), choruses of 4th and 5th graders, and band students. These take place in the winter and spring and are well attended by parents, families, and caregivers. Dedham's young people look forward to these opportunities to display their hard work and skills.

Performances at Oakdale are held in gymnasiums with stages that significantly limit the educator's ability to showcase student learning and for the audience to fully enjoy the performances. The level floor, height of the stage, acoustics and lighting do not support the breadth of performance that the program is able to accomplish in a sloped floor auditorium like Riverdale's.

Design Implications for Performing Arts

The District believes that a stand alone space for the Performing Arts program would best suit the needs of students and the community. General music classes for all students, choral programs, instrumental music lessons, and community performances and concerts compose the core program and require dedicated, stable space and storage for success. Beyond the core program Dedham's facilities are used by the broader community to host evening and summer events and programs. The Dedham Public Schools seeks to enhance and extend its capacity to operate its facilities as community centers. Additionally the District is also currently in the process of expanding its before, after, and summer school programming for all students. A dedicated performing arts space is central to the long term success of core programming, extended school day/year programming, and community programming.

Capacity. The ideal music room for a new elementary school in Dedham would need to be larger than a regular classroom to accommodate the choral program, dancing, instrumental music, and direct instruction.

Storage. Ample storage for the Performing Arts program in the new facility is critical. The program requires instruments, movement props, and associated teaching materials. These items are generally larger than traditional teaching equipment and are not able to be stacked and stored neatly in traditional storage areas.

Small Group/Break-Out Space. Spaces for the performing arts should have adjacent and adjoining small group breakout spaces where educators and students can work in small group settings to collaborate and practice skills and concepts.

Practice Rooms. In addition to the adjoining instrumental room, several practice rooms/dressing rooms should be included, along with designated storage spaces for sets, props and costumes for our growing theater programming.

Performing Area. The performance area should be situated adjacent to the music classroom, and should be large enough to accommodate band and theater programs. The space should readily accommodate choral risers (and their storage), dance showcases, and cast and crew for theater. Appropriate space to the left and right of the stage should be part of the design to support mobile sets and stage entry for performers. The stage should be high enough for visibility from the audience, yet low enough for optimal acoustics and lighting.

Ambiance. The design of the performance space should be well ventilated, sound-proofed, and provide for complete and easy control of interior and exterior lighting.

HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Dedham Public Schools Wellness Department focuses on providing all students with age and grade appropriate Fitness and Health programming at the Elementary level. It is our goal to teach students about the importance of and health benefits of enjoying an active and healthy lifestyle while encouraging students to adopt a routine of daily movement. Dedham's Health and Physical Education curriculum is closely aligned to the Massachusetts Comprehensive Health Education Frameworks, National Health Education Standards, the National Physical Education Standards and Shape America Grade Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.

Fitness and health education are essential elements of the Department's instructional program. Each Elementary School has at least one designated instructor certified in both Health and Physical Education. All students at the Elementary Schools receive two forty minute physical education classes each week and these classes combine elements of Health and Physical education. In the structure of the physical education class, students receive mini health lessons that introduce topics on SEL, safety, nutrition, heart health, communication, emotional management and decision making to name a few.

Skills and concepts embedded within each unit of study are reinforced through game play, situational opportunities and physical activity. Additionally, each spring, all Dedham Public School students in Grade 5 receive a unit on Human Growth and Development taught collaboratively by the Wellness faculty, Nurses, and Elementary School Counselors in the different buildings.

The current instructional spaces for health and physical education at Oakdale, are less than equitable and often serve a number of purposes not related to health and physical education. The gymnasium is part of the stage or "auditorium", which often results in loss of the classroom space for speakers, presentations, concerts, assemblies and weekly choir classes for students in grades 4 and 5. Additionally, due to the open space, the gymnasium has been used to house book fairs as well as class and individual school photos for the students consuming multiple dates in the calendar year.

At present, the gymnasium space is the only space where the entire school can gather indoors. As a result, the health and physical education classes are directly impacted by the inadequate infrastructure and instructional space which is limited in functionality, due to both the size of the gymnasium, the lack of storage space, and additional usage during the school year. The outdoor space is adequate in size and could benefit from additional storage dedicated to Physical Education classes.

Both the Middle School and Avery Elementary have provided insight on how scheduling, class size and the number of classes simultaneously using the instructional space impact

instruction and student learning. In each case, the facility may have multiple classes with upwards to 60 students using the space together. Although some relief is offered in that joint classes have recently been scheduled within the same grade, the large number of students impact participation, skill development, and choice of activities.

Design Implications for Health and Physical Education

Moving forward with a new design for instructional space, essential elements should include:

Dedicated Space: a large area that is designated for use as a gymnasium alone. This space should be large enough to host multiple classes where students can move freely, safely and without restriction.

Classroom Teaching Space: Health and Physical education at the elementary level. Classroom for health classes. This could also double as a PD space

Outdoor Space: Adjacency to the gymnasium.

STUDENT SERVICES & SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Dedham Public Schools Student Services team provides evaluations, consultation, and direct services to approximately 570 students with disabilities (~20% of enrollment) via Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), approximately 144 students with disabling conditions (~6% of enrollment), students with medical needs, students for whom English is a second language, students with mental and behavioral health challenges, homeless students, and students who require accommodation plans. Some of our elementary schools also house district programs for children with autism, language-based learning disabilities, and mental-behavioral health challenges.

STUDENT SERVICES STAFFING

As planning for the new facility proceeds, the designers will need to understand the types of student services and special education programs operated in the building as well as the number of students served, the number of staff, and the necessary adjacencies to ensure high levels of students learning and professional collaboration. The chart below provides a comprehensive summary of student services staffing for (a) current enrollments at the Oakdale, Riverdale, and Greenlodge schools and (b) projected enrollments of 360, 560, and 665 as per MSBA models.

PERSONNEL	Current Configuration			New Building Enrollments		
	OAK	RIV	GRNL	360	560	665
Special Education Teachers	5	6	6	5	6	7
Special Education Teacher (STAR)	0	0	2	0	0	2
Paraprofessionals	9	8	11	8	20	25
Speech & Language Pathologist (SLP)	1	1	1.2	1	2	2
Occupational Therapist (OT)	1	1	0.8	1	1.5	2
Physical Therapist (PT)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Education Team Leader (ETL)	.5	.5	.5	.5	1	1

SPECIAL EDUCATION CLINICS, OFFICES, AND MEETING SPACES

Currently, the Oakdale elementary school serves 46 students with special needs. Each of these students is provided with a wide range of specially designed instruction and therapeutic services articulated in an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP is a contract between the family and the school system that identifies in clear and specific terms the needs of the child, the goals for the child's programming, the specific interventions and supports that the child needs, and the timelines for review and revision of the IEP.

Every Elementary School in Dedham is staffed with an Education Team Leader (ETL) who is primarily responsible for evaluation timelines, IEP development timelines, compliance and special education regulations, scheduling and monitoring of services, parent consultation, and teacher consultation. Supporting the student services associated with the implementation and maintenance of 157 IEPs is essential to family engagement and students' success. To do so, the ETL meets regularly with families, service providers, and other stakeholders to monitor student progress and plan for services moving forward. ETL's host mandated eligibility determination, annual reviews, and three year reviews for all students on their caseloads. In addition to IEP mandated meetings, ETLs meet regularly with their staff to provide policy/legislative updates, case consultation, and other professional training. As a result, the design of the new facility must include consideration for a confidential office space for the ETL as well as a meeting space that is centrally located, confidential, and able to accommodate up to 20 adults.

Special educators, speech language therapists, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and board certified behavioral analysts are clinicians that support students and the services they receive through their IEPs. These clinicians engage in consultation relating to children on their caseload, provision of direct clinical services to students in 1:1 and small group settings, and psychoeducational evaluations to assess and monitor student acquisition of skills and concepts. Each clinician requires a confidential office space that can accommodate these activities.

Design Implications for Special Education Clinics and Offices

- The ETL requires an office space to conduct confidential meetings and phone calls.
 - The design of the ETL's office space should include an adjacent storage/work room to accommodate confidential special education records that must be maintained in accordance with state and federal statutes.
 - The design of the ETL's office space should include an adjacent conference room that is large enough for up to 20 adults to accommodate IEP team meetings, professional consults, and training.

- Special educators and related service providers each require confidential office spaces that can accommodate consultation, psychoeducational assessment, and provision of direct services to individual and small groups of students.

INCLUSION AND PARTIAL INCLUSION CLASSROOMS

Inclusion classrooms. Services include push-in from itinerant specialists, pull-out for reinforcement of skills, co-teaching, evaluation, and consultation. In the current context, Black and Hispanic students are about 30% more likely to be identified for special education. They are also more likely to be identified for behavior (eg., ADHD) and mental health-related challenges than White students. Moreover, there are economic disparities between schools.

There are lasting impacts on students who are misidentified. Regardless of race, children who are identified may have less access to rigorous content standards and curricula, less access to typically developing peers, and less access to expert content teachers (US Department of Education, 2016). Thus it is important to address issues of overidentification in situations with and without disproportionality. High-leverage instructional practices and teacher professional development have a significant positive impact on student performance (Hattie, 2008). It is important to offer a variety of on-ramps in the general curriculum, high-quality instruction, and alternative service delivery methods such as co-teaching so that students with disabilities are not excluded and so that students without disabilities can receive support without being referred. Inclusion classrooms are regular education classes where students with educational disabilities are educated along with their nondisabled peers.

In Dedham, most students receive services in inclusion or partial inclusion settings, and our goal is to remove barriers for traditionally marginalized groups by expanding in-class support by increasing “push-in” services and by providing a comprehensive co-teaching model consistent with our Student Services Strategic Plan.

Within a co-taught general education setting, students with special needs participate as much as possible in a general education classroom with typically developing peers. A strong partnership between the general education teacher and special educator provides a setting that fosters a deeper understanding of various learning styles, exposes students with disabilities to typical role models, and an opportunity to receive diverse instructional strategies.

Accommodations and/or modifications are made for students to access grade level curriculum as well as the involvement of specialists and clinicians who provide services in mainstream settings. In general, all programming for students is designed on an individual case-by-case basis (per the Individual Education Program) and provided in an integrated model.

Partial Inclusion Classrooms. Partial inclusion programs, which Massachusetts regulations define as the student being in the special program between 21 percent and 60 percent of the day, require flexibility, professional collaboration, and co-teaching. The Greenlodge School serves 10 students in partial inclusion and the Riverdale school currently serves 7 students in partial inclusion settings.

Partial inclusion service delivery models are designed to meet the unique needs of children with developmental delays in more than one area of functioning. Mild developmental delays, global language challenges, and delayed social development may impact ability to access the reading, writing and math curriculum in the general education setting. The curriculum is modified for more specific targeting and review of essential skills.

Classroom emphasis is on full-engagement and internalization of classroom material. Students are highly motivated to learn, but typically have difficulty with longer term retention of material and require frequent review, repetition and re-application of skills. In addition, students in this model often require a high level of support, as well as a significantly slower pace compared to their grade-level peers.

Students who are identified for partial inclusion programming are included in general education classes as much as possible, but they have a wide variety of needs and require individualized services as well. They all share the need for a "home base," a place for pull-out services, and a place to receive explicit instruction in social skills. The students' language impairments often impact social functioning and comprehension of materials. Within this model, lessons and discussions are highly teacher-mediated for language development. Teachers continually model language and questioning techniques, and frequently cue students for elaboration of their responses.

Design Implications for Partial Inclusion Classrooms

Breakout Spaces: Breakout spaces adjoining classrooms provide opportunities for pre-teaching, teaching, and reteaching within the inclusion classrooms. Breakout spaces could be accessed by ELL teachers, instructional coaches, interventionists, special education teachers, speech/language pathologists and classroom teachers who require a quiet space and who are serving students in the two classrooms.

Learning Lab: Massachusetts law requires that students be educated with peers whose ages fall within a 48-month range. The ACCESS program requires one lower and one upper learning lab large enough for up to 12 students. Learning labs should be equipped with the same furniture, technology and storage as other classrooms.

Specialized Teaching and Readiness Program (S.T.A.R)

The Specialized Teaching and Readiness Program (S.T.A.R.) provides intensive support and instruction for students diagnosed with Autism Spectrum and related disorders. This program offers robust systematic and structured behavioral teaching approaches, complementing academic instruction, social pragmatic and social emotional support.

Highly specialized curriculum, related services and therapies, and a wide range of interventions are provided within the STAR program model. Among many, these include:

1. Intensive speech and language support
2. Assistive and augmentative communication devices
3. Small group, multi-sensory instruction
4. Peer modeling through inclusive experiences and support
5. Provision of multi-sensory academic instruction
6. Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)
7. Behavior management systems and Board Certified Behavioral Analyst (BCBA) services
8. Provision of significant adult support for addressing academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral needs
9. Physical and occupational therapy

A primary goal of the STAR program is to provide inclusion opportunities that support the generalization and transfer of skills, participation as appropriate in the general curriculum, and participation to the greatest extent possible with nondisabled peers. These focus areas ensure opportunities for STAR students to increase their independent skills in all areas including academics, recreation, social, communication skills, self-care, motor skills, and behavior management.

Consultation and coordination between special educators, related service providers, BCBA's and classroom teachers serving the STAR program ensures that consistent approaches are utilized across settings to promote student growth and learning. Collaboration in planning amongst professionals is critical to the program's success and ensures a robust co-teaching model in which students experience a combination of supported inclusion, discrete trial training and/or 1:1 instruction, small-group activities, incidental teaching and community learning. The program is based on the principles of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) with a focus on individualized reinforcement systems and consistent behavior management programs.

Presently the STAR program lacks sufficient space that is appropriately configured to support the program goals and associated methodologies specified above. Special educators

and related service providers share office and work spaces which creates efficacy issues for direct support to students, distractions for students during clinical/therapeutic sessions, and compromises the privacy and confidentiality of these spaces.

The lack of adequate and appropriately configured space for the program also presents long term fiscal and statutory compliance issues for the District. The current STAR spaces do not allow for additional enrollment thus preventing the district from bringing students back from highly restrictive out-of-district placements. Statutorily the current program lacks ADA compliant amenities and, because there is only one space available, the age range within the program exceeds the 48 month maximum allowed by law.

Design Implications for the STAR Program

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility should include two classrooms for the STAR program to accommodate increased enrollments and the need to ensure statutory compliance with age span limits and ADA.

Students and staffing. The design of STAR classrooms should consider the need for maintenance of required student:teacher ratios. By law, the maximum student-teacher ratio in a substantially separate classroom is 8:1 or 12:2. Each STAR classroom will serve up to 12 students; and the general staffing pattern requires 1:1 or 2:1 instruction. As such, the STAR classroom must accommodate 12 students and 12 adults at all times.

Highly specialized instructional spaces. The design of STAR classrooms should include individualized study carrels for Discrete Trial (ABA) instruction.

Restrooms and sinks. The design of STAR classrooms must include handicap-accessible sinks and bathrooms for students who require support with self-care. This is a critical element because many STAR students require toileting support and other students are working on Activities of Daily Living (ADL) skills that are critical to independence and self-care.

Breakout Spaces. The design of STAR classrooms must include adjoining breakout spaces to facilitate the provision of highly specialized instructional methodologies for individual and small groups of students.

Sensory room. The design of STAR classrooms must include an adjoining sensory room to best meet the needs of students. Students with autism and autism spectrum disorders experience extreme sensitivity to sensory experiences. Sensory rooms will allow service providers to provide children with necessary sensory intervention and relief from the classroom conditions that at times overwhelm children’s capacity for sensory input and integration.

Key adjacencies. The design of the STAR classrooms should consider key adjacencies to all related service providers including speech, occupational, and physical therapists and BCBA.

Storage. Each classroom needs ample storage for instructional materials. Students with sensory-seeking behaviors may crash into shelving units, attempt to climb them, and ingest small non-food items. For safety reasons, storage options need to be out of sight and inaccessible to students.

Soundproofing. Sound field adaptations are strongly recommended and may include rubberized flooring, cork, or Flotex tiles and furniture with rubberized legs to reduce sensory overload for students. Soundproofing also includes sound deadening wall panels and rooms with solid walls and doors to reduce noise from students who become distressed or students who make frequent loud noises due to vocal stereotypes.

Sensory-friendly lighting. Sensory-friendly lighting is essential. For example, fluorescent lighting may be too harsh visually and creates a buzzing sound due to ballasts that regulate current to the lamps in fluorescent lighting systems. These systems have a high-pitched hum that children with autism may find so intolerable they cannot focus or engage.

Ambient noise. Auditory conditions of the classroom must be considered. Children may fixate on the hum from mechanical systems such as HVAC and be unable to concentrate. Other children may benefit from steadily modulated “white noise” machines.

Clearly defined classroom space. Changes to routine may cause duress, so classroom spaces need to be free from distractions and clearly defined by function.

Color. Color can have a substantial impact on learning.

- Harsh colors should be avoided. For students with autism, subdued colors with gray undertones, particularly those with blue/green hues are preferred.
- Clear contrast between ceilings and floors assists students with proprioceptive delays with spatial and proprioceptive challenges.
- Color used in tonal blocks and color-coding doors or hallways by function is often helpful for navigation, independence, and feelings of security.

Student Pathways. Attention must be paid to the paths students use to move through the building.

- Hallways that are too large or long can be intimidating, and hallways that are too enclosed can cause discomfort. These structures can encourage escape-avoidance behaviors that are unsafe.
- Patterned floors are confusing, disorienting, and increase anxiety.
- Exits that are open to children’s field of vision can cause fight/flight responses, large and imposing facades as well as soaring porticos can be frightening, and open staircase designs can be disorienting; therefore, travel options in the form of circulation spaces are preferable.

- Curved hallways without blind corners, and points of interest such as seating nooks, can help children to understand, predict, and navigate the environment.
- Passive seclusion opportunities built into the spaces would assist students with sensory and social-emotional challenges to self-manage and escape in safe and socially appropriate ways.
- Another design implication might be to make the school smaller and more welcoming by dividing it into “neighborhoods” or sections with enclosed common areas and by providing alternative pathways for getting from one place to another.



Example of ABA/Discrete Trial Training (DTT) side of double classroom.

ELEMENTARY COMPLEX LEARNER PROGRAM

Delays in language skills may impact a student’s ability to access the Reading, Writing and Math curriculum in the general education setting. The curriculum is modified for more specific targeting and review of essential skills. Classroom emphasis is on full-engagement and internalization of classroom material, as opposed to mere memorization. Students are highly motivated to learn, but typically have difficulty with long-term retention of material and require frequent review, repetition and re-application of skills. In addition, students in this model often require a high level of support, as well as a slower pace compared to their grade level peers.

The student’s language impairments often impact social functioning and comprehension of materials. Within this model, lessons and discussions are highly teacher-mediated for language development. Teachers continually model language

and questioning techniques, and frequently cue students for elaboration of their responses.

Key Components of Student Profile

- Primary diagnosis of Developmental Delay, Communication, Neurological, or Autism. Students that fit this model typically would not have a specific learning disability given the cognitive profile of the cohort as noted below.
- The student requires a higher level of coordination of care than the typical special education student.
- There have been multiple systematic interventions utilized in an effort to help the student access the curriculum. These have been well documented.
- The student typically requires support in three or more of the following domains:
 - Academics
 - Student Skills
 - Behavior
 - Communication
 - Social Skills

Cognitive Profile	Language Profile	Academic Profile	Student Skills Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student is functioning at a significantly slower pace compared to grade level peers ○ The student is likely to have a cognitive level below 85, or there is a difficulty in determining the cognitive level due to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delays in language impact ability to function in reading, writing, and math in the general education setting ○ Language impairment often impacts the student’s social skills (particularly at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student requires high levels of support in all academic areas, either in the small group setting or in the general education setting ○ Student presents with comprehension deficits ○ Rate of skill acquisition is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requires direct teaching of student skills ○ Slow to respond to instruction/intervention ○ Requires support to generalize student skills across the day. The special education teacher shares the student skill

splits in the testing profile or impaired language.	elementary level)	diminished ○ Significant pre-teaching and/or re-teaching is required	of the week with classroom teacher.
---	-------------------	---	-------------------------------------

THE EDUCATIONAL TEAM

The model comprises a multi-disciplinary team, which may include::

- Special education teachers
- Highly trained Instructional assistants
- Board certified behavior analyst (BCBA)
- Speech therapists
- Occupational therapists
- Physical therapists
- Adaptive physical education teachers
- Assistive technology consultation to the model

Design Implications for the Complex Learner Program

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility should include two classrooms for the Complex Learner program to accommodate increased enrollments and the need to ensure statutory compliance with age span limits and ADA.

Students and staffing. The design of Complex Learner classrooms should consider the need for maintenance of required student:teacher ratios. By law, the maximum student-teacher ratio in a substantially separate classroom is 8:1 or 12:2. Each classroom will serve up to 12 students.

Breakout Spaces. The design of Complex Learner classrooms must include adjoining breakout spaces to facilitate the provision of highly specialized instructional methodologies for individual and small groups of students.

Key adjacencies. The design of the Complex Learner classrooms should consider key adjacencies to all related service providers including speech, occupational, and physical therapists.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY AND PHYSICAL THERAPY

Occupational therapists (OTs) and occupational therapy assistants (COTAs) support children with motor and sensory development, as well as the academic implications of visual-spatial and visual-motor processing deficits. Occupational therapists conduct both motor and processing assessments, direct therapy, and consultative support.

Physical therapists and physical therapy assistants in school settings provide assessments and direct therapy to students with gross motor delays, physical mobility challenges, and loss of mobility due to physical injury, brain damage, stroke, or other medical conditions.

Both OTs and PTs provide significant support to students with sensory needs. These supports may include vestibular therapy, direct desensitization, sensory diet management, or consultation. Currently, the OT and PT programs at Oakdale are housed in a converted classroom on the ground level. The spaces can be loud, and are not set up for a comprehensive OT program. Students have to travel through an open area to access services. As a result, the space does not meet DESE or IDEA standards. At Greenlodge school, there is no OT space.

Children with developmental disorders such as autism may show significant delays in the development and integration of sensory experiences throughout their lifespan. The way the brain processes these experiences can be a major source of distress and discomfort. In some cases, the brain may overreact to these sensory stimuli. Other times, it may not react enough. An inability to regulate sensory stimuli can cause a variety of negative behaviors such as acting out, fighting, meltdowns, spinning, rocking or hand-flapping, as well as problems with information processing and development.

Sensory regulation is an integral part of the school day for students who have needs relating to sensory regulation. Sensory services and intervention require access to specialized equipment and associated therapies. Children with sensory processing deficits may respond to stimuli in the environment in unpredictable, maladaptive, and even dangerous ways. For example, unmodulated sensory experiences such as touch, bright light, noise, or other sensory experiences can cause avoidance behaviors such as running away from the area, hand-flapping, spinning, rocking and severe tantrums, as well as self-injurious behaviors such as head banging and crashing into obstacles at a high rate of speed.

Sensory experiences are cumulative. For example, a child may be able to handle a morning meeting with several children, yet be unable to progress through the rest of the day without direct intervention. A trained Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) and an Occupational Therapist (OT) may prescribe treatment called a “sensory diet,” which is a series of progressively tolerable sensory experiences that are carried out in controlled conditions for safety reasons. Sensory diets also include a menu of calming activities that are designed to mitigate an overactive arousal system. These activities include equipment such as a

therapy swing, aroma therapy, special lighting and white noise systems, weighted blankets, and body socks.

Design Implications for Occupational Therapy And Physical Therapy

Sensory room. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility must include a sensory room. A sensory room is a therapeutic space designed to help children regulate their sensory responses and develop coping skills. Sensory rooms are designed to provide a place for individuals with sensory issues to decompress and confront a variety of sensory issues in a way that will ultimately help them learn to cope. Other benefits include increased communication and socialization, increased attention and stamina for learning, and improved motor and cognitive development. Sensory rooms often include aromatherapy diffusers, soundproofing, white noise machines, adaptable lighting, therapy swings, and other calming tools. There is no current space at Oakdale to support sensory integration for these students.

Flexible spaces and furnishings. The design of the sensory room should include flexible spaces and furnishings. Occupational and physical therapists require flexible space to provide direct therapy to support sensory integration and motor system development.

Adjacent office space. The design of the sensory room should consider adjacent office spaces for occupational and physical therapists. These related service providers conduct direct services within the sensory room and in adjacent office spaces, conduct all related evaluations, and provide professional consultation to colleagues and families.

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY

Speech-language pathologists (SLPs) work on a variety of communication disorders, including social and pragmatic deficits displayed by students with autism, structural deficits impacting speech and intelligibility, functional deficits impacting receptive or expressive communication, and fluency disorders impacting intelligibility and reading. SLPs conduct evaluations, provide direct therapy, provide push-in services to support academics, and provide consultation. Currently Oakdale has one full time SLP for 20 students.

Design Implications for Speech & Language Therapy

Privacy. Therapy rooms require quiet and privacy so that SLPs can conduct sound-sensitive evaluations of auditory perception and processing, oral-motor examinations, and communication evaluations.

Space. Therapy rooms also require space for individual and small-group therapy sessions. The increased population projected will require at least two general speech-language therapy rooms and one STAR speech-language room.

Location. The STAR SLP therapy room should be located adjacent to the STAR classrooms.

AUGMENTATIVE AND ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION

An Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) specialist is a specialized speech-language pathologist who works with students who do not use verbal communication. AAC services may include direct 1:1 assessment of a student, consultation, parent communication, trials of AAC equipment in individual and group settings, and development and programming of communication platforms.

Design Implications for AAC Services

The AAC service requires an office with a small instructional space for testing devices and programming devices..

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

Assistive Technology (AT) specialists are professionals who conduct evaluations, provide staff training, and offer direct student consultation on the use of high- and low-tech solutions for a wide variety of student challenges involving input or the presentation of information (e.g., color-coding, text-to-speech, etc.) and output or modalities for sharing learning (e.g., speech-to-text). These specialists are skilled in the application of both technology devices (e.g., smart pens, magnification) and software options (e.g., screen masking, PDF conversion, dictation).

Design Implications for Assistive Technology Services

Assistive Technology specialists are itinerant. They need access to spaces such as a small conference room where they can work with students and staff in trying various technology and software options.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY SERVICES

The Dedham Public Schools Department of Student Services provides evaluations, consultation, and direct services to students with a wide variety of mental and behavioral health challenges in specialized programs and in the general classroom setting. The

department is composed of 26 school psychologists, licensed social workers, guidance counselors, and school adjustment counselors. Beyond services provided to students with Individual Education and Section 504 plans, the department provides ongoing support to all students within the Dedham Public Schools.

School psychologists conduct cognitive, social-emotional, and academic assessments to inform eligibility determinations and provide ongoing monitoring of student progress towards identified goals. Student assessments require intense concentration and the application of auditory processing and discrete visual processing skills. In addition to assessment, School psychologists provide direct consultation to other staff, students, and families on mental health and other issues relating to student development and well being.

Design Implications for School Psychology Services

Confidential and private office space. The design of Dedham’s newest elementary facility should include a confidential and private office space for the school psychologist. This office space should allow for evaluations, consultation, and small group intervention/meetings for up to 6 people. 360student enrollment will require one office while enrollments of 560and 665will require two offices.

BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS (BCBA) SERVICES

Dedham schools are currently served by contracted Board Certified Behavior Analysts who work with students exhibiting mental and behavioral health challenges. One BCBA is .8 FTE and serves students in the BRIDGE program through weekly consultations. The other BCBA is .6 FTE and serves the rest of the school’s student body. BCBA consultation includes any combination of the following: observations of the student; developing data collection systems, behavior plans or skills development programming; data analysis; teacher/team meetings; teacher/team training.

Typically, the BCBA helps classroom staff to identify and isolate a targeted behavior that needs to be extinguished and then collaborates with staff to develop a system of positive reinforcement that will produce the appropriate behavior. The BCBA’s are assisted by 2.0 FTE Registered Behavior Technicians (RBT). These RBTs assist the BCBA’s in the direct application and implementation of services. The RBTs may take data (sometimes every two or three minutes), complete observations, carry out behavior plans, and perform other duties assigned by the BCBA’s. The Bridge classrooms have a dedicated BCBA of their own.

Design Implications for BCBA Services

Therapy rooms. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a designated space for the delivery of BCBA evaluations, consultation, and therapy.

Location. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that the BCBA space is directly adjacent to the STAR classroom.

EDUCATOR PLANNING, COLLABORATION & DEVELOPMENT

Dedham's curriculum and pedagogical models require and, simultaneously, support a high degree of professional collaboration, planning, and coordination.

DATA-REFLECTIVE CULTURE

Every Dedham elementary school operates data teams in which teachers and administrators meet regularly to review assessment results and student work samples. The information gleaned from these meetings helps to drive changes in instruction at the school, classroom, and student levels with the goal of improving student performance. The major assessment instruments currently in place include MCAS, STAR360, EarlyBird, MCLASS, Foundations Unit assessments, and Lexia. All of this information provides multiple perspectives on students' reading and math performance and allows teachers to diagnose strengths and areas of concern and plan individualized lessons accordingly.

Monitoring progress in the social skill development of students and in the culture and climate of schools is important to making progress in social-emotional learning. In 2017 the district began using surveys from Panorama Education to collect and reflect on data in these areas. Currently, the District is building a targeted universal mental health screening program.

Data teams offer another specific example of how teacher collaboration can be integral to the improvement of student performance. Through each school's data team meetings, teachers have regularly scheduled time for professional collaboration with colleagues to focus on analysis of student work and assessment of instructional practices. This collaborative work requires a focus on using evidence of student understanding to adjust instruction and on providing direct and just-in-time feedback to students about how to advance their own learning.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

In addition, teachers need to be able to form professional learning communities (PLCs) around topics of mutual interest and work together to further their own professional development. Unless it is a professional development release time scheduled by the district or stipends are available for after-school work, PLCs meet during the school day. The media center and other spaces are scheduled for continual use by students during the school day and so are not available for PLC meetings. A PLC meeting typically involves 4-10 faculty members.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

Instructional coaches provide direct support to educators and students. Their primary responsibility is to support educators with real time, job embedded coaching. Much of the coaches' work takes place in the 1-5 classrooms throughout the school. For example, an academic coach may introduce a lesson, setting the stage for the teacher with student motivation and prompts; demonstrate a specific activity; model how to teach an entire lesson; or co-teach one lesson with the classroom teacher.

The coaches' offices are primarily used to confer with teachers before and after the activities that take place in the classroom. For example:

- A teacher may describe to the literacy coach a challenge with the effective teaching of syllables; they review student work or assessment data to more clearly pinpoint the problem area; the coach presents a lesson in the classroom; later the teacher and coach meet in the office to discuss how the lesson was delivered and how the students reacted; the next day, the coach observes the teacher presenting a continuation of the lesson; later they confer again about what worked and what didn't and what the teacher might do differently next time.
- The math coach and teacher may co-administer an assessment of students' skills with fractions; the next day, they may meet in the office to grade and record the assessments; the next day they may review the data and identify the students having difficulty; at their next meeting, they would strategize on an intervention to assist those students.

Each coach will be in and out of classrooms and the office area multiple times during the course of each day. Most of the time blocks spent in the office will be about 45 minutes in length, corresponding to the teachers' scheduled planning periods. Under the coaching model every classroom teacher receives coaching during the year in order to improve their practice.

CO-TEACHING MODELS

Several co-teaching models have been planned and taught with the classroom teacher and the Instructional coach or the classroom teacher and a special educator. Co-teaching requires focused collaboration that involves reviewing student work and/or formative assessments and using that data to plan instruction.

Currently, the only space to collaborate is in the classrooms, which results in at least one or two teachers carrying necessary materials to another space. When this level of collaboration takes place during the day, there is limited time before students return to the classroom, which means all the materials need to be picked up and put away, most likely when teachers are getting to the heart of the work.

Design Implications for Teacher Collaboration

Teacher collaboration conference room. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a dedicated conference room that can accommodate up to 12 adults for the purposes of teacher collaboration and planning. The room should be configured and outfitted to support high levels of collaboration.

Classroom spaces. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should consider implications for real time, job embedded coaching for educators. All classrooms should incorporate design patterns that facilitate the close collaboration of two or more educators at any given time.

Instructional coach office. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should include a dedicated office space for the instructional coach. This office should be directly adjacent to the teacher collaboration conference room and able to accommodate up to 5 adults.

FOOD SERVICES

Dedham’s Food Services Department is a self-operated program dedicated to students’ health, well-being, and ability to learn. The primary goal of the Food Services Department is to serve delicious and healthy meals to as many children as possible ensuring that they have the nutrition necessary to fuel high levels of learning and growth. This endeavor is increasingly important as the percentage of income-eligible families in Dedham has risen substantially in recent years. As of the 2022 - 2023 school year, 29.8% of our student population qualifies as economically disadvantaged.

The Dedham Food Service program participates in the National School Lunch and Breakfast program and adheres closely to federal and state guidelines for free and reduced-price meals, including breakfast and lunch. Students are always offered five components at lunch: grains, protein, fruits, vegetables, and milk. For breakfast, they are offered fruit, grains, milk and protein. All students receive wholesome and nutritious meals that meet the USDA dietary guidelines.

The current systems and structures for food service at the Oakdale School delivers nutritious meals to students each day and successfully achieves the department’s fundamental goal. That being said, the current systems and structures are inefficient and disruptive to teaching, learning, and the effective operation of the District.

The first and most pressing issue with the current systems and structures for food service is the burden it places on teaching and learning. Unnecessary instructional and administrative time are consumed in the daily logistics associated with ensuring that the food that children wish to eat is prepared and delivered on time for lunch. In addition to

this inefficiency Dedham's students at the Oakdale school miss a critical opportunity for socialization and interpersonal skill development that come with eating lunch together in a school cafeteria. Over five years students miss 450 hours of social skill building that occurs when children learn how to share space, engage in conversation, and care for one another in the space that is the social space of the meal. This is a major equity issue.

Inefficiencies in food preparation and distribution are another major issue for the Food Services Department. Each day educators collect lunch orders from their students first thing in the morning. These lunch orders are compiled and relayed to the kitchen staff at Dedham High School who then prepare the meals and pack them in warming and cooling bags for distribution to the elementary schools. Food services then deliver meals to Oakdale where they wait for distribution from a centralized location. Students and educators retrieve the meals and return to the classrooms where students eat with one another. Costs associated with the logistics are unnecessary and create a situation in which the duration between meal preparation and consumption impacts the quality of the food that children experience.

Finally, these antiquated systems and structures create issues for the management and operations of the District's buildings. Lunch in the classrooms creates an unnecessary scheduling and supervision burden. More adults are necessary to supervise the many spaces in which children eat and, as a result, creates significant human resource inefficiencies. There is a parallel inefficiency and burden placed on custodial resources who must divert attention daily from the care and maintenance of school facilities to support educators in cleaning up after student meals in many locations throughout the building.

Design Implications for Food Services

To address inefficiencies and their impact on teaching and learning, the design of a new elementary school facility for the Dedham Public Schools must consider the following:

Cafeteria. The new facility should have a centrally located, spacious, open, and bright space for children to commune and share meals throughout the school year. This common experience connects children and provides critical time for social skill development.

Full Service Kitchen. The new facility should have a spacious, full service kitchen that allows for the preparation of breakfast and lunch onsite for students and staff throughout the school year. The kitchen should meet modern food preparation standard and be designed in close coordination with

Sensory Aware. The cafeteria design should consider the social, emotional, and sensory needs of all children. Designing the cafeteria from the perspective of the young people who are using it is critical. For some young people, the cafeteria can be an overwhelming and anxiety producing space. Navigating large numbers of people, sound volume, and the logistics associated with finding your place and getting your lunch can stress a young

person's resources. Designing a large communal space that provides for large and small group gathering would benefit these youngsters. Small group gathering spaces might include some degree of visual separation from the larger cafeteria, sound buffering, sensory-friendly supports such as a lower ceiling, and diffused and/or natural lighting.

Acoustics. The cafeteria design should incorporate sound absorption panels on walls or sound-absorbing walls and ceiling panels.

Connection To And Support For Teaching And Learning. The cafeteria design should incorporate connections to and extensions of the curriculum and content that students engage in. Displays for students' work and exhibitions that demonstrate the cultural connections to food that is being served or to the math and science concepts associated with cooking and baking should be considered.

Size. The cafeteria should be designed to accommodate up to half of the projected enrollment at any given time. This space would provide the scheduling flexibility necessary to accommodate a two or three lunch service model depending on initial and future enrollments at the school.

Traffic And Circulation. Careful consideration should be given to safe and efficient traffic and circulation patterns within the cafeteria. Entrance to and exit from, circulation to and from the food service area and point of sale, and supervision of the space all must roll into the design of the space.

Restrooms. An appropriate number of gender neutral bathrooms should be directly adjacent to the school's cafeteria.

TECHNOLOGY & INFRASTRUCTURE

The Dedham Public Schools has developed a robust teaching and learning experience for students and technology is a critical tool in delivering and enhancing that experience for all students. Dedham operates a 1:1 environment in grades 1-12 and relies heavily on digital assessment, learning management, and enrichment applications and software. Effective use of technology is always evolving as the District continuously reviews its programs, refines its curriculum, and provides resources and training for teachers to support technologically enhanced learning environments. New technologies and associated pedagogies provide opportunities to improve student-centered learning through deeper learning strategies and Universal Design principles.

In addition to teaching and learning, the management and operation of the District's school facilities relies heavily on robust technological infrastructure, hardware, and software/applications. Managing student enrollment and demographic data, management

of student records and maintenance of FERPA and HIPAA compliance, monitoring mechanical systems, procurement and fiscal operations, and ensuring safety and security are just a few examples of key management and operations systems that are almost exclusively dependent on current technology.

Design Implications for Technology

Infrastructure

Data. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include data retrieval and connectivity capabilities in all spaces.

Audio. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include sound fields with audio enhancements to support effective teaching and learning practices.

Wireless internet. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility must include robust, redundant wireless access to ensure that all systems that support teaching, learning, management and operations remain connected and operational at all times.

Building configuration

Classrooms. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should give careful consideration to furnishings that accommodate the technology infrastructure and hardware necessary to support and enhance Dedham’s teaching and learning model.

Educator workstations. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that all instructional and office spaces are equipped with workstations that integrate necessary technological infrastructure to support the hardware and software necessary to support the District’s systems for teaching and learning and management and operations.

Conference and meeting spaces. The design of Dedham’s new elementary facility should ensure that all conference and meeting spaces integrate technological infrastructure to support the hardware and software necessary to enact the District’s professional learning model and the District’s systems for teaching and learning and management and operations.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Health Services Department provides direct care and support to all students in the Dedham Public Schools. All schools are staffed with at least one nurse who provides all clinical care of students and medication management; assists with screenings and ensures compliance with vaccination and health documentation requirements; attends all health-related IEP meetings; creates medication plans and health care plans; offers emergency allergy and OSHA training for all staff; handles health-related parent communications; and plays an integral role in overall health education.

In addition to these services, Dedham also serves its students and families with a case management model that is supervised by the District's Nurse Case Manager. This individual provides both clinical and social-work based support for families with children who have complex medical needs throughout the district. These children typically have Health Care Plans and require ongoing and changing support and liaison work between school health and multiple private providers.

The District's School Nurse Assistant Program (SNAP) maintains a comprehensive database that tracks all activity in health clinics across the district. Recent SNAP data indicates a significant increase in the number of students visiting school health offices.

- Oakdale has seen an increase in Health Office visits from SY 21 of 432 students to 985 in SY 2022. As of 2/14/2023 they already had 656 visits.

This data does not include students seeking nursing support for somatic complaints and emotional support without a diagnosis. This increase in medically complex and fragile students has direct implications for staffing and space needs at our elementary school facilities

The current health suite at the Oakdaleschool is not appropriately designed and outfitted for effective school health practices in today's post pandemic context. Clinics are not equipped to house confidential records, provide separate and secure medication and refrigeration facilities, hold private consultation with students and families, for adequate private exam space. The clinic currently sees an average of 10 medical visits per day and additional medication visits during the lunch period, leaving the clinic over-crowded and students waiting in line to be evaluated.

Design Implications for Health Services

Elementary children have not yet developed a strong immune system. They become ill more frequently than adults do. They are also prone to react to stress by exhibiting headaches

and stomachaches. Based on current data, Dedham projects an average of 30 students per day visiting the clinic, not including medication and treatment visits throughout the day and consults with faculty, staff, and families.

Central Location. The health suite should be centrally located and directly adjacent to the main office. This adjacency is critical to safe and efficient day to day operations of the school and in response to emergency situations.

Office Space. A separate, confidential space for the school nurse to conduct necessary paperwork and processing, maintain records, and hold meetings/consultation is a key design consideration. The office space design should include interior windows that maintain line of sight access to the health suite. The number of offices necessary will be a function of final enrollment determination. Design should be closely coordinated with the District's Director of Health Services and Assistant Superintendent for Student Services.

Examination Areas. The design of the health suite should include a number of examination areas that are consistent with and provide appropriate service to the selected enrollment model. Examination areas should be private and consideration given to making these spaces multifunctional. These spaces should be designed for use in meeting screening requirements and should be well ventilated in the event an individual must be quarantined.

General Care and Treatment. The design of the health suite should incorporate a spacious, general area that allows for the school nurse to provide general care and treatment to students who report for regular medication or somatic, non medical related care/treatment.

Waiting and Receiving. The design of the health suite should include a comfortable waiting/receiving area for students and families who must wait to see a school nurse. This area should be in line of sight from the nursing office(s) and separate from examination rooms to protect the privacy of students and families.

General Storage. The design of the health suite should include ample storage for all materials and supplies associated with the medical care of students. This includes additional storage for clean changes of clothing and secured dry and refrigerated storage for prescription medications and epi-pens.

Specialized Storage. The design of the health suite should include storage for emergency and specialized medical equipment. Backboards, wheelchairs, screening instruments, and other specialized equipment all require storage that is secured and directly adjacent to the health suite.

Emergency Access. The design of the health suite should incorporate efficient and discreet access for emergency responders. Children who are experiencing an acute medical emergency must be efficiently and safely transported from the building through intentional design that also allows for discretion that ensures privacy and ensures that the remainder

of the school community is not unnecessarily alarmed by the presence of emergency responders and vehicles.

Restrooms. The design of the health suite should incorporate gender neutral, ADA compliant restrooms directly adjacent to the health suite. This is critical for privacy and treatment. The number of restrooms in the health suite will be a function of the final enrollment determination.

OUTDOOR LEARNING & PLAY

Outdoor learning and play are central to Dedham's overall educational program. Opportunities for hands-on experiential learning, physical activity and exercise, and socializing with peers are essential considerations for the design of Dedham's new elementary facility.

OUTDOOR LEARNING

Dedham's curriculum and instructional model encourages and supports a high level of experiential, hands-on learning that promotes inquiry and social learning. The design of Dedham's new elementary facility must include outdoor learning spaces that are accessible to all students and community members while enhancing the current instructional model. Shaded areas for whole group instruction, gardens, and other means by which children can engage in the study of environmental phenomena within their community are important design considerations.

RECESS

Children in grades 1-5 spend 30 minutes daily at recess. Over five years in elementary school every child spends 450 hours at recess. This is the equivalent of 70 school days. Recess is essential, unstructured learning time and the design of outdoor play spaces must consider the physical, social, and emotional skill practice that takes place during this time. Accessible play structures that encourage movement and exercise are a centerpiece of the play area along with accessible areas for team sports, small group, and partner play are all important considerations in the design process.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Physical education classes are scheduled outdoors when weather permits. Outdoor play areas should be directly adjacent to the gymnasium to support physical education outdoors whenever possible.

Design Implications for Outdoor Learning and Play Areas

Accessible. The design of outdoor learning and play areas must keep accessibility at the forefront. Beyond access for children and community members with mobility needs, these areas should also be designed with an eye for language barriers, sensory needs, etc.

Safety. The design of outdoor learning and play areas must keep safety at the forefront. Primary design considerations include the location/placement of the primary play area in close proximity to the building and directly adjacent to the cafeteria. This play area should have a fully enclosed perimeter to define the play space and maintain safety. The play area should also include a poured in place surface to minimize opportunity for injuries.

Outdoor learning. The design of Dedham's new elementary school facility should incorporate outdoor learning spaces. These spaces should facilitate whole and small group learning in a safe space directly adjacent to the building. The incorporation of a community garden would further the District's partnership with the Endicott Estate and support hands-on learning opportunities throughout the school year.

LIBRARY / MEDIA PROGRAM

The mission of the Dedham Public School Library Media Program is to empower students to become enthusiastic readers, information seekers, and creative problem solvers, prepared to participate in an evolving world. Through collaborative teaching, curriculum integration, and classroom support, we cultivate curious, independent, lifelong learners with the inquiry skills needed to be ethically responsible and successful in our global community. We equitably connect learners to diverse materials and learning opportunities in an environment that supports cooperation, collaboration, and a love of literature.

The mission of the Dedham Public Schools Library/Media Program is lofty, commendable, and hindered by structural limitations and constraints. The Oakdale school is home to a beautiful and historic school library that is situated on the third floor of the 120 year old facility. This space is not ADA accessible and prevents many students and community members from accessing the benefits and beauty of this space.

Furthermore, the static fixtures and furnishings limit the utility of the space, compounding ADA accessibility issues and use of these wonderful learning spaces.

Design Implications for Library / Media Program

The Library/Media center for Dedham's newest elementary facility should be centrally located, accessible to all members of the community, and serve as a learning commons for the students, faculty, and community. The library or media center should be a flexible space with mobile furnishings and walls to allow for multiple uses within and beyond the school day/year. Technology infrastructure should facilitate large and small group learning for children and adults. Specifically, design implications include:

Multifunctional. This library/media center should be designed as a multifunctional space that is able to support all elements of the District's educational program as well as extended school day/year programming, and community programming in the evenings and summers.

Small Group/Breakout Spaces. This library/media center should be designed to incorporate small group/breakout spaces for children to engage in collaborative, hands-on learning, conduct research, and work in small intervention groups. These small group/breakout spaces will also serve similar functionality in before, after, and summer school programming and better support flexible community use during non-school hours.

Outdoor Learning Space. The library/media center should be designed to support outdoor learning opportunities that supplement and enhance the core academic curriculum. Ideally this space would be directly adjacent to an interior courtyard that would promote a comfortable and safe learning environment for students and faculty.

Storage. The library/media center should be designed to incorporate adequate storage for the materials and supplies necessary to manage and maintain a large collection of print materials and to engage students in experiential learning opportunities throughout the school year.

TRANSPORTATION & STUDENT ARRIVAL/DISMISSAL

Elementary students in Dedham travel to and from school via school buses, vans, families, and walking/biking when weather permits. The following table provides a detailed overview of vehicle and foot traffic to and from each school on a daily basis.

STUDENT DAILY TRANSPORTATION BY SCHOOL

	BUS AND VAN	PARENT AND FAMILY	WALK AND BIKE
Oakdale	60	130	50

Parents and families are the primary means of transport for students to and from Oakdale Elementary. The school runs a live drop off and pick up process that allows faculty and staff to safely and efficiently welcome children to school and dismiss them to their caregivers at the end of each day. Currently only one bus transports students daily. The Oakdale community also has approximately 50 children who walk/bike to and from school each day.

Design Implications for Transportation, Arrival and Dismissal

Arrival and dismissal. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility should consider carefully a safe and efficient traffic pattern for school arrival and dismissal. The new facility, regardless of the enrollment decision, will run a live drop off and pick up process which will require ample room for parent/family vehicles. Bus/van arrival and dismissal areas should be separate from by adjacent to the live drop off area to ensure safety and supervision.

Bicycles. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility should incorporate safe and secure spaces for children to store bicycles and scooters. When weather permits, a large number of students elect to ride to school which supports social and physical development. The District encourages students to interact and exercise and having proper storage for their bikes/scooters promotes this healthy behavior.

Parking. The design of Dedham’s new elementary school facility must include sufficient parking to accommodate all faculty and visitors to the building. Parking should be in close

proximity to the facility with clear and safe walkways to the building. The design should also consider the potential for future installation of solar parking canopies.

SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS & KEY ADJACENCIES

SITE ADJACENCIES

Dedham’s new elementary facility should be designed to accommodate flexible, student centered learning in all spaces. A centrally located main office, health suite, cafeteria, auditorium, and library media center are both functionally and culturally important. Having these resources centralized creates a common hub for gathering, socializing, and connecting as a community. This is critical in any school and even more important should Dedham select a larger enrollment option.

Classroom neighborhoods that shape learning spaces into small communities within the larger school is a critical design consideration. The design of classroom neighborhoods should ensure that all students can access learning opportunities within the neighborhood. This would require multiple small group break out spaces for intervention, special education, related services, EL services and general collaboration.

COMMUNITY ADJACENCIES

Dedham’s school facilities serve the community well beyond the school day and year. It is critical that the new school be designed with this consideration in mind.

Community center. Dedham’s new elementary facility should be designed with community use in mind. Evening and summer recreation programs, adult learning and education programs, and youth sports are just a few types of programs that the District wishes the facility to accommodate.

Before and after care programming. The new facility will hold a before and after school care program operated by the District. This program will require office space for the site director and assistant site director. Additionally, common spaces such as the gymnasium, library/media center, and cafeteria should be designed for flexible use before, during, and after the school day.

SECURITY & ACCESS

The safety and security of students, faculty, and staff is Dedham's first priority. Within and around its facilities is a top priority of the Dedham Public Schools. Currently, conditions and design at the Oakdale presents unique challenges to maintaining a safe and secure learning space for students and educators. Aging windows and doors must be monitored closely to ensure that latching mechanisms and hardware work properly. Keyless entry and modern surveillance systems are not economically feasible to install with the structural limitations and aging mechanical systems. These are just a small sample of the issues related to maintaining safe and secure environments.

The District maintains an interdepartmental safety team that meets monthly to review safety planning and needs throughout the district. This team includes representatives from the School, Police, and Fire Departments as well as other town agencies and community groups and is responsible for all emergency planning for the district. The last submission of the District's Medical Emergency Response Plan was in 2018 and these plans are currently under review for updating and resubmission to DESE. Members of the District Safety Team have met and continue to meet to discuss and inform design implications for the safety and security of Dedham's newest elementary school facility.

Design Implications for Security & Access

Controlled Entry. The new elementary school should be designed and equipped with a secure entry vestibule that ensures visual and verbal identification of all visitors. Controlled entrance to the new facility should provide for the safety and security with equal consideration given to making our faculty, students, community, and visitors feel welcome.

Protective Architectural Perimeter. The main entrance and other appropriate areas should be designed to include bollards that prevent vehicles from close proximity to the building.

Video Surveillance. The new facility should be equipped with appropriate external and internal video surveillance cameras to ensure safety and efficacy of any necessary emergency response. This video surveillance system should be spec'd to integrate seamlessly with the District's existing video surveillance infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Exterior Doors and Entry. The new facility should be equipped with an appropriate keyless entry system that ensures all faculty and staff are able to enter and exit the building with fob access. The keyless entry system should be spec'd to integrate with the District's existing infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Telecommunications. The new facility should be equipped with appropriate phone, PA, and radio communication systems to ensure efficient communication and secure operation of the building. These systems should be spec'd to integrate with the District's existing infrastructure and in concert with the Dedham Police and Facilities Departments.

Wayfinding Mechanisms. Color and symbology can be used to define areas of the school or classroom that are intended for high-energy vs. reflective activities, welcome families whether or not their primary language is English, and to establish non-verbal cues for how the school functions.


Building Layout. The layout of the building can contribute to the students' sense of security and well-being. For example, long hallways leading outside can be anxiety-provoking for young students, but curvilinear in-between spaces with open areas can guide students from one location to another and help them to feel safe.

4.2 Space Summary

UPDATE - On March 20, 2024 the School Committee unanimously voted for an 360 student enrollment. An updated Space Summary for 360 students follows. Space summaries for the 560 and 665 enrollments are also included for reference.

- 360 students (Preferred Solution, signed)
- 560 students
- 665 students

Program Diagram – 360 student Enrollment



UPDATE - programming bubble diagram - 360 students



Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
360 Students, Grades 1-5, 4 Classrooms per Grade

Legend Change from MSBA Guidelines

3800

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL		
ROOM TYPE	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
Core Academic	15,405		
<i>(List rooms of different sizes separately)</i>			
Kindergarten Classroom with Toilet	0	0	0
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	750	6	4,500
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	815	3	2,445
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	895	5	4,475
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	1,040	3	3,120
General Classroom (Grades 1-5) w/toilet			0
Science, Technology, Engineering Room (Grades 3-5)	797	1	797
STE Storage Room (if applicable)	68	1	68
Teacher Planning			0
Classroom Breakout Grades 1 - 2			0
Cohort Commons - Grades 3, 4, 5			0
Academic Storage			
Special Education	3,500		
<i>(List rooms of different sizes separately)</i>			
Self-Contained Special Education Classroom	770	4	3,080
Self-Contained Special Education Toilet Room			
Resource Room	210	2	420
Small Group Room / Reading			0
Medically Fragile Special Education Classroom			0
Teacher Planning			0
OT / PT Room			0
IEP Conference Room			0
Psychiatrist Office			0
Guidance Office			0
Evaluation Team Leader Office			
Break-out room			
Records Room			
Collaborative Program Spaces (List rooms separately below)			
Teacher Planning (above)			0
Classroom Breakout (above)			0
Cohort Commons (above)			0
Quiet Dining (below)			0
Art & Music	940		
Art Classroom (25 seats)			0
Art Workroom with Storage and Kiln	240	1	240
Music Classroom / Large Group (25-50 seats)			0
Music Practice / Ensemble			0
Music Storage			
Maker Space	700	1	700

PROPOSED PROGRAM								
EXISTING TO REMAIN / RENOVATED			NEW CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
0			24,200			24,200		
		0	1,200	0	0	1,200	0	0
		0	900	20	18,000	900	20	18,000
		0			0			0
		0			0			0
		0			0			0
		0	1,080	1	1,080	1,080	1	1,080
		0	120	1	120	120	1	120
		0	50	20	1,000	50	20	1,000
		0	300	4	1,200	300	4	1,200
		0	800	3	2,400	800	3	2,400
			200	2	400	200	2	400
0			8,210			8,210		
		0	900	3	2,700	900	3	2,700
		0	100	2	200	100	2	200
		0	500	3	1,500	500	3	1,500
		0	500	1	500	500	1	500
		0	900	1	900	900	1	900
		0	100	4	400	100	4	400
		0	950	1	950	950	1	950
		0	250	1	250	250	1	250
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
			250	1	250	250	1	250
			150	1	150	150	1	150
			110	1	110	110	1	110
		0			0	0	0	0
		0			0	0	0	0
		0			0	0	0	0
		0			0	0	0	0
0			3,850			3,850		
		0	1,000	1	1,000	1,000	1	1,000
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	1,350	1	1,350	1,350	1	1,350
		0	75	0	0	75	0	0
			150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	1,200	1	1,200	1,200	1	1,200

VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
9,000		
0	0	0
-50	4	2,800
		0
		0
		0
0	1	1,080
0	1	120
50	20	1,000
300	4	1,200
800	3	2,400
200	2	400
3,680		
-50	0	-150
40	-1	20
0	1	500
0	0	0
900	1	900
100	4	400
950	1	950
250	1	250
150	1	150
150	1	150
250	1	250
150	1	150
110	1	110
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
1,350		
0	0	0
0	0	0
150	0	150
0	-2	-150
150	1	150
1,200	1	1,200

MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) <i>(Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)</i>			
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS
15,200			
1,200	0	-	
950	16	15,200	4 Classrooms / Grade Combined with Teacher Planning Rms
		-	
		-	
		-	
1,080	0	-	
120	0	-	
		-	Combined with paired classrooms. (10) rooms at 100
		-	Between 2 Classrooms
		-	1 Cohort Commons per grade (6 CR)
		-	Common Storage for teacher supplies. Sizes vary.
4,530			Spaces require DESE review and approval.
950	3	2,850	Identical to Gen Ed Classrooms.
60	3	180	Include changing tables (all) and Hoyer lift for medically fragile. Medically Fragile shared with Medical
500	2	1,000	
500	1	500	
		-	
		-	Each Teacher Planning room dedicated to Special Education Classroom, not shared
		-	
		-	
		-	
		-	
		-	In Central Admin For Lower STAR for STAR program
		-	
		-	See above
		-	See above
		-	See above
		-	See below
2,500			
1,000	1	1,000	
150	1	150	
1,200	1	1,200	
75	2	150	
		-	Storage in lieu of practice rooms

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
 360 Students, Grades 1-5, 4 Classrooms per Grade

Legend Change from MSBA Guidelines

3800

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL		EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL		
ROOM TYPE	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	
Health & Physical Education				4,600
Gymnasium	4,600	1	4,600	
Gym Storeroom			0	
Health Instructor's Office with Shower and Toilet			0	
Media Center				2,135
Media Center / Reading Room			0	
Library	2,135	1	2,135	
Dining and Cafetorium				2,001
Cafeteria / Dining	0	0	0	
Servery Queueing				
Stage	1,193	1	1,193	
Chair / Table / Equipment Storage			0	
Kitchen	808	1	808	
Staff Lunch Room			0	
Quiet Dining			0	
Medical				438
Medical Suite Toilet			0	
Nurses' Office / Waiting Room	438	1	438	
Examination Room / Resting			0	
Administration & Guidance				1,202
General Office / Waiting Room with Toilet	171	1	171	
Teachers' Mail and Time Room	230	1	230	
Copy Room	98	1	98	
Records Room	145	1	145	
Principal's Office with Conference Area	142	1	142	
Principal's Secretary / Waiting	0	0	0	
Assistant Principal's Office	0	0	0	
Supervisory / Spare Office	0	0	0	
Conference Room	0	0	0	
Guidance Office	0	0	0	
Guidance Office	0	0	0	
Guidance Storeroom	80	1	80	
Teachers' Work Room	336	1	336	
Lactation Room			0	
Custodial				5,160
Custodian's Office	455	1	455	
Custodian's Workshop	0	0	0	
Custodian's Storage	1,378	1	1,378	
Recycling Room / Trash	0	0	0	
Receiving and General Supply	0	0	0	
Storeroom	3,327	1	3,327	
Network / Telecom Room	0	0	0	
Outdoor Equipment Storage			0	
OTHER				0

PROPOSED PROGRAM								
EXISTING TO REMAIN / RENOVATED			NEW CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
		0			7,150	7,150		
		0	6,750	1	6,750	6,750	1	6,750
		0	250	1	250	250	1	250
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0			2,290	2,290		
		0	2,290	1	2,290	2,290	1	2,290
		0						
		0			7,760	7,760		
		0	3,240	1	3,240	3,240	1	3,240
			250	1	250	250	1	250
		0	1,000	1	1,000	1,000	1	1,000
		0	320	1	320	320	1	320
		0	2,100	1	2,100	2,100	1	2,100
		0	250	1	250	250	1	250
		0	600	1	600	600	1	600
		0			600	600		
		0	100	1	100	100	1	100
		0	300	1	300	300	1	300
		0	100	2	200	100	2	200
		0			2,535	2,535		
		0	400	1	400	400	1	400
		0	100	1	100	100	1	100
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	110	1	110	110	1	110
		0	375	1	375	375	1	375
		0	125	1	125	125	1	125
		0	120	0	0	120	0	0
		0	120	1	120	120	1	120
		0	250	1	250	250	1	250
		0	150	0	0	150	0	0
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	35	1	35	35	1	35
		0	300	2	600	300	2	600
		0	120	1	120	120	1	120
		0			2,160	2,160		
		0	150	1	150	150	1	150
		0	375	1	375	375	1	375
		0	375	1	375	375	1	375
		0	400	1	400	400	1	400
		0	220	1	220	220	1	220
		0	240	1	240	240	1	240
		0	200	1	200	200	1	200
		0	200	1	200	200	1	200
		0			1,600	1,600		

VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
		850
750	0	750
100	0	100
0	0	0
		0
0	0	0
		1,880
540	0	540
250	1	250
0	0	0
0	0	0
440	0	440
50	0	50
600	1	600
		90
40	0	40
50	0	50
0	0	0
		460
70	0	70
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
-30	1	270
120	1	120
		200
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0
200	1	200
		1,600

MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)			
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS
		6,300	
6,000	1	6,000	Includes area for bleachers (seating for 130)
150	1	150	
150	1	150	
		2,290	
2,290	1	2,290	
		5,880	
2,700	1	2,700	2 Seatings, Grades 3-5 together
			Allows 2 lines
1,000	1	1,000	Stage at Gymnasium
320	1	320	At Gymnasium
1,660	1	1,660	Sized to allow full service breakfast and lunch per Dedham food service standards
200	1	200	
		510	
60	1	60	Include hoier lift. Shared with Medically Fragile
250	1	250	Special Education classroom
100	2	200	2 nursing stations
		2,075	
330	1	330	
100	1	100	
150	1	150	
110	1	110	
375	1	375	Includes Toilet Room
125	1	125	
120	0	-	
120	1	120	
250	1	250	
150	0	-	
150	1	150	
35	1	35	
330	1	330	1 per wing
			Required by Staff
		1,960	
150	1	150	
375	1	375	
375	1	375	
400	1	400	
220	1	220	
240	1	240	
200	1	200	
			For outdoor maintenance equipment
		0	

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
360 Students, Grades 1-5, 4 Classrooms per Grade

Legend Change from MSBA Guidelines

3800

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL		
ROOM TYPE	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
<i>(List rooms separately below)</i>			
Pre-Kindergarten Classroom with Toilet (if applicable)	0	0	0
Net Zero Mechanical			0
Total Building Net Floor Area (NFA)			35,381
Proposed Student Capacity / Enrollment			
NON-PROGRAMMED SPACES			
<i>Other Occupied Rooms (List rooms separately below)</i>			
Unoccupied MEP / FP Spaces			
Unoccupied Closets, Supply Rooms, and Storage Rooms			
Toilet Rooms			
Circulation (corridors, stairs, ramps and elevators)			
Remaining ³			
Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA)²			
Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)			0.00

PROPOSED PROGRAM								
EXISTING TO REMAIN / RENOVATED			NEW CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
		0	1,200	0	0	1,200	0	0
		0	1,600	1	1,600	1,600	1	1,600
		0			60,355			60,355
		% of GFA 0			% of GFA 30,781			% of GFA 30,781
-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	2,180	-	2.4%	2,180
-	0.0%		TBD	TBD		-	0.0%	0
-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	3,949	-	4.3%	3,949
-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	17,662	-	19.4%	17,662
-	0.0%	0	TBD	TBD	6,990	-	7.7%	6,990
		0			91,136			91,136
		N/A			1.51			1.51

VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES		
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS
0	0	0
1,600	1	1,600
		19,110
		28,856
		0.00

MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) <i>(Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)</i>			
ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS
1,200	0	-	
			Additional Mech space required for Geothermal
		41,245	Total Building Net Floor Area (NFA)
# of Grade	5	360	Total Enrollment (Enter Design Enrollment)
K	0	0	Kindergarten Enrollment
Grade 1	1	144	Lower Elementary School Enrollment (Grades 1-
Grade 2	1	216	Upper Elementary School Enrollment (Grades 3-
Grade 3	1		
Grade 4	1		
Grade 5	1		
Grade 6	0		
			Complete this category with Schematic Design Su
		62,280	Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) ²
		1.51	Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)

¹ Individual Room Net Floor Area (NFA) Includes the net square footage measured from the inside face of the perimeter walls and includes all specific spaces assigned to a particular program area including such spaces as non-communal toilets and storage rooms.

² Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) Includes the entire building gross square footage measured from the outside face of exterior walls.

³ Remaining Includes exterior walls, interior partitions, chases, and other areas not listed above. Do not calculate this area, it is assumed to equal the difference between the Total Building Gross Floor Area and area not accounted for above.

Architect Certification	<p>I hereby certify that all of the information provided in this "Proposed Space Summary" is true, complete and accurate and, except as agreed to in writing by the Massachusetts School Building Authority, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of</p> <p>Name of Architecture Firm: <u>Jonathan Levi Architects</u></p> <p>Name of Principal Architect: <u>Jonathan Levi</u></p> <p>Signature of Principal Architect: _____</p> <p>Date: <u>5/1/24</u></p>
--------------------------------	---

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
560 Students, Grades 1-5, 6 Classrooms per Grade

Legend. Change from MSBA Guidelines

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE RIVERDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL								EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL			EXISTING CONDITIONS RIVERDALE SCHOOL			COMBINED EXISTING SF	PROPOSED PROGRAM									VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES			MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)					
ROOM TYPE	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS		ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS			
Core Academic								15,405			13,379			28,784	0			35,730			35,730			11,730			24,000					
<i>(List rooms of different sizes separately)</i>																																
Kindergarten Classroom with Toilet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1,200	0	0	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200	0	-				
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	750	6	4,500	1,120	2	2,240	6,740				900	30	27,000	900	30	27,000	-50	6	4,200	950	24	22,800				950	24	22,800	6 Classrooms / Grade Combined with Teacher Planning Rms			
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	815	3	2,445	922	2	1,844	4,289						0		0																	
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	895	5	4,475	910	4	3,640	8,115						0		0																	
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	1,040	3	3,120	685	3	2,055	5,175						0		0																	
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)				620	3	1,860	1,860						0		0																	
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)				580	3	1,740	1,740						0		0																	
General Classroom (Grades 1-5) w/toilet			0			0	0						0		0																	
Science, Technology, Engineering Room (Grades 3-5)	797	1	797				797				1,080	1	1,080	1,080	1	1,080	0	0	0	1,080	1	1,080				1,080	1	1,080	Functions as Cohort Commons			
STE Storage Room (if applicable)	68	1	68				68				120	1	120	120	1	120	0	0	0	120	1	120				120	1	120				
Teacher Planning			0				0				50	30	1,500	50	30	1,500	50	30	1,500												Combined with paired classrooms. (15) rooms at 100	
Classroom Breakout Grades 1 - 2			0				0				300	6	1,800	300	6	1,800	300	6	1,800												Between 2 Classrooms	
Classroom Breakout			0				0				400	6	2,400	400	6	2,400	400	6	2,400												Between 2 Classrooms	
Cohort Commons - Grades 3, 4, 5			0				0				950	1	950	950	1	950	950	1	950													
Academic Storage											220	4	880	220	4	880	220	4	880												Common Storage for teacher supplies. Sizes vary.	
Special Education								3,500			794			4,294	0			7,610			7,610			1,570			6,040					
<i>(List rooms of different sizes separately)</i>																																
Self-Contained Special Education Classroom	770	4	3,080	302	2	603	3,683				900	3	2,700	900	3	2,700	-50	-1	-1,100	950	4	3,800				950	4	3,800	Identical to Gen Ed Classrooms.			
Self-Contained Special Education Toilet Room											100	1	100	100	1	100	40	-3	-140	60	4	240				60	4	240	Include changing tables (all) and Hoyer lift for medically fragile. Medically Fragile shared with Medical			
Resource Room	210	2	420	191	1	191	611				500	2	1,000	500	2	1,000	0	-1	-500	500	3	1,500				500	3	1,500				
Small Group Room / Reading			0			0	0				500	1	500	500	1	500	0	0	0	500	1	500				500	1	500				
Medically Fragile Special Education Classroom			0			0	0				900	1	900	900	1	900	900	1	900													
Teacher Planning			0			0	0				100	4	400	100	4	400	100	4	400												Each Teacher Planning room dedicated to Special Education Classroom, not shared	
Speech / Language			0			0	0						0	0	0																	
OT / PT Room			0			0	0				950	1	950	950	1	950	950	1	950													
IEP Conference Room			0			0	0				250	1	250	250	1	250	250	1	250													
Psychiatrist Office			0			0	0				150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150													
Guidance Office			0			0	0				150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150													
Evaluation Team Leader Office			0			0	0				250	1	250	250	1	250	250	1	250													
Break-out room			0			0	0				150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150													
Records Room			0			0	0				110	1	110	110	1	110	110	1	110													In Central Admin For Lower STAR for STAR program
Collaborative Program Spaces (List rooms separately below)																																
Teacher Planning (above)			0			0	0						0	0	0					0	0	0									See above	
Classroom Breakout (above)			0			0	0						0	0	0					0	0	0									See above	
Cohort Commons (above)			0			0	0						0	0	0					0	0	0									See above	
Quiet Dining (below)			0			0	0						0	0	0					0	0	0									See below	
Art & Music								940			2,435			3,375	0			3,850			3,850			50			3,800					
Art Classroom (25 seats)			0			0	0				1,000	1	1,000	1,000	1	1,000	0	-1	-1,000	1,000	2	2,000				1,000	2	2,000				
Art Workroom with Storage and Kiln	240	1	240			0	240				150	1	150	150	1	150	0	-1	-150	150	2	300				150	2	300				
Music Classroom / Large Group (25-50 seats)			0	2,317	1	2,317	2317				1,350	1	1,350	1,350	1	1,350	150	0	150	1,200	1	1,200				1,200	1	1,200				
Music Practice / Ensemble			0	118	1	118	118				75	0	0	75	0	0	0	-4	-300	75	4	300				75	4	300	Storage in lieu of practice rooms			
Music Storage			0			0	0				150	1	150	150	1	150															Storage in lieu of practice rooms	
Maker Space	700	1	700			0	700				1,200	1	1,200	1,200	1	1,200	1,200	1	1,200													

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
560 Students, Grades 1-5, 6 Classrooms per Grade

Legend. Change from MSBA Guidelines

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE RIVERDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL				EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL			EXISTING CONDITIONS RIVERDALE SCHOOL			COMBINED EXISTING SF			PROPOSED PROGRAM									VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES			MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)			
ROOM TYPE	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	EXISTING TO REMAIN / RENOVATED			NEW CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL			ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS
							ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS													
NON-PROGRAMMED SPACES							% of GFA 0			% of GFA 35,885			% of GFA 35,885															
Other Occupied Rooms (List rooms separately below)																												
Unoccupied MEP / FP Spaces							-			TBD			2,080			-			1.9%			2,080						
Unoccupied Closets, Supply Rooms, and Storage Rooms							-			TBD			0			-			0.0%			0						
Toilet Rooms							-			TBD			3,949			-			3.6%			3,949						
Circulation (corridors, stairs, ramps and elevators)							-			TBD			17,662			-			16.2%			17,662						
Remaining ³							-			TBD			12,194			-			11.2%			12,194						
Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) ²							0						109,120						25,307			83,813 Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) ²						
Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)				0.00			N/A						1.49						0.00			1.49 Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)						

¹ Individual Room Net Floor Area (NFA) Includes the net square footage measured from the inside face of the perimeter walls and includes all specific spaces assigned to a particular program area including such spaces as non-communal toilets and storage rooms.

² Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) Includes the entire building gross square footage measured from the outside face of exterior walls.

³ Remaining Includes exterior walls, interior partitions, chases, and other areas not listed above. Do not calculate this area, it is assumed to equal the difference between the Total Building Gross Floor Area and area not accounted for above.

Architect Certification

I hereby certify that all of the information provided in this "Proposed Space Summary" is true, complete and accurate and, except as agreed to in writing by the Massachusetts School Building Authority, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of the Massachusetts School Building Authority to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Jonathan Levi Architects _____
Jonathan Levi _____

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
665 Students, Grades 1-5, 7 Classrooms per Grade

Legend. Change from MSBA Guidelines

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE GREENLIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL			EXISTING CONDITIONS GREENLIDGE SCHOOL			COMBINED EXISTING SF	PROPOSED PROGRAM									VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES			MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)			
	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS		ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS
Core Academic	15,405			15,460			30,865	0			40,950			40,950			13,400			27,550			
(List rooms of different sizes separately)																							
Kindergarten Classroom with Toilet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1,200	0	0	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200	0	-		
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	750	6	4,500	920	8	7,360	11,860	0	900	35	31,500	900	35	31,500	-50	6	3,950	950	29	27,550	7 Classrooms / Grade Combined with Teacher Planning Rms		
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	815	3	2,445	960	6	5,760	8,205	0			0			0			0				-		
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	895	5	4,475			0	4,475	0			0			0			0				-		
General Classroom (Grades 1-5)	1,040	3	3,120			0	3,120	0			0			0			0				-		
General Classroom (Grades 1-5) w/toilet			0	1,170	2	2,340	2,340	0			0			0			0				-		
Science, Technology, Engineering Room (Grades 3-5)	797	1	797				797	0	1,080	1	1,080	1,080	1	1,080	0	1	1,080	1,080	0	-			
STE Storage Room (if applicable)	68	1	68				68	0	120	1	120	120	1	120	0	1	120	120	0	-			
Teacher Planning			0				0	0	50	35	1,750	50	35	1,750	50	35	1,750				-	Combined with paired classrooms. (15) rooms at 100	
Classroom Breakout Grades 1 - 2			0				0	0	300	7	2,100	300	7	2,100	300	7	2,100				-	Between 2 Classrooms	
Cohort Commons - Grades 3, 4, 5			0				0	0	1,100	3	3,300	1,100	3	3,300	1,100	3	3,300				-	1 Cohort Commons per grade (7 CR)	
Academic Storage								0	220	5	1,100	220	5	1,100	220	5	1,100				-	Common Storage for teacher supplies. Sizes vary.	
Special Education	3,500			1,669			5,169	0			9,710			9,710			2,160			7,550			
(List rooms of different sizes separately)																							
Self-Contained Special Education Classroom	770	4	3,080	748	2	1,496	4,576	0	900	4	3,600	900	4	3,600	-50	-1	-1,150	950	5	4,750	Identical to Gen Ed Classrooms.		
Self-Contained Special Education Toilet Room								0	100	2	200	100	2	200	40	-3	-100	60	5	300	Include changing tables (all) and Hoyer lift for medically fragile. Medically Fragile shared with Medical		
Resource Room	210	2	420				420	0	500	3	1,500	500	3	1,500	0	0	0	500	3	1,500			
Small Group Room / Reading			0				0	0	500	2	1,000	500	2	1,000	0	0	0	500	2	1,000			
Medically Fragile Special Education Classroom			0				0	0	900	1	900	900	1	900	900	1	900				-		
Teacher Planning			0				0	0	100	5	500	100	5	500	100	5	500				-	Each Teacher Planning room dedicated to Special Education Classroom, not shared	
Speech / Language			0	173	1	173	173	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				-		
OT / PT Room			0				0	0	950	1	950	950	1	950	950	1	950				-		
IEP Conference Room			0				0	0	250	1	250	250	1	250	250	1	250				-		
Psychiatrist Office			0				0	0	150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150				-		
Guidance Office			0				0	0	150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150				-		
Evaluation Team Leader Office								0	250	1	250	250	1	250	250	1	250				-		
Break-out room								0	150	1	150	150	1	150	150	1	150				-	In Central Admin For Lower STAR	
Records Room								0	110	1	110	110	1	110	110	1	110				-	for STAR program	
Collaborative Program Spaces (List rooms separately below)																							
Teacher Planning (above)			0				0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	See above	
Classroom Breakout (above)			0				0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	See above	
Cohort Commons (above)			0				0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	See above	
Quiet Dining (below)			0				0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	See below	
Art & Music	940			1,508			2,448	0			5,000			5,000			0			5,000			
Art Classroom (25 seats)			0	754	2	1,508	1,508	0	1,000	1	1,000	1,000	1	1,000	0	-1	-1,000	1,000	2	2,000			
Art Workroom with Storage and Kiln	240	1	240	0	0	0	240	0	150	2	300	150	2	300	0	0	0	150	2	300			
Music Classroom / Large Group (25-50 seats)			0				0	0	1,175	2	2,350	1,175	2	2,350	-25	0	-50	1,200	2	2,400			
Music Practice / Ensemble			0				0	0	75	0	0	75	0	0	0	-4	-300	75	4	300	Storage in lieu of practice rooms		
Music Storage								0	150	1	150	150	1	150							-	Storage in lieu of practice rooms	
Maker Space	700	1	700				700	0	1,200	1	1,200	1,200	1	1,200	1,200	1	1,200				-		
Health & Physical Education	4,600			3,998			8,598	0			7,150			7,150			850			6,300			
Gymnasium	4,600	1	4,600	3,998	1	3,998	3998	0	6,750	1	6,750	6,750	1	6,750	750	0	750	6,000	1	6,000	Includes area for bleachers (seating for 130)		
Gym Storeroom			0				0	0	250	1	250	250	1	250	100	0	100	150	1	150			
Health Instructor's Office with Shower and Toilet			0				0	0	150	1	150	150	1	150	0	0	0	150	1	150			

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
665 Students, Grades 1-5, 7 Classrooms per Grade

Legend. Change from MSBA Guidelines

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE GREENLodge ELEMENTARY SCHOOL								EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL			EXISTING CONDITIONS GREENLodge SCHOOL			COMBINED EXISTING SF	PROPOSED PROGRAM									VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES			MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)								
ROOM TYPE								ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS		ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS		
Media Center								2,135			2,295			4,430	0			3,663			3,663			1			3,663								
Media Center / Reading Room										0	361	1	361				3,663	1	3,663	3,663	1	3,663	1	0	1	3,663	1	3,663							
Library								2,135	1	2,135	1,934	1	1,934	1,934																					
Dining and Cafeterium								2,001			970			2,971	0			9,860			9,860			1,220			8,640								
Cafeteria / Dining								0	0	0	0	0	0			4,988	1	4,988	4,988	1	4,988	1	0	1	4,988	1	4,988								
Stage								1,193	1	1,193	585	1	585	585		1,000	1	1,000	1,000	1	1,000	0	0	0	1,000	1	1,000								
Chair / Table / Equipment Storage										0			0			422	1	422	422	1	422	0	0	0	422	1	422								
Kitchen								808	1	808	385	1	385	385		2,400	1	2,400	2,400	1	2,400	435	0	435	1,965	1	1,965					Sized to allow full service breakfast and lunch per Dedham food service standards			
Staff Lunch Room										0			0			450	1	450	450	1	450	184	0	184	266	1	266								
Quiet Dining										0			0			600	1	600	600	1	600	600	1	600									For special needs students - 40 seats		
Medical								438			288			726	0			750			750			140			610								
Medical Suite Toilet										0			0			100	1	100	100	1	100	40	0	40	60	1	60						Include hoier lift. Shared with Medically Fragile		
Nurses' Office / Waiting Room								438	1	438	88	1	88	88		350	1	350	350	1	350	100	0	100	250	1	250						Special Education classroom		
Examination Room / Resting										0	200	1	200	200		100	3	300	100	3	300	0	0	0	100	3	300						2 nursing stations		
Administration & Guidance								1,202			1,635			2,837	0			3,088			3,088			438			2,650								
General Office / Waiting Room with Toilet								171	1	171	84	1	84	84		483	1	483	483	1	483	1	0	1	483	1	483								
Teachers' Mail and Time Room								230	1	230	462	1	462	462		100	1	100	100	1	100	0	0	0	100	1	100								
Copy Room								98	1	98	69	1	69	69		150	1	150	150	1	150	0	0	0	150	1	150								
Records Room								145	1	145	67	1	67	67		110	1	110	110	1	110	0	0	0	110	1	110								
Principal's Office with Conference Area								142	1	142	187	1	187	187		375	1	375	375	1	375	0	0	0	375	1	375							Includes Toilet Room	
Principal's Secretary / Waiting								0	0	0	141	1	141	141		125	1	125	125	1	125	0	0	0	125	1	125								
Assistant Principal's Office								0	0	0	0	0	0	0		120	1	120	120	1	120	0	0	0	120	1	120								
Supervisory / Spare Office								0	0	0	0	0	0	0		120	1	120	120	1	120	0	0	0	120	1	120								
Conference Room								0	0	0	249	1	249	249		250	1	250	250	1	250	0	0	0	250	1	250								
Guidance Office								0	0	0	188	1	188	188		200	1	200	200	1	200	50	1	200	150	0	-						Adjustment Counselor		
Guidance Office								0	0	0	188	1	188	188		150	2	300	150	2	300	0	0	0	150	2	300								
Guidance Storeroom								80	1	80	0	0	0	0		35	1	35	35	1	35	0	0	0	35	1	35								
Teachers' Work Room								336	1	336	0	0	0	0		300	2	600	300	2	600	-183	1	118	483	1	483					1 per wing			
Lactation Room										0			0			120	1	120	120	1	120	120	1	120									Required by Staff		
Custodial								5,160			529			5,689	0			2,265			2,265			0			2,265								
Custodian's Office								455	1	455	0	0	0	455		150	1	150	150	1	150	0	0	0	150	1	150								
Custodian's Workshop								0	0	0	0	0	0	-		375	1	375	375	1	375	0	0	0	375	1	375								
Custodian's Storage								1,378	1	1,378	349	1	349	1,727		375	1	375	375	1	375	0	0	0	375	1	375								
Recycling Room / Trash								0	0	0	0	0	0	-		200	1	200	200	1	200	-200	0	-200	400	1	400						Divided with Outdoor Storage		
Receiving and General Supply								0	0	0	180	1	180	180		322	1	322	322	1	322	0	0	0	322	1	322								
Storeroom								3,327	1	3,327	0	0	0	3,327		443	1	443	443	1	443	0	0	0	443	1	443								
Network / Telecom Room								0	0	0	0	0	0	-		200	1	200	200	1	200	0	0	0	200	1	200								
Outdoor Equipment Storage																200	1	200	200	1	200													For outdoor maintenance equipment	
OTHER								0			0			0	0			1,800			1,800			1,800			0								
(List rooms separately below)																																			
Pre-Kindergarten Classroom with Toilet (if appli								0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1,200	0	0	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200	0	-					
Net Zero Mechanical										0			0			1,800	1	1,800	1,800	1	1,800	1,800	1	1,800									Additional Mech space required for Geothermal		
Total Building Net Floor Area (NFA)								35,381			28,352			63,733	0			84,236			84,236			20,008			64,228			Total Building Net Floor Area (NFA)					
Proposed Student Capacity / Enrollment																																			
# of Grades										5			665	Total Enrollment (Enter Design Enrollment)																					
K										0			0			0		0					0		0								Kindergarten Enrollment		
Grade 1										1			266			266			266															Lower Elementary School Enrollment (Grades 1-	
Grade 2										1			399			399			399															Upper Elementary School Enrollment (Grades 3-	
Grade 3										1																									
Grade 4										1																									

Proposed Space Summary - Elementary School
665 Students, Grades 1-5, 7 Classrooms per Grade

Legend. Change from MSBA Guidelines

Date: 4/30/24 Preferred Schematic Report

OAKDALE GREENLodge ELEMENTARY SCHOOL				EXISTING CONDITIONS OAKDALE SCHOOL			EXISTING CONDITIONS GREENLodge SCHOOL			COMBINED EXISTING SF	PROPOSED PROGRAM									VARIATION TO MSBA GUIDELINES			MSBA GUIDELINES (DO NOT MODIFY) (Refer to Educational Facility Planning for additional information)								
ROOM TYPE				ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS		EXISTING TO REMAIN / RENOVATED			NEW CONSTRUCTION			TOTAL			ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	ROOM NFA ¹	# OF ROOMS	AREA TOTALS	COMMENTS		
NON-PROGRAMMED SPACES										% of GFA 0			% of GFA 42,118			% of GFA 42,118															
Other Occupied Rooms (List rooms separately below)																															
Unoccupied MEP / FP Spaces										-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	1,980	-	1.6%	1,980													
Unoccupied Closets, Supply Rooms, and Storage Rooms										-	0.0%		TBD	TBD		-	0.0%	0													
Toilet Rooms										-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	3,949	-	3.1%	3,949													
Circulation (corridors, stairs, ramps and elevators)										-	0.0%		TBD	TBD	17,662	-	14.0%	17,662													
Remaining ³										-	0.0%	0	TBD	TBD	18,527	-	14.7%	18,527													
Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) ²												0			126,354			126,354			29,929						96,425	Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA) ²			
Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)						0.00						N/A			1.50			1.50			0.00						1.50	Grossing Factor (GFA / NFA)			

- ¹ **Individual Room Net Floor Area (NFA)** Includes the net square footage measured from the inside face of the perimeter walls and includes all specific spaces assigned to a particular program area including such spaces as non-communal toilets and storage rooms.
- ² **Total Building Gross Floor Area (GFA)** Includes the entire building gross square footage measured from the outside face of exterior walls.
- ³ **Remaining** Includes exterior walls, interior partitions, chases, and other areas not listed above. Do not calculate this area, it is assumed to equal the difference between the Total Building Gross Floor Area and area not accounted for above.

Architect Certification

I hereby certify that all of the information provided in this "Proposed Space Summary" is true, complete and accurate and, except as agreed to in writing by the Massachusetts School Building Authority, in accordance with the guidelines, rules, regulations and policies of the Massachusetts School Building Authority to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Jonathan Levi Architects

Jonathan Levi

4.3 Space Summary Variations

UPDATE - March 20, 2024 the School Committee unanimously voted for an 360 student enrollment. Space Summary Variations noted below reflect the updated Space Summary for 360 student enrollment.

General Classrooms:

As previously approved by the MSBA in the original PSR Submission, additional General Classrooms are proposed in order to accommodate the Dedham standard number of 18 students / classroom.

As in the previously approved Space Summary, Typical Classrooms have been reduced from 950 nsf to 900 nsf due to inclusion of shared 100 sf teacher planning spaces (50 sf per classroom, for a total of 950 sf / classroom). This strategy allows greater flexibility within each classroom by eliminating the need for a fixed teacher desk, while simultaneously promoting greater collaboration between classroom teachers.

Classroom Breakout

As in the previously approved Space Summary, Classroom Breakout rooms at 300 nsf are proposed for Grades 1 and 2.

Because Grade 1 and 2 students do not yet have autonomy outside the classroom, these breakout spaces will be directly adjacent to and between two adjoining classrooms. Like Teacher Planning spaces, the scheduling of these classroom breakout spaces will blend a routine schedule with flexible scheduling for educators to use the spaces with students as needs arise throughout the school day. Routine scheduling will include time for academic support groups, special education services, counseling groups, small group content instruction, etc. Flexible scheduling will include activities such as small, ad hoc instructional groups to address student learning needs, student-teacher conferences and meetings, common teacher planning amongst larger groups of grade alike educators, etc.

Supervision of these spaces will be a blend of direct and indirect supervision depending on the circumstance. Educators using the space for the provision of direct services to students will directly supervise children utilizing these spaces. Educators who send a small group of children to use one of the breakout spaces to work on a project together will indirectly supervise the children using the space.

These classroom breakout spaces are critical learning spaces for academic support programming, special education service delivery, and other pedagogical practices that require flexible grouping of students. Provision of these types of services in a smaller, distraction free environment allows students to focus and engage fully in their learning or clinical services. These spaces greatly enhance inclusive practices that keep children near to their home base for learning instead of pulling them away from their peers and teachers for the provision of academic

support and special education services in traditional resource room settings. The practice of removing students from the general education setting is exclusionary and creates unnecessary anxiety and stigma for many young children.

Cohort Commons

As in the previously approved Space Summary, 3 Cohort commons are proposed, 1 for each grouping of 6 classrooms for grades 3, 4, and 5. Each to serve multiple functions including:

- Collaboration and project-based learning space for students outside of the classroom;
- Increase sense of community and “belonging” within the cohort by provide dedicated common space to each cohort;
- Exhibition space for project-based learning activities; when students see their work displayed, they are demonstrably part of the community and culture of the cohort.

Each cohort commons will be directly adjacent to and shared by General Education classrooms and Special Education classrooms. These cohort commons are the shared community space for grades 3, 4, and 5. Paralleling the scheduling of educator planning and classroom breakout spaces, Cohort Commons will blend routine and flexible scheduling of the space. Routine scheduling may include class/grade level meetings and assemblies and co/extracurricular enrichment activities. Flexibly scheduled uses may include cross grade level project-based learning teams, investigation/experimental space for student teams engaged in project-based learning opportunities, etc.

Supervision of these spaces will be a blend of direct and indirect. Students in grade 3, 4, and 5 are increasingly independent and seek opportunities to engage in work independently. In instances of flexible use for independent or small group project work the spaces will be indirectly supervised by appropriate grade level teachers. Routine events in the Cohort Commons will be directly supervised by grade level educators and related service providers.

Engaging students in class/grade level meetings or cross classroom activities is made possible by having the cohort commons space. This allows for children and educators to gather and work in a space that is separate from the classroom and allows for other learning opportunities or student groupings to function simultaneously without disruption to learning.

Special Education

As in the previously approved Space Summary and consistent with MSBA guidelines, 4 Self-Contained SPED Classrooms are proposed. 3 are undifferentiated, and 1 is to be outfitted to accommodate medically fragile students.

As with all General Classrooms, these 4 Classrooms have been reduced from 950 nsf to 900 nsf due to include of shared 100 sf teacher planning spaces (50 sf per classroom, for a total of 950 sf / classroom). This strategy allows greater flexibility within each classroom by eliminating the need for a fixed teacher desk, while simultaneously promoting greater collaboration between classroom teachers. Making the SPED classrooms as identical to general ed classrooms as possible helps to reduce stigma for students who use the SPED classrooms

The Medically Fragile classroom has a 100 sf bathroom (larger than the 60 sf MSBA standard) to allow room for a Hoyer lift. The other 3 SPED classrooms do not have bathrooms, in order to allow them to be identical with Gen Ed classrooms, and be interchangeable with other classrooms should the need arise in the future.

In conformance with the unified school's Educational Program, the space summary proposes a 950 sf OT/PT Room, an IEP Conference Room, a 150 sf Psychiatrist Office, and a 150 sf Guidance Office.

Art and Music

As in the previously approved Space Summary, in lieu of 2 art classrooms at 1,000 sf, each with a 150 sf art workroom, the program proposes that one of the Art Room and Workrooms be a 1,200 sf Maker Space. This will allow greater flexibility for project-based learning. For safety, the Maker Space is proposed to be 1,200 sf, which is 50 sf larger than the combined 1,150 sf Art & Workroom it will replace.

Quiet Dining

Consistent with current practice, a quiet dining room has been added for the benefit of children who have special needs, to help them self-regulate and otherwise not be overwhelmed by the levels of noise and activity that are inevitable in a Grade 1-5 elementary school.

Lactation Room

A 120 sf Lactation Room has been added as required by Dedham's union contract

We believe that the incorporation of these strategies into the program will not only result in a very successful school for 360 kids in grades 1-5, but will also be flexible enough to accommodate future changes to our educational methods and needs, so that the building will be successful for decades to come.

4.4 Sustainability Documents

Sustainability documents of the below items follow.

- LEED Scorecard
- Designer's sustainability letter



LEEDv4 BD+C: Schools (LEEDv4 SC) Project Scorecard

Project: Dedham Oakdale Elementary School

Date: 8/28/23 (Initial Preliminary Scorecard)



The Green Engineer
Sustainable Design Consulting

Y	?	N	1	0	INTEGRATIVE PROCESS	1
			1	0	Integrative Process	1
			15	6	LOCATION & TRANSPORTATION	15
		N			LEED for Neighborhood Development Location	15
			1		Sensitive Land Protection	1
			1		High Priority Site	1-2
			2	3	Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses (RP@4)	1-5
			1	3	Access to Quality Transit (RP@1)	1-4
			1		Bicycle Facilities	1
			1		Reduced Parking Footprint	1
			1		Green Vehicles	1
			12	6	SUSTAINABLE SITES	12
					SSpr1 Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Required
					SSpr2 Environmental Site Assessment	Required
			1		SSc1 Site Assessment	1
			1	1	SSc2 Site Development - Protect or Restore Habitat (RP@2)	1-2
			1		Open Space	1
			3		Rainwater Management	2-3
			1		Heat Island Reduction	1-2
			1		Light Pollution Reduction	1
				1	Site Master Plan	1
					Joint Use of Facilities	1
			12	3	WATER EFFICIENCY	12
					WEpr1 Outdoor Water Use Reduction	Required
					WEpr2 Indoor Water Use Reduction	Required
					WEpr3 Building-Level Water Metering	Required
			1	1	WEC1 Outdoor Water Use Reduction	1-2
			3	2	WEC2 Indoor Water Use Reduction	1-7
				2	WEC3 Cooling Tower Water Use	2
				1	WEC4 Water Metering	1
			31	11	ENERGY & ATMOSPHERE	31
					EApr1 Fundamental Commissioning and Verification	Required
					EApr2 Minimum Energy Performance	Required
					EApr3 Building-Level Energy Metering	Required
					EApr4 Fundamental Refrigerant Management	Required
			6		EAc1 Enhanced Commissioning	2-6
			14	2	Optimize Energy Performance (RP@3)	1-16
			1		Advanced Energy Metering	1
			2		Demand Response	1-2
			3		Renewable Energy Production (RP@2)	1-3
			1		Enhanced Refrigerant Management	1
			2		Green Power and Carbon Offsets	1-2

Y	?	N	3	6	4	MATERIALS & RESOURCES	13
			Y			MRpr1 Storage and Collection of Recyclables	Required
			Y			MRpr2 Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning	Required
			2	3		Building Life-Cycle Impact Reduction (RP@2)	2-5
			1	1		Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - EPD	1-2
			1	1	1	Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Sourcing of Raw Materials	1-2
			1	1		Building Product Disclosure and Optimization - Material Ingredients	1-2
			1	1		Construction and Demolition Waste Management	1-2
			9	6	1	INDOOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	16
			Y			IEOpr1 Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance	Required
			Y			IEOpr2 Environmental Tobacco Smoke Control	Required
			Y			IEOpr3 Minimum Acoustic Performance	Required
			2			IEOc1 Enhanced Indoor Air Quality Strategies	2
			3			IEOc2 Low-Emitting Materials	3
			1			IEOc3 Construction Indoor Air Quality Management Plan	1
			1	1		IEOc4 IAQ Assessment	2
			1			IEOc5 Thermal Comfort	1
			1	1		IEOc6 Interior Lighting	2
			3			IEOc7 Daylight	3
			1			IEOc8 Quality Views	1
					1	IEOc9 Acoustic Performance	1
			4	2	0	INNOVATION	6
			1			INc1.1 Innovation: Assumes minimum of 3 will be earned	1
			1			INc1.2 Innovation: Assumes minimum of 3 will be earned	1
			1			INc1.3 Innovation: Assumes minimum of 3 will be earned	1
			1			INc1.4 Innovation: TBD	1
			1			INc1.5 Pilot Credit: TBD	1
			1			INc2 LEED Accredited Professional	1
			1	3	0	REGIONAL PRIORITY (underlined)	4
					X	RPc1 RP: LT c4 Surrounding Density @4	1
			1			RPc2 RP: LT c5 Access to Quality Transit @1	1
					X	RPc3 RP: SSc2 Protect or Restore Habitat @2	1
			1			RPc4 RP: EAc2 Optimize Energy Performance @8	1
			1			RPcX RP: EAc5 Renewable Energy Production @2	1
			1			RPcX RP: MRC1 Bidg Life-cycle Impact Reduction @2	1
			51	42	17	PROJECT TOTALS (Certification Estimates)	110

Certified: 40-49 points Silver: 50-59 points Gold: 60-79 points Platinum: 80+ points




Statement Regarding MSBA High Efficiency Green School Program

This is an acknowledgement that the Town of Dedham has identified a goal of 4% additional reimbursement from the MSBA High Efficiency Green School Program, consistent with MSBA Project Advisory 81. As their Designer, I have submitted a completed LEED scorecard showing 51 attempted points, and an additional 42 possible points which will meet that goal.

The Oakdale Elementary School shall be designed to achieve at least a LEED Silver certification.

The scope of work for this project will include the construction elements and performance tasks to achieve the goal, and all subsequent documents, including but not limited to, specifications, drawings and cost estimates will match the scope of work indicated in the submitted scorecard.

It should be noted that LEED Certified certification requires 50 to 59 points, and that it is anticipated that a cost benefit analysis will be performed during Schematic Design and Design Development to refine the list of targeted points as appropriate for this project, so that the final approved points will conservatively fall within this window.


Jonathan Levi, FAIA
Principal
Jonathan Levi Architects

4.5 Preferred Solution - Site

UPDATE: Oakdale Site - New Construction - 360 students

The 360 student enrollment at 91,100 sf allows for a 2 story solution and minimizes the building footprint on the site. The gymnasium located at the east side of the building has direct access to the outdoor space and fields. The site has continuity of the green space surrounding the building while at the same time maintaining proper solar orientation for the classrooms.

The building's plan shape bows away from a projecting abuttor's property, thereby helping to alleviate neighborhood concerns and, at the same time, expanding available protected open space for outdoor classroom and recreational use. Overall, the efficiency of the



UPDATED - Site Plan

resulting site plan allows for the flexibility of creating approximately 53,000sf of temporary usable open space to the north of the existing building during construction. Permanent usable open space would be a generous 148,000sf with the removal of the existing 1902 school structure. On October 10, 2023 the SBRC votes unanimously to remove the 1902 building structure.

The community expressed a strong preference for minimizing traffic on residential Madison St. Accordingly, the conceptual parking and drop off plan calls for parent access and exiting from Cedar St - with ample on-site cueing through the east parking lot which hugs Madison St. This configuration of parking maximizes consolidated green space. The west parking lot provides convenient community access to the gymnasium, access to the loading dock as well as additional teacher and staff parking. Bus drop off will be provided with a cut out lane along Madison St.

The building entrance is announced by a 2 story portico facing toward the Cedar St. approach and framing the main cafeteria meeting space. The lobby spans from front to back highlighting access to the north outdoor learning and playspaces. It is superintended by a one story projecting administration wing whose welcome area commands views to the core spaces and central corridor.

An exciting cluster of interactive core spaces occupies the center of the building, with cafeteria, media center, maker space, art and music all proximate and visible to each other. The two academic wings, grades 1-2 to the left and 3-5 to the right form two 'schools within a school' creating appropriately sized learning sub-communities. They are differentiated from each other according to the program requirements; with the 3-5 corridor widening into shared collaborative cohort commons activity areas while the 1-2 classrooms include shared breakout spaces.



4.6 Preferred Solution - Building Plans

The Preferred Solution 'Core Cluster' plans reflect the program requirements documented in the updated Space Summary in Section 4.2 reflecting the 360 student enrollment.



UPDATED - Floor Plans - 360 students

- CORE ACADEMIC SPACES
- SPECIAL EDUCATION
- ART & MUSIC
- HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION
- MEDIA CENTER
- DINING & FOOD SERVICE
- MEDICAL
- ADMINISTRATION & GUIDANCE
- CUSTODIAL & MAINTENANCE
- CIRCULATION
- TOILET AND MECH



0' 20' 40' 80' **2ND FLOOR**



4.7 Local Funding

UPDATED - The Total Construction Costs budget for New Construction Option D, also called O-O-N, is \$87.1 million. At this early stage of development, the construction costs are very high level. During the Schematic Design phase of the design the SBRC will make some key decisions on types of building systems, exterior materials, and site layouts which will then allow the estimators to establish a detailed construction budget. It is important to note that the SBRC has discussed some of these items as part of the previous SD discussions, however they will revisit these conversations during the upcoming SD phase for the preferred standalone Oakdale School Option. Based upon the current estimate the team estimates the soft cost budget to be \$26.1 million bringing the total project cost to \$113.2 million.

Over the past ten years the Town has invested in multiple capital improvements projects including the new ECEC School, the new combined Town Hall/Senior Center Building, the new Public Safety Building which opened earlier in 2023, and a new Town Green on the old Police Station property. The Town of Dedham maintains a healthy balance sheet and its current debt load is well within the recommended level. For the new Oakdale School project, the Town of Dedham will request a debt exclusion vote. This will require a 2/3 majority vote at Town Meeting and a majority vote at the Town Election vote.

The Town of Dedham is committed to procuring funding for this project. The project team has worked thoroughly and diligently to develop the preferred Design Option D (O-O-N) that best suits the educational goals, neighborhood concerns, and is the most fiscally feasible solution for the Town.

4.8 Budget Statement

Following is the PSR budget document. For the post construction budget assuming 3 years in the future:

- Union based salary lines have been increased 3.5% annually each year
- Non-union salary lines have been increased 5% annually each year
- Added one custodian to help maintain the larger building
- Added 3 paraprofessionals as an industry standard
- Accelerated expense lines by 3% annually
- Electricity line has been reduced to compensate for solar addition
- Expense budgets have been added for HVAC, equipment maintenance, and elevators, with a larger increase to facility maintenance to account for repairs of the more complicated and more plentiful equipment on a new building

UPDATE - An Updated Budget Statement spreadsheet follows.

Budget Statement for Preferred Schematic - Expenditures


As reported on the school district's most recent three end of year information, please updated to the 3 latest fiscal year periods and complete the fields below.										
Category	2021-2022 FY2022		2022-2023 FY2023		Change from Previous Year		Post-Constuction Budget		New Facility vs. Current	
	Staff (FTE)	Budget	Staff	Budget	Staff (FTE)	Budget	Staff	Budget	Staff (FTE)	Budget
Salaries										
Administration (Greenlodge and Oakdale Elementaries)										
Admin. Secretary	1.00	52,690	1.00	54,320	0.00	1,630	1.50	89,035	0.50	34,715
Assistant Principal	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Business Office	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Curriculum Director/Coord.	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Custodians/Maintenance Staff	2.00	113,404	2.00	116,911	0.00	3,507	2.50	186,208	0.50	69,296
Executive Secretary	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Facilities Manager	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Guidance	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Adjustment Counselor	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Guidance Counselors	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Guidance Director	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Legal	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Nurse	1.00	78,265	1.00	80,686	0.00	2,421	1.50	134,187	0.50	53,501
Other	1.00	35,000	1.00	35,000	0.00	-	4.00	152,982	3.00	117,982
Principal	1.00	134,879	1.00	139,050	0.00	4,172	1.00	160,968	0.00	21,918
Special Education Admin	0.50	60,625	0.50	62,500	0.00	1,875	1.00	125,000	0.50	62,500
Superintendent/Asst. Superintendent	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Transportation	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Treasurer	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Total Administration	6.50	474,863	6.50	488,467	0.00	13,604	11.50	848,380	5.00	359,912
Instruction - Teaching Services										
Arts	0.60	62,598	0.60	64,789	0.00	2,191	1.00	100,566	0.40	35,777
Business	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Communications	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Coping Instructor	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Culinary Arts	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
ELL	1.00	72,021	1.00	74,248	0.00	2,227	1.40	115,248	0.40	41,000
English Language	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Family Consumer Services	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Foreign Language	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Health Services	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
History & Social Science	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Instructional Assistant/Paraprofessionals	9.00	270,000	9.00	278,100	0.00	8,100	12.60	413,051	3.60	134,951
Library/Media	1.00	95,000	1.00	97,850	0.00	2,850	1.00	108,488	0.00	10,638
Mathematics	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
MCAS	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Music	0.80	68,000	0.80	70,040	0.00	2,040	1.20	77,655	0.40	7,615
Other	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Physical Education	1.00	95,000	1.00	97,850	0.00	2,850	1.60	173,581	0.60	75,731
Reading	14.00	1,190,000	14.00	1,225,700	0.00	35,700	20.00	1,339,355	6.00	113,655
School Adjustment Counselor	1.00	85,000	1.00	87,550	0.00	2,550	2.00	191,336	1.00	103,786
Science	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Biology	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Botany	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Chemistry	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Geology	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Physics	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Special Education	8.00	664,000	8.00	683,920	0.00	19,920	11.20	758,274	3.20	74,354
Substitute Teachers	1.00	37,000	1.00	38,110	0.00	1,110	1.40	41,644	0.40	3,534
Technology	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Vocational Tech.	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	-
Total Instruction - Teaching Services	37.40	2,638,619	37.40	2,718,157	0.00	79,538	53.40	3,319,198	16.00	601,041
Total Salaries Administration & Instruction	43.90	3,113,482	43.90	3,206,624	0.00	93,142	64.90	4,167,578	21.00	960,954
Employee Benefits										
All employee-related fringe (health insurance, retirement etc)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Materials & Services										
Materials										
Audio-Visual Materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-


Budget Statement for Preferred Schematic - Expenditures

Category	2021-2022 FY2022		2022-2023 FY2023		Change from Previous Year		Post-Constuction Budget		New Facility vs. Current	
	Staff (FTE)	Budget	Staff	Budget	Staff (FTE)	Budget	Staff	Budget	Staff (FTE)	Budget
Culinary Arts Materials		-		-		-		-		-
General Office Supplies		44,500		44,500		-		68,077		23,577
Information technology		-		-		-		-		-
Hardware		-		-		-		-		-
Software		-		-		-		-		-
Library Materials		5,950		5,950		-		9,102		3,152
Non info-tech equipment		-		-		-		-		-
Testing Materials & Supplies		3,000		3,000		-		4,589		1,589
Textbooks		20,000		20,000		-		30,596		10,596
Vocational Program Materials		-		-		-		-		-
Total Materials		73,450		73,450		-		112,365		38,915
Services										
Athletics		-		-		-		-		-
Attendance		-		-		-		-		-
Food Service		-		-		-		-		-
Health Services		-		-		-		-		-
Other Student Activities		70,000		70,000		-		76,491		6,491
Psychological Services		-		-		-		-		-
School Security		-		-		-		-		-
Student Transportation		90,000		90,000		-		196,691		106,691
Total Services		160,000		160,000		-		273,182		113,182
Total Material & Services		233,450		233,450		-		385,547		152,097
Facility Costs & Capital Improvements										
Facility Costs										
Custodial Supplies		16,800		16,800		-		25,032		8,232
Electricity		100,548		100,548		-		149,817		49,269
Heating Oil		40,000		40,000		-		59,600		19,600
Maintenance										
Building Security Maintenance		-		-		-		-		-
Elevator		-		-		-		-		-
Equipment Maintenance		-		-		-		-		-
Exterminating		-		-		-		-		-
Facility Maintenance		8,400		8,400		-		12,516		4,116
Fire Alarm		-		-		-		-		-
Fire Extinguisher Inspection		-		-		-		-		-
Generator		-		-		-		-		-
HVAC Maintenance		-		-		-		-		-
Other		-		-		-		-		-
Site Maintenance (Grouds)		-		-		-		-		-
Technology		-		-		-		-		-
Trash Removal		-		-		-		-		-
Natural Gas		-		-		-		-		-
Snow Removal		-		-		-		-		-
Telephone		4,900		4,900		-		7,301		2,401
Water/Sewer		7,000		7,000		-		10,430		3,430
Total Facility Costs		177,648		177,648		-		264,696		87,048
Capital Improvements										
Capital Improvements		40,000		40,000		-		-		(40,000)
Total Facility Costs & Capital Improvements		217,648		217,648		-		264,696		47,048
Debt Service										
Short-term		-		-		-		-		-
Long-term		-		-		-		-		-
Total Debt Service		-		-		-		-		-
Total Budget & Staff	43.90	3,564,580	43.90	3,657,722	0	93,142	65	4,817,820	21	1,160,098

4.9 Project Schedule

UPDATE - An updated Project Schedule dated May 2, 2024 with key dates and durations follows.





5 Local Actions and Approvals

5.1 Local Actions and Approval Certification

UPDATE - Updated Certified letter of meetings follows.



Dedham Public Schools
Home of America's First Tax-Supported Free Public School

Nan Skiff Murphy
Superintendent of Schools
781-310-1011

Dr. Ian P. Kelly
Deputy Superintendent
781-310-1023

Dr. Sara Stetson
Assistant Superintendent, Student Services
781-310-1025

May 2, 2024

Ms. Mary Pichetti
Director of Capital Planning
40 Broad Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Dear Ms. Pichetti:

The Town of Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee ("SBRC") has completed its review of the Preferred Schematic Report for the Oakdale school project (the "Project"), and on April 29, 2024, the SBRC voted to approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Feasibility Study related materials to the MSBA for its consideration. A certified copy of the SBRC meeting minutes, which includes the specific language of the vote and the number of votes in favor, opposed, and abstained, are attached.

Since the MSBA's Board of Directors invited the District to conduct a Feasibility Study on *April 14, 2021*, the SBRC has held Forty Seven (47) meetings regarding the proposed project, in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law. These meetings include:

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee (SBRC) Meetings:				
<u>Mtg. Date</u>	<u>Topics</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Materials</u>
May 25, 2022 SBRC Meeting	Shortlist OPM Candidates	SBRC	VOTE: Shortlist OPM Candidates	
June 8, 2022 SBRC Meeting	Interview OPM Candidates	SBRC, OPM Firms	n/a	OPM Provided Presentations
June 14, 2022 SBRC Meeting	OPM Candidates	SBRC	VOTE: Approve Compass/Vertex as OPM	
July 17, 2022 SBRC Meeting	Introduce Compass/Vertex, Review Project Timeline	SBRC, Vertex	n/a	OPM Timeline, Team Introductions
August 22, 2022 SBRC Meeting	Designer Select Update - RFS issued	SBRC, Vertex	n/a	Vertex Slides with project update

The Dedham Public School does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, genetic information, ancestry, military status, disability, pregnancy, or pregnancy related condition in its educational activities or employment practices.

September 19, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Designer Select panel Reps; Community Mtg on 9/28/22	SBRC, Vertex	n/a	Vertex Slides with project update
October 11, 2022 SBRC Mtg	(3) Designer Proposals rec'd; DSP Update; Community Meeting Discussion	SBRC, Vertex	n/a	Vertex Slides with project update
November 21, 2022 SBRC Mtg	DSP Update (JLA selected); Public Communications Subcommittee creation	SBRC, Vertex	VOTE: Public Communication Subcommittee formation	Vertex Slides with project update, JLA Introduction slides
December 5, 2022 SBRC Mtg	JLA Introduction; Possible project sites; Public Feedback	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Slide presentation
December 19, 2022 SBRC Mtg	Site Evaluation Matrix; Potential community meetings	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Site Evaluation Matrix
January 17, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Site Evaluation Matrix; Visioning; Redistricting Consultant	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Site Evaluation Matrix; Visioning Introduction
January 31, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Site Evaluations; 1/26/23 Community Mtg; Visioning; Redistricting Consultant	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to Eliminate Paul Park, Dolan Center, Whitcomb Woods, and Rustcraft Rd as potential sites	Site Evaluation Matrix
February 13, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Site Test Fits; Space Summaries; Visioning update	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to eliminate remove the Oakdale/Riverdale combination school options from both the Striar and Capen School sites VOTE: Approve Cropper GIS Redistricting Consultant	Site Test Fits, Space Summaries
February 18, 2023 SBRC Mtg/Site Walk	Outdoor Site walk of all potential sites	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	none
February 27, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Visioning Report Review; Updated Building Test Fits; School Committee Update; Community Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Visioning Report, Building Test Fits
March 13, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Test Fits for Add/Reno Options; Community Meeting Details	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to eliminate a combined Capen/Striar option	Building Test Fits
March 27, 2023 SBRC Mtg	Project update, survey results discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: To approve PDP submittal to MSBA	PDP Report

April 10, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Project Cost presentation, meeting schedule, joint meeting prep	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Vertex schedule & cost slides
April 26, 2023 Joint SBRC/School Committee Meeting	Project cost presentation, site matrix review, schedule review	SBRC, School Committee, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to Eliminate Striar Property	Vertex schedule & cost slides, JLA Matrix
May 9, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Survey discussion, schedule review	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Draft Site Survey
May 22, 2023 SBRC School Tours	Tour of the Fales School in Westborough and the Field School in Weston	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	None
May 23, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Project Financing with Town Finance Manager, schedule review, survey update, Matrix review	SBRC, Vertex, JLA, Town Representatives	n/a	Vertex Schedule, JLA Matrix & Draft matrix summary
June 5, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Schedule Review, Site Considerations discussion, classroom layout presentation	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA bubble diagrams and classroom layout examples
June 21, 2023 SBRC Meeting	conceptual site layouts, Site considerations & public comment on sites,	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to remove Greenlodge sit from consideration	JLA Site Layout presentation
June 26, 2023 SBRC Meeting	conceptual site layouts, Site considerations & public comment on sites, SBRC Vote on Preferred Site	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to select Oakdale as the preferred site and eliminate Capen.	Vertex Schedule Slide, JLA Site Layout presentation
July 10, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Discuss PSR process and schedule, future meeting schedule	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA PSR Schedule
July 17, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Discussion on possible recission of site vote with public comment; Building option presentation	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Site & Building Layout presentation
July 31, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Building option matrix review, Building option presentation, cost discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Site & Building Layout presentation, Vertex Cost presentation
August 7, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Schedule review; Discussion on voting process, Discussion on Building options	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to selection Building Option D as the preferred option.	JLA Site & Building Layout presentation, Vertex Cost presentation
August 21, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Schedule Review, PSR Review, Discussion on project name change and communications	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to approve the PSR Submittal to the MSBA	Vertex Slides, JLA Option D Slide

September 11, 2023 SBRC Meeting	MSBA/PSR update, Design update, Traffic Study update	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Design Presentation
September 26, 2023 SBRC Meeting	MSBA/PSR update, Design update, Traffic Study update, 1902 building discussion, ex officio member discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to close the ex- officio member posting	JLA Design Presentation
October 10, 2023 SRC Meeting	1902 building discussion, Design update, School committee report, Fincom meeting report	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to demolish the existing 1902 building VOTE: to approve design option D.2 VOTE: to add ex-officio members	JLA Design presentation
October 23, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Financial/Tax implication discussion, Design update, Traffic Study update, Landscape Design discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to create subcommittees and update working group members	JLA Design Presentation
November 7, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Landscape design, building design, community meetings	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to add more ex- officio members	Halvorson Design Presentation
November 20, 2023 SBRC Meeting	community meetings, history of project to date, school dept. report, design update,	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Halvorson Design Presentation, SC Presentation on larger schools
December 4, 2023 SBRC Meeting	Design update, project budget review, school department report,	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	3011 budget form, JLA Value management presentation, school department slides
December 11, 2023 SBRC meeting	Design update, site design discussion, HVAC/Geothermal discussion, CMR v DBB, Value management, Responses to MSBA queries	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to move forward with Geothermal	JLA phasing diagrams, Vertex CMR v DBB presentation, Value Management spreadsheet
December 12, 2023 Joint SBRC, School Committee, Select Board Meeting	General project discussion, vote schedule discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA, School Committee, Select Board	n/a	Town clerk vote schedule presentation, JLA design presentation, School Department Presentation

December 19, 2023 SBRC Meeting	CMR v DBB discussion, Value management, response to MSBA enrollment query	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to move forward with CMR delivery VOTE: to accept removal of saw tooth roof at gym VOTE: to go back to the MSBA and request a formal enrollment review	none
January 22, 2024 SBRC Meeting	Project recap, discussion on public outreach, Town capital improvements on surrounding streets	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Classroom/Enrollment matrix
February 6, 2024 SBRC Meeting	MSBA Enrollment options update, future meeting dates	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Classroom/Enrollment matrix
March 5, 2024 SBRC Meeting	MSBA Enrollment options update, School Committee report	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	none
March 25, 2024 SBRC Meeting	MSBA Enrollment options update, Potential site discussion, Added cost for new PSR/SD	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to move forward with the Oakdale school site	none
April 9, 2024 SBRC Meeting	Warrant Article discussion, PSR update & discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	none
April 29, 2024 SBRC Meeting	Design review, PSR submission discussion	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to approve submission of revised PSR to the MSBA	JLA Design Presentation

In addition to the regular SBRC meetings listed above, the District held Thirty (30) public community and school committee meetings, which were posted in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law and at which the Project was discussed. These meetings include:

Dedham Oakdale Community Meetings				
Mtg. Date	Topics	Present	Votes	Materials
September 28, 2022 Community Mtg	Overall project timeline update	SBRC, School Committee, Vertex, Public	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
October 18, 2022 Riverdale Informational Meeting	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, Riverdale School PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
November 1, 2022 Avery Informational Meeting	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, Avery School PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information

November 9, 2022 Oakdale Informational Meeting	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, Oakdale School PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
November 22, 2022 Greenlodge Informational Meeting	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, Greenlodge School PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
December 6, 2022 ECEC Informational Meeting	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, ECEC PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
December 7, 2022 School Committee Designer Intro Mtg	Introduction of JLA to School Committee	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
January 26, 2023 Community Mtg	Project Schedule, Site Matrix Review, Intro. JLA	SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	Site Evaluation Matrix
February 2, 2023 Dedham MS Informational Mtg	Project Update at School PTO Meeting	SBRC, Vertex, Middle School PTO	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
March 25, 2023, Community Meeting	Community Meeting to discuss potential project sites - held as an open discussion with stations for each site	SBRC, Vertex, JLA, community members	n/a	Large poster boards of each site; large white boards to record public comments
June 17, 2023 Community Meeting	Community Meeting to review sites, project costs, schedule, and next steps	SBRC, Vertex, JLA, community members	n/a	Vertex Schedule & Costs slides; JLA site layout slides
July 13, 2023 Abutters Meeting	Meet with direct abutters to discuss the project. Walk the site to review actual conditions and answer questions.	SBRC, Vertex, JLA, Abutters	n/a	JLA Site layout slides
February 12, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
February 28, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 4, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 7, 2025	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 11, 2026	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 20, 2024	Recommendation on enrollment option for new Elementary School	School Committee	VOTE: To approve 360 stand alone Oakdale enrollment	n/a

April 3, 2024	Warrant Article recommendation for added funds for feasibility	School Committee	VOTE: To approve the updated Educational Program for the PSR VOTE: To approve warrant article for added feasibility funding	
May 1, 2024	Recommendation on enrollment option for new Elementary School	School Committee	VOTE: To approve PSR Submission.	n/a

Dedham Oakdale **School Committee** Meetings

<u>Mtg. Date</u>	<u>Topics</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Materials</u>
September 28, 2022	COMMUNITY MEETING - project overview	SBRC, School Committee, Vertex, Public	n/a	Project Timeline, Website/Contact Information
October 5, 2022	Community Meeting update, Dedham Day flyers and attendance update	School Committee	n/a	n/a
October 19, 2022	Designer Selection update, Harvard, MA School Visti	School Committee	n/a	n/a
November 2, 2022	Design Selection Pane update, Avery School PTO Meeting update	SC, Vertex, SBRC Chair	n/a	n/a
November 16, 2022	Designer Selection Panel, Greenlodge PTO Meeting update	School Committee	n/a	n/a
December 7, 2022	MSBA Program, ECEC PTO Meeting update, Introduction of JLA	School Committee, Vertex, SBRC Chair	n/a	n/a
January 4, 2023	Update on potential sites, Education Model for PDP	School Committee	n/a	n/a
January 18, 2023	Upcoming community meeting, site evaluation update	School Committee	n/a	n/a
February 1, 2023	Timeline & Process update, Educational Plan requirements for PDP,	School Committee, Vertex, JLA	Vertex Slides	n/a
February 15, 2023	Update on previous meetings, Timeline review, Cropper Redistricting Proposal Review, Visioning update	School Committee, Vertex, JLA	VOTE: to approve the Cropper GIS redistricting consultant proposal	Vertex Slides, JLA Slides
March 1, 2023	Educational Plan update, Visioning update	School Committee, Vertex, JLA	n/a	n/a
March 15, 2023 School Committee Mtg.	School Committee Meeting: PDP	John Tocci, Vertex, JLA, School Committee	VOTE: To approve Educational Plan for PDP submission	Vertex Slides, JLA Slides

	Submission, Educational Plan			
April 1, 2023	Community Meeting update, Discussion of joint meeting with SBRC	School Committee	n/a	n/a
April 26, 2023 Joint Meeting with SBRC	Project overview, timeline update, site evaluation update	School Committee, Vertex, JLA	SBRC VOTE: to eliminate Striar property from consideration	Vertex Slides, JLA Slides
May 3, 2023	Review of site options as they relate to the enrollment options	School Committee, SBRC Chair, Vertex	n/a	n/a
May 17, 2023	School tours update, upcoming meetings regarding project financing	School Committee, SBRC Chair, Vertex	Vertex Slides	n/a
March 25, 2023, Community Meeting	Community Meeting to discuss potential project sites - held as an open discussion with stations for each site	School Committee, SBRC, Vertex, JLA, community members	n/a	Large poster boards of each site; large white boards to record public comments
June 7, 2023	Discussion on enrollment options	School Committee, SBRC Chair, Vertex	VOTE: to approve the 550 student enrollment option	n/a
August 22, 2023	PSR Submission Discussion	School Committee, SBRC Chair, Vertex	VOTE: to approve submission of the PSR to the MSBA	n/a
December 6, 2023	Discussion on NESDEC Enrollment Projections	School Committee	n/a	n/a
December 12, 2023, Joint Meeting with Select Board & SBRC	General project discussion, enrollment projections, potential vote sequencing	School Committee, Select Board, SBRC, Vertex, JLA	n/a	JLA Presentation, School Dept. Presentation, Town Clerk vote presentation
December 20, 2023	Discussion on SBRC Recommendation	School Committee	VOTE: to request a formal enrollment re-evaluation by the MSBA	n/a
January 31, 2024	Review MSBA Revised Enrollment options	School Committee	VOTE: to execute the enrollment certification from the MSBA for the Oakdale School Project	n/a
February 12, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a

February 28, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 4, 2024	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 7, 2025	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 11, 2026	Community Forum on Greenlodge/Oakdale ES Project	School Committee	n/a	n/a
March 20, 2024	Recommendation on enrollment option for new Elementary School	School Committee	VOTE: To approve 360 stand alone Oakdale enrollment	n/a
April 3, 2024	Warrant Article recommendation for added funds for feasibility	School Committee	VOTE: To approve the updated Educational Program for the PSR VOTE: To approve warrant article for added feasibility funding	
May 1, 2024	Recommendation on enrollment option for new Elementary School	School Committee	VOTE: To approve submission of the PSR Report to the MSBA	n/a

The presentation materials for each meeting, meeting minutes, and summary materials related to the Project are available locally for public review at the project website, the School Committee Website, or the SBRC Website which are all pages attached to the Town of Dedham Town Webpage: <https://www.dedham-ma.gov/>
SBRC Meetings Webpage: <https://www.dedham-ma.gov/government/school-building-rehabilitation-committee/meetings/-npage-2>
School Committee Meetings Webpage: <https://www.dedham.k12.ma.us/Page/2717>

To the best of my knowledge and belief, each of the meetings listed above complied with the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25 and 940 CMR 29 *et seq.*

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Steve Theran, Sr. Project Manager, Vertex Companies at stheran@vertexeng.com or 508-353-1203.

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in


this Certification is true,
complete, and accurate.


By: _____

**Title: Chief Executive
Officer**

Date: 5/1/24


this Certification is true,
complete, and accurate.


By: _____

**Title: Superintendent of
Schools**

Date: 5/1/2024

this Certification is true,
complete, and accurate.


By: _____

**Title: Chair of the School
Committee**

Date: 5/1/24

5.2 SBC Meeting Minutes

UPDATE - Certified Minutes for the meetings listed below follow:

SBRC 1/31/23
SBRC 2/13/23
DPS 2/15/23
SBRC 3/13/23
DPS 3/15/23
SBRC 3/27/23
SBRC 4/26/23
SBRC 5/25/23
DPS 6/07/23
SBRC 6/21/23
SBRC 6/26/23
SBRC 8/07/23
SBRC 8/21/23
DPS-SBRC- 8/22/23
SBRC 10/10/23
SBRC 12/11/23
SBRC 12/19/23
DPS 12/20/23
DPS 1/31/24
DPS 3/20/24 (draft)
SBRC 3/25/24
SBRC 4/29/24 (in process)
DPS 5/01/24 (in process)

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Oakdale School and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Tuesday January 31, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux; Project Director	A	Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
	Kevin Coughlin	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi		
	Victor Hebert	A	Philip Gray		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM

No old business to be discuss.

2. Previous meetings minutes reviewed:

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the minutes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Heffernan corrected the name of the person on zoom asking a question, should be Drew Pepoli.

Motion: to approve by Mr. Bilafer

Second by: Ms. MacDonald Briggs

3. January 26 Community Meeting Update:

Mr. Tocci provided an update on the January 26, 2023, community meeting that was held at the Middle School and via Zoom. He noted there were many questions about the sites, most of them regarding the Capen and Striar properties. There were no other sites recommended for consideration by the public.

4. Site Considerations:

Ms. Ellis provided a schedule update stating the project is progressing on schedule and anticipates having a design ready for a Spring 2024 Town Meeting. The PDP is the next big submission and due in Mid-March.

Mr. Tocci stated Vertex will also attend the school committee meeting this coming Wednesday.

Ms. Ellis continued, stating Vertex is going to bring the school committee up to speed on the project and provide an overview of school committee required votes for the upcoming months.

A True Copy Attest

Paul M. Manastach
Town Clerk

Mr. Tocci also stated Vertex will be presenting the Cropper GIS proposal for approval.

Mr. Bilafer requested clarification on the PDP requirements for the project for the community and people not familiar with the MSBA terminology.

Mr. Theran stated the PDP is the Preliminary Design Plan and that submission is scheduled for 3/23/23. The PDP will include a few options of what the project could be. The next submission is the PSR, Preferred Schematic Report, which narrows the options down to one final option and that is presented to the MSBA in the PSR report which will be submitted in Mid-Summer 2023.

Mr. Tocci noted the PDP is a winnowing down of all the proposed sites as well as a status report to the MSBA. The Schematic Design Report will have the one desired site for the project.

PUBLIC QUESTION:

Once the sites have been narrowed down does that mean you will have made a decision on combining schools.

Mr. Tocci stated yes, that will be decided at that time.

Mr. Lemieux stated the MSBA requires the design team to look at three options for each site: renovating the existing building, an add/reno option, and a new building option. So, the PDP report includes a lot of different options and test fits of the different options. The entire process is winnowing down from the many, to the few, to the one by the PSR submission in the Summer.

PUBLIC QUESTION:

Will you know ahead of time if you will be combining schools considering some of the sites will not be big enough to combine schools?

Mr. Gray stated that will be considered and each of the sites will be evaluated for each enrollment option to see if a combined school will fit on the selected sites.

Ms. Mayanne Briggs stated that the enrollment is ultimately a school committee decision. Vertex will be outlining the votes required by the school committee at the meeting on Wednesday.

Ms. Ellis presented a slide showing the decisions required for the PDP and PSR submissions to the MSBA. She noted the school committee will vote on the educational plan and space summary. They will also vote on the enrollment options for the PSR report. The remaining decisions are to be made by the SBRC. Ms. Ellis then presented a slide showing all the upcoming SBRC and School Committee meetings through the end of March. She noted this information is also available on the project website.

Mr. Gray provided an in-depth summary on the community meeting. He stated no new sites were recommended during the community meeting. The following comments were received during the meeting:

Oakdale – Protect neighboring houses from adverse effects.

Greenlodge – loss of school is a negative for the neighborhood, review if the site is ‘waterlogged’

Riverdale – Distance from Oakdale and bus distance is not an overriding concern, question on what would happen to the existing Non-ADA compliant school.

Paul Park – no comments

Dolan Center – Remote from neighborhood centers

Whitcomb Woods - Remote from neighborhood centers

Rustcraft Road – no comments

Mr. Gray then reviewed the site evaluation matrix and the evaluation criteria being used to assess the sites. He stated the SBRC reviewed the matrix at the last meeting and the conclusion was to eliminate four sites (Paul Park, Rustcraft Road, Whitcomb Woods, and the Dolan Center) after the community had a chance to weigh in on the sites at the public at the forum held on 1/26.

Mr. Gray turned the floor over to the SBRC to discuss eliminating the four sites noted above.

Mr. Tocci requested thoughts from the SBRC members. He stated he is not convinced that the Rustcraft site should be removed from consideration.

Mr. Gray asked if there is any concern about acquisition of the property since the school committee does not currently control the site.

Mr. Tocci stated the property is owned by the Town and it can be worked out with Parks and Rec if needed.

Mr. Gray noted that if the school committee wants to take the Rustcraft Road property from Parks and Recreation they must provide an equal property in return. He continued stating this will then welcome community input and can become a complicated issue. He also noted this site has more impediments than the other 5 being considered.

Mr. Heffernan noted he was surprised by how much the wetlands buffer shrunk the usable site. He also stated there is not a large enough piece of property that can be offered as comparable to the current Rustcraft location.

Mr. Gonzalez stated those are the only 3 small baseball diamonds in the town, all other fields are really softball diamonds, and it would be a hardship to lose those fields for 2 years.

Mr. Tocci requested comments from the public.

PUBLIC QUESTION:

The slides are hard to read, please read out the first five that are being considered as sites.

Mr. Gray stated the options are Oakdale, Greenlodge, Riverdale, Capen, and the Striar property and an option for Capen and Striar as a combined site.

Ms. Ellis noted the matrix is on the project website.

Mr. Gray noted that the matrix will be re-invented once the building test fits are done.

PUBLIC QUESTION:

Jim Driscoll asked if the committee has decided if the new school will encompass two neighborhood schools or just the Oakdale school.

Mr. Tocci summarized the options: Stand alone Oakdale for 235 students, an Oakdale/Greenlodge for 550 or a Oakdale/Riverdale for 450 students.

Mr. Driscoll asked if the single Oakdale School is not being considered.

Mr. Tocci stated that is still being considered, however the MSBA is strongly encouraging consolidation to get as many students as possible into a new building as soon as possible.

Mr. Gray noted that decision has not been made and will not be made until June 2023.

PUBLIC QUESTION:

Lisa Sheehan asked for clarification on which town entity owns the Rustcraft property?

Mr. Tocci clarified stating it is not in the possession of the school committee but is owned by the Town.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the Striar property is owned by the Town but there may be some terms and conditions on the property that should be considered.

Mr. Tocci agreed, it is unknown if there are any restrictions on the property.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the SBRC cannot keep Rustcraft on the list if they do not know what property they can offer as an alternate property for Chapter 97 land.

Mr. Tocci asked if Striar should be removed as well for that reason.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated it is unknown what part of Striar would be used and it would be great to have a joint project with Parks and Rec on that large piece of land.

Mr. Tocci noted the SBRC can propose offering one or two of the school properties that will be vacated by building a school on Rustcraft Road.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she does not want to potentially lose MSBA funding by keeping Rustcraft on the list and then ultimately not be able to use it due to acquisition issues.

Mr. Bilafer stated Rustcraft is developed and heavily used, Striar is undeveloped and not being used currently. He also noted that offering a school property includes demolition and a lot of work to bring them to the required state for sports use.

MOTION: Mr. Bilafer motioned to remove Paul Park, Dolan, and Whitcomb and leave Rustcraft for a separate discussion.

SECOND: Mr. Heffernan seconds the motion

VOTE: Unanimous vote to remove PP, Dolan, Whitcomb

MOTION: Ms. MacDonald Briggs makes a motion to remove Rustcraft Road from the list of properties.

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

VOTE: Four vote in favor, Chair opposes, motion passes.

Mr. Tocci summarized the discussion stating the remaining properties under consideration are Oakdale School, Greenlodge School, Riverdale School, Capen School, and Striar Property.

Mr. Gray thanked the committee and stated the JLA team will provide building test fits at the next SBRC meeting.

Mr. Tocci stated the next meeting will be February 13 at the Greenlodge School and the next after that will be February 27 at Riverdale.

5. Visioning update:

Mr. Gray summarized the visioning sessions to date. The group spoke about priority goals for what and how The Town wants the students to learn and what are our educational goals for the new school. The visioning group was diverse and included parents, teachers, and faculty. He noted there are two more workshops coming up and those will discuss opportunities and challenges that exist today in being able to accomplish those goals. David Stephen will also provide insight on what is happening in elementary schools throughout the country to provide ideas how to achieve the goals through building design. The team will also discuss how cohorts will work and breaking the larger school down into smaller communities. A report will be generated once all the visioning sessions are complete. That report will be used in the overall design of the building and part of the MSBA PDP submission.

6. Redistricting Consultant:

Mr. Theran suggested the SBRC authorize approval of the Cropper GIS proposal contingent upon approval by the School Committee at their meeting tomorrow.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the review of the proposal is not listed on the school committee agenda for a vote, so it can be presented tomorrow however the vote will not happen until the following meeting on 2/15. She noted that the members don't have any information on the proposal at this time, she will forward the information for their review.

Dr. Kelly stated he has the presentation material is ready for the meeting and will make sure the folder contains all the necessary information prior to the meeting.

7. Future Community and other Meeting Dates:

Mr. Tocci noted this has already been discussed.

8. New Business

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked if the SBRC can do a Saturday site walk of each of the properties to really look at each one.

Mr. Bilafer agreed, it would be a good idea to walk through the sites.

Mr. Bilafer also noted it would be a good time to engage town counsel on property ownership issues and transferring properties if needed.

Mr. Tocci agreed and he will speak with the Town Managers office.

Mr. Tocci also stated it would be a good idea to consider holding the next community meeting on a Saturday.

9. Adjourn

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Heffernan

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Unanimous vote to adjourn

Meeting Adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Attachments:

Vertex SBRC PowerPoint

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Greenlodge School and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – Approved

Monday February 13, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jon Lemieux, Project Director	A	Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Kevin Coughlin	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager		Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan	A	Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
	Victor Hebert	A	Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez		Philip Gray		
		A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM

No old business to be discuss.

2. Previous meetings minutes reviewed:

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the minutes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Heffernan noted a spelling error to be corrected.

Motion: to approve by Mr. Bilafer

Second by: Mr. Gonzalez

Vote: Unanimous approval – with Mr. Coughlin Abstaining from vote.

3. Project Update:

Mr. Tocci requested Vertex provide a project update, he noted that the slides are in the packets that were handed out to the community members.

Ms. Ellis summarized the overall project timeline; the PDP is due in March and the goal is to bring the project to Town Meeting in 2024.

Mr. Theran noted that Vertex attended the School Committee meeting to discuss the Educational Plan as well as the Redistricting consultant proposal. Vertex also sent the MSBA requirements to the School Committee. He noted the Vertex team will also attend the next School Committee meeting this coming Wednesday.

Mr. Tocci paused the meeting and asked the Vertex and JLA teams and the SBRC to introduce themselves.

Team made introductions

A True Copy

Paul M. ...
Town Clerk

Mr. Tocci requested Vertex provide more information on the PDP submission and what is required for that submission.

Mr. Theran noted the PDP (also called the Preliminary Design Plan) is the first report required by the MSBA, and the second required report is the PSR, also called the Preferred Schematic Report. The PDP will provide the MSBA with several options for what the project can be. The SBRC has already reviewed many options and eliminated the ones that are unfeasible. The project is currently in the feasibility stage, which involves looking at various locations and how each size school could look on each site. The sum of these options will be submitted in the PDP report to the MSBA. The next step is to narrow down the many options to the few options submitted at the PSR, and then to the one. The single selected option will be mapped out in the Schematic Design stage and that will be priced and brought to Town Meeting.

Mr. Tocci noted the MSBA is the Massachusetts Building Authority, and they are the state agency funding up to 50% of the project. They have provided Dedham with 3 potential options for school configurations: a stand along Oakdale School for 235 students, a combined Greenlodge/Oakdale School for 550 students, or a combined Riverdale/Oakdale School for 450 students. The final option needs to include the Oakdale School.

4. Site Considerations/Test Fitting/Space Summaries:

Mr. Theran introduced Jonathan Levi from JLA to review the building test fit slides.

Mr. Levi noted the deliberation over the best approach to a new school has two elements. One is understanding what activities and programming will happen in the new school, this is done through the Visioning Process. The second part is understanding the sites that are available. Once the sites are evaluated the two can be brought together to design the new school.

Mr. Levi continued, noting the team has narrowed down the sites through committee review, public presentations, and public comments. The original nine sites have been winnowed down to five using an evaluation matrix. He noted the committee voted to eliminate the Whitcomb Woods, Dolan Center, Paul Park, and Rustcraft Road sites after much deliberation and discussion over the period of a couple months.

Mr. Levi continued and said his presentation provides a picture of how a "model" school building and all the other required amenities fit on the site. This includes parking, site access driveways, queuing lines that stay off the street, and play spaces. He also noted each site needs to accommodate the three different enrollments options depending on which schools are being replaced on each site.

Mr. Levi began presenting the first set of test fits on the Oakdale site. The first option presented is a combined Greenlodge/Oakdale School which is sized at 85,500 Gross Square Feet (GSF) based on MSBA standard building guidelines. The number of parking spaces provided for each test fit includes the total number of spaces currently provided at each school or combination of schools. A combined Riverdale/Oakdale is a 72,000 GSF building, and a stand-alone Oakdale school is a 40,000 GSF building.

Mr. Levi explained that the blue dashed lines show the existing building. He stated that safety precautions would be put in place to separate the existing school from the new during construction. He noted that this depiction is not necessarily how a new school will look, this is simply a model to show that a building of this size can fit on this site. He also noted that a two-story building is ideal for an elementary school. The yellow portions of the building are the learning wings, the dark blue is the cafetorium, and the orange is the gymnasium. The gym size is set by the MSBA and will not change based on the student enrollment, so the Town is paying for a large gym regardless of enrollment.

Mr. Levi continued noting the parking and queuing areas, pointing out the white lines are topography lines, and the yellow dashed lines are the site outline. He concluded that the Oakdale site is a good site and can accommodate combining two schools. There is plenty of room for a new building and it will provide equivalent or larger play space than what exists today. He noted that the smaller school configurations only provide more open space on the site.

Mr. Levi noted there are other factors to consider for each site including how many trees are being removed and building orientation. Classrooms placed south to North are better for daylighting and decrease operating costs over the building lifetime. He also noted the lifetime operating costs are always more than the up-front capital costs of the new building.

Mr. Levi moved on to the Greenlodge site test fit which only includes the Greenlodge/Oakdale option. The site is a good size; however, it does have wetlands which can be dealt with mitigation options which would be discussed with the conservation commission. The Greenlodge site can fit a regulation size soccer field which is what is shown. This is to provide an idea on how much space is available. There is less open space currently at the site because the terrain is very hilly, however there is potential to fit another regulation size soccer field where the trees are currently if required/desired. He also noted the site has a lot of ledge which is a negative.

QUESTION: Ms. Ellis interjected to ask a question from an online participant who wants to know if the decision has been made to keep a stand-alone Oakdale school or a combined school.

Mr. Tocci stated that decision has not been made at this time, he said the solution has to include the Oakdale School and at this point the committee is evaluating each site to see what size/type of school will fit on each site.

QUESTION: Rich Dalton asked how the SBRC came up with the Oakdale School as the one being replaced because the Riverdale School is in pretty bad shape as well.

Mr. Tocci noted the MSBA has rated the condition of every school in Massachusetts and in Dedham they have rated the Oakdale as the most in need of replacement. Consequently the condition of the Oakdale is what brought the project into the MSBA program and therefore that school needs to be addressed first.

Mr. Dalton continued asking if there is a possibility of keeping the historic portion of the Oakdale building and adding on to it instead of building a new building.

Mr. Levi stated that's a great idea and his team will explore that idea. He noted there is a renovation/addition option that will be explored for each of these sites and enrollment options.

Mr. Levi presented the Riverdale test fits. Again, there is only one option that makes sense for this site and that's a combined Riverdale/Oakdale School. The diagram shows the existing turn around area will remain and the building access can be on either Needham Street or on Hillside Road. There is a lot of open space, it's flat/level, and has good sun orientation.

Mr. Levi moved on to the Capen site. He noted that is not currently in use by Dedham Schools and therefore construction would not disrupt current students. This site is very hilly with a 30 foot +/- drop off from the building to the field on the lower site. The plan for this site would be to demo the existing building and build a new building on same footprint in an "L" configuration. He noted connecting the

school with the lower playground levels is a challenge for accessibility and would include a lot of retaining walls and earthwork cuts and fills.

Mr. Levi also noted that connecting the Capen and Striar sites is not feasible due to topography, distance, and running water within the Striar property. In conclusion the Capen school is a very feasible site and as noted before, the smaller enrollment option buildings become easier to fit onto the site.

Mr. Levi continued his presentation with the Striar Property stating this site was previously a candidate for a recreation amenity and a lot of research has already been done as part of that proposal. He noted the recreation proposal included a bridge over the wetlands to get from the road to the rear of the site. JLA placed the building in the middle of the site to leave the area to the right available for recreational use. Mr. Levi noted there is plenty of room for parking and queuing on this site.

Mr. Levi said the next step in the review process is to update the previously used site evaluation matrix to include the additional information shown by the building test fits. The team will also evaluate the sites based on estimated costs gathered from this additional information.

Mr. Tocci opened up discussion on the test fits starting with the SBRC members.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs requested copies of the models be distributed to the committee, Mr. Levi will provide copies after the meeting.

Mr. Tocci clarified that the test fits are just a schematic representation of a building and not the actual size/layout of the building that will be built or the location on each site.

Mr. Levi confirmed stating these are just to test the size of the site and confirm the building and associated parking, playgrounds, etc. will fit.

QUESTION: Ms. Lisa Desmond asked if there is wiggle room in the capacity numbers shown on each slide?

Mr. Tocci stated that one of the evaluation matrix criteria is to evaluate each site based on room for expansion down the line. He noted the Oakdale School has been through a few expansions over the years. He also noted that the enrollment numbers have been set by the MSBA and based on what they offered the MSBA is encouraging the town to consider school consolidation.

Mr. Levi clarified that there is not wiggle room in enrollment numbers but there is in future expansion potential. The MSBA requires the project designer to design a school that can be expanded up to 15% in the future. He also noted that keeping the class sizes similar to what they are currently in the Town is important and will be discussed further.

Mr. Bilafer stated he does not think the MSBA is a fan of building over capacity. He also asked if the Town decided to pay for any excess capacity over and above what the MSBA has offered if that is possible?

Mr. Theran stated the way to do that is through the classroom breakdown. For example, if there are 18 kids per classroom and there are 4 classrooms for each grade, each room has the potential to expand in student size if needed. And using the 18 kids per classroom number needs to be justified through the Town's Educational Plan which is in process.

Mr. Bilafer noted that the size of classrooms is at the discretion of the School Committee.

Mr. Tocci asked if the Town can build for excess capacity on their own dime, and if the MSBA would be open to that.

Mr. Theran noted that the Town would have to meet with the MSBA and get their buy in in order to do that. He noted that the MSBA would not pay for the building costs or any associated overhead or soft costs associated with that that additional space.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs noted that during the ECEC project the MSBA did not reimburse the Town for the pre-school part of the new school, so it is possible. She also noted that the ECEC was over capacity the day it opened.

Mr. Heffernan stated the question is if there are 4 classrooms and the MSBA is willing to pay for those, and the Town then decides they want 6 classrooms and the excess is on the Town's dime can we do that.

Mr. Levi stated the MSBA is very clear they will not reimburse for a larger gym or a pool. When it comes to smaller class sizes and number of classrooms it is less clear and it's a conversation to be had with the MSBA.

Mr. Heffernan stated Oakdale will need a minimum enrollment of 275.

Mr. Levi noted that the only flexibility is with class sizes because Dedham insists on having smaller class sizes, not the MSBA recommended 22-23 students per class.

QUESTION: Jim Maher noted that the drawings presented are off base because the schools do not require a regulation soccer field. Currently the elementary schools have defined baseball diamonds and nothing more defined than that. He requested the design team adjust the schematics accordingly to allow for more room between neighboring homes. He also noted that the drawings do not show the required Fire Department turn radius for getting into the sites. He continued stating demolishing the Capen School would be detrimental to the Town when the new building can be built on the lower field and the play area built on the adjacent Striar Property. He also noted the stream shown on the Striar Property is in the wrong location. He suggests looking at the Capen and Striar Properties as one single connected property.

QUESTION: Mary Ellen McDonough stated the Town has been through this discussion for over a decade and it was decided to keep the local neighborhood schools even though it's not the most cost-effective construction model. She also noted that by combining schools one entire school community is being disrupted, and there is a lot to be said of keeping the local school model. She also noted that it feels like the combined school option is being strongly encouraged and the SBRC really needs to focus on trying to make the single Oakdale School option the best it can be and then moving on to renovation the remaining two schools.

QUESTION: From Matthew Beaufort asked if the partnership has been going on for a long time and he appreciates the presentation. He believes the Riverdale/Oakdale option should be eliminated because the two schools are too far apart. He noted that after the Oakdale School is complete, the Riverdale should be the next one the Town renovates because this new Oakdale School benefits them the least and that will be about 7 years out from now. He believes the new Oakdale should stay within a 3-mile proximity of the existing school.

Mr. Tocci stated he is correct and it is a long process with the MSBA, approximately 7-15 years. He also noted that this process started about 10-15 years ago during the Master Plan process and this Oakdale project started in 2020 when the Town submitted an application to the MSBA. He also noted that if the Town wants to proceed with construction outside of the MSBA that can be done as well on their own timeline, not the MSBA mandated timeline.

QUESTION: from Kara Reczkowski, she asked if redistricting would affect the entire town or just the two schools that are combined?

Ms. MacDonald Briggs confirmed stating yes, this could affect the entire town and the Avery School as well.

QUESTION: from Anne Stevens noted the Avery School has lost the art room to a classroom because of higher enrollment than anticipated. If the Town has the opportunity to review enrollments, knowing they will be higher, they should do that. She continued that the Town ultimately needs to replace all 3 elementary schools and it will take a lot of time. She believes it's most cost effective to combine the two larger schools to get the most students into a new school sooner. She also asked if a Riverdale/Oakdale combination school happens then all the Riverdale School children will need to be bussed and she wants to know if the cost of bussing students has been a thought during this process.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs noted that each school has one or two busses already so those busses will just be going to a different place because there would still be walkers, just different neighborhoods walking. Things would just be shifted. She also noted that Dedham hasn't had neighborhood schools since 1982 when there were eight schools. She noted that is not how schools run or operate anymore. She also noted that the Town needs to deal with the equity issues between schools and not leave 180 kids at a cold run-down school.

Ms. Stevens said the parking counts should be looked at again because there is often not enough parking currently at the schools so using the existing parking as a base isn't the most accurate way to figure out required parking for a new building.

Mr. Bilafer stated the MSBA goal is to use their limited amount of money to get as many children into a new school as possible. He continued, saying that there is fierce competition for the funds and since this is the fourth school the MSBA has invited into the program it is very likely the last time Dedham will receive funds. He also stated the SBRC will do what is best for the community.

QUESTION: from Heather Power, she asked if there will be a deeper site review prior to narrowing down the sites further noting that there are water and ledge issues with some sites. Specifically, the Striar property has a river that runs through it, especially in the Spring.

Mr. Levi stated there will be a deeper site investigation mapping water courses as the project progresses.

QUESTION: from Alicia O'Brien asking how the Town thinks about equity among all the schools with regard to class size? She noted that Riverdale classrooms have 16-18 children while other schools have larger classes and how does the town make sure teachers have the support required.

Mr. Levi noted that no one has made a decision to increase class size and the state is not pushing for larger class sizes.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs said this is always a big concern and the Town is always looking at class size and enrollments. As a standard Dedham keeps classes below 22 students and below on average.

QUESTION: Tara Murphy asks why redistricting is being brought up after this process, why for the Oakdale School are we using enrollment numbers that could change through redistricting.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the MSBA set the enrollment which is lower than the current enrollment. Ms. Murphy continued asking if the town should redistrict first since those enrollment numbers are off?

Ms. MacDonald Briggs noted that the School Committee is going to review the proposal from a redistricting consultant now who will look at all the different scenarios and the town may redistrict sooner.

Dr. Kelly stated the Town is always redistricting due to class size and limits. He also noted the redistricting study will be done as part of the process to help the community understand how the redistricting might play out for each enrollment option.

Mr. Heffernan stated the idea of tonight is to look at each site to see if a building is possible, not to rule anything out. He also noted that building renovation needs to be considered as well. He said that as far as finances, proceeding with the largest school isn't necessarily the best option. The Finance committee has been looking at the Town's debt and Dedham has done a lot of building in a small amount of time. Once the Oakdale School is complete there will still be school(s) to be addressed. He also stated due to the Debt Schedule it could be a long time before the Town has the funds to address the other school(s).

QUESTION: from Rick asking how many students who are non-taxpayers are enrolled in Dedham Schools. He believes its an issue that needs to be addressed.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated this comes up every year and the school department deals with each case as it comes up.

Dr. Kelly stated the School Department watches this very carefully.

Mr. Tocci requested the online questions:

ONLINE QUESTION: From Danielle Deluca asking about playground spaces and if they are located in what's shown as field space on the diagrams?

Mr. Levi stated these are just diagrams showing components that need to fit on the site and there is space for a playground, but the team has not determined size or location yet.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Elizabeth Doris-Gustin asking if the schools will be walkable or all busses?

Mr. Tocci stated there are currently one or two busses going to each elementary school and it is unknown if that will increase, also there are a substantial number of students being driven to school which is why there is such a large queuing line shown in all the schematics.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Liz asking if there would still be outdoor play space for kids during construction?

Mr. Theran stated that is the most challenging time of the project, keeping the construction completely separate from the existing school. During the site analysis of each location the area that remains for play will be one of the discussion points.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Ned asking if two schools are combined is there a plan for the school(s) that will be left behind?

Mr. Tocci stated that when Avery was rebuilt the Town appointed a "Re-Use Committee" to decide what to do with the existing abandoned building and it would make sense to do the same in this scenario as well.

ONLINE QUESTION: Lynnette asked if the committee has considered the negative effect combining schools would have on Dedham and if property values would decline?

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC is considering all the negative effects, however they will not try to predict property values.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Danielle DeLuca stating there is a great amount of tree cover on the Striar Property and losing those trees would have a negative affect on the adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Tocci thanked Ms. DeLuca for the comment.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Jo asking if the team has looked at reasons why the Town of Dedham voted against using Striar property? It was not intended for recreation use. It is mainly wetlands, conservation land and walking trails currently used daily by neighbors, several of whom are on this call today. Second, huge traffic issues last 15 years and currently, daily speeding citations, on Sprague St, creating even bigger safety issue for the Capen School location or Striar-both located on Sprague Street. Lastly, costs/traffic were already reviewed and outrageous for building on Striar, overburdening taxpayers by millions (20 million plus). Extremely surprised it made 'the list' with: safety for our children, climbing construction costs, traffic, and extremely high overall costs to taxpayers (that's already been researched).

Mr. Tocci stated the reasons for the Striar proposal failing at Town Meeting was combination of a lot of things, not just one of those things. He stated each site has positives and negatives and the SBRC is aware of the issues that were raised previously. He also noted that Traffic and walkability are issues at all sites, these are all great points and all will be considered going forward.

ONLINE COMMENT: from Danielle DeLuca stating that combining Oakdale and Greenlodge still preserves for many people the idea of a neighborhood school. They are awfully close to each other.

ONLINE QUESTION: from Jim Sullivan asking if the project will be funded by an override vote?
Mr. Heffernan stated an override is a change in taxes forever, a debt exclusion is a change in taxes for a specific period of time. It has yet to be determined how the project will be funded.

Mr. Levi wanted to mention that when talking about a unified school he overheard the MSBA assertion that educationally there are advantages in terms of types of services that can be delivered to a student in a larger school that cannot be delivered in a smaller school, for example special education, larger gym, and larger performance space in the cafetorium.

Mr. Heffernan restated his comments about Debt Exclusions vs. Overrides. He explained that a Debt Exclusion is generally for a capital project and is paid off over a specific period of time stating the Middle School was done this way. An Override is a change in taxes that stays in place forever.

5. Vote on Elimination of Potential Configurations:

Mr. Tocci asked for further discussion on the configurations presented and if it makes sense to eliminate any.

Mr. Bilafer stated he is looking at the project as only the following 16 options:

At Oakdale: New Oakdale
 Add/Reno Oakdale
 New Oakdale/Greenlodge
 Add/Reno Oakdale/Greenlodge

New Oakdale/Riverdale
Add/Reno of Oakdale River
Greenlodge: New Oakdale/Greenlodge
Add/Reno Oakdale/Greenlodge
Riverdale: New Oakdale/Riverdale
Add/Reno Oakdale/Riverdale
Capen School: New Oakdale
Add/Reno Oakdale
New Oakdale/Greenlodge
Add/Reno Oakdale/Greenlodge
NO RIVERDALE OPTION
Striar Property: New Oakdale School
New Oakdale/Greenlodge
NO RIVERDALE OPTION

Mr. Levi stated he can show a combination Capen/Striar property and what it would look like. He stated creating play space on the upper Capen area is not feasible due to size and layout. He noted that the only way to make it work would be to have a building on the Capen lower space and play space on Striar. However, the distance between the two sites is too great for the school to use the Striar property as play area.

Mr. Bilafer stated a Capen/Striar combined site would have the same options as the Capen site, adding 4 additional options to his previous list.

QUESTION: Mr. Maher reminded the committee that the Striar property is protected under Article 97 which requires parks and recreation to declare the land surplus, then it will require a 2/3 vote at Town Meeting to turn the land over to the Select Board, then the Select Board will turn the land over to the School Committee. This is at least a year long process and a lot of paperwork.

Mr. Bilafer thanked Mr. Mahar and stated this was discussed at the last meeting although not in as much detail.

MOTION: Ms. MacDonald Briggs made a motion to remove the Oakdale/Riverdale combination school options from both the Striar and Capen School sites.

SECOND: John Heffernan

VOTE: Unanimous

6. Visioning Update:

Mr. Levi noted that the first two sessions are complete and the third and final session is scheduled for next week.

7. School Committee Considerations:

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated Vertex attended the last School Committee meeting and will be the next one this coming Wednesday evening. The School Committee will vote on the Cropper GIS redistricting consultant proposal as it is on the agenda for Wednesday.

8. CropperGIS Redistricting:

Ms. MacDonald Briggs requesting the SBRC hold off on voting until the next meeting so the school committee can approve the proposal first.

Ms. Ellis requested a vote to approve the CropperGIS proposal contingent on the school committee approval as well.

Mr. Tocci asked what the process will be once the proposal is approved.

Mr. Lin stated the next step is to write up a Purchase Order for the proposal. He also noted that it is important to start this process now so the committee has the baseline data.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked who will be signing the contract.

Mr. Theran stated it will be the SBRC.

Mr. Lin stated it will be Town Manager signing the Purchase Order.

MOTION: Ms. MacDonald Briggs motions to approve the CropperGIS proposal contingent upon the school committee approval of the proposal at the next meeting.

SECOND: Mr. Bilafer

VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Tocci is tabling item #9 (Report and Vote on Warrant Article restoring voting power to ex officio SBRC members) until the next meeting due to the time.

9. Next Community Meeting Date:

Mr. Tocci stated the next SBRC Meeting is scheduled for Monday 2/27/23 at the Riverdale School. He also requested a Saturday to walk all the different project sites.

Ms. Ellis clarified if the community meeting will be to present the test fit layouts shown tonight by JLA.

Mr. Tocci confirmed.

Committee decides to meet this coming Saturday 2/18/23 to walk the sites starting at the Oakdale School.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC will need to review the community calendar to come up with a date for a Saturday community meeting date and time.

10. New Business:

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she would like to further survey the community for input, they did that quite often during other projects. She thinks using something similar to the Menti-Meter used during Visioning would be a great tool so people can prioritize thoughts. Also it would be great to get an idea on what how the Town wants to handle the two school issue, a preschool, potential existing building left behind.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs also noted it would be a good idea to get the Planning Board Input.

11. Adjourn:

MOTION: to adjourn by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

Unanimous vote to adjourn

Meeting Adjourned at 9:05 pm.

Attachments:


Vertex/JLA SBRC Presentations

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk



MSBA FEASIBILITY / SCHEMATIC PROCESS & BEYOND VERTEX



PDP: Preliminary Design Plan | PSR: Preferred Schematic Report | SD: Schematic Design Report
 • Aligned with MSBA Board Meetings and Town Ballot | Dates shown are approximate

★ = Dedicated Community Forums (Suggested **MINIMUM** amount of meetings) in addition to other committee meetings
 1) Kick-off: Process & Timeline 2) Pre-PDP: Options 3) Pre-PSR: Selected Option 4) Pre-TM Info 5) Pre-Construction




Upcoming Meetings



- Tuesday 1/31/23 – SBRC at Oakdale School at 7:00 PM
- Wednesday 2/01/23 – School Committee at Avery School 7:00-9:00
- Thursday 2/02/23 – Middle School PTO via Zoom 7:00 PM
- Tuesday 2/07/23 - Working Group via Zoom/Teams 3:30-4:30
- Visioning Session 2 – Wednesday 2/8 from 6:00-8:00 pm – Via Zoom
- Monday 2/13/23 – SBRC at Greenlodge School at 7:00PM
- Wednesday 2/15/23 – School Committee at Avery School 7:00-9:00
- Visioning Session 3 – Thursday 2/16 from 6:00-8:00 pm via zoom
- Tuesday 2/21/23 - Working Group via Zoom/Teams 3:30-4:30
- Monday 2/27/23 - SBRC at Riverdale School at 7:00PM
- Wednesday 3/01/23 – School Committee at Avery School 7:00-9:00
- Wednesday 3/15/23 – School Committee at Avery School 7:00-9:00

Suggested SBRC Meeting Schedule going forward:



- Monday 3/13/23 at 7:00 pm
- Monday 3/27/23 at 7:00 pm
- Monday 4/10/23 at 7:00 pm
- Monday 4/24/23 at 7:00 pm




OAKDALE
A.1 OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
85,500GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSESSES, 3 VANS




OAKDALE
A.2 OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
72,000GSF
92 SPACES, 3 BUSESSES, 1 VAN










RIVERDALE
C.2 OAKDALE + RIVERDALE
72,000GSF
92 SPACES, 3 BUSES, 1 VAN



CAPEN
D.1 OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
85,300GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3 VANS










E-3 OAKDALE ONLY
50,000GSF
44 SPACES, 1 BUS

STRIAR




J-1 OAKDALE + GREENLODGE
85,500GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3 VANS

CAPEN + STRIAR



Option 4: Capen Site



**Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
February 15, 2023**

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Dr. Melissa Pearrow
Victor Hebert
Mayanne Briggs
Joshua Donati
Christopher Polito
Cailen McCormick
Tracey White
Tara Duncan (absent)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Dr. Ian Kelly, Interim Superintendent
Matthew Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Heather Smith, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum
Karen Hillman, Principal of Middle School
Jim Forrest, Principal of High School

Meeting Location:
Avery Elementary

School Committee Meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.

Open Meeting
Dr. Melissa Pearrow called the meeting to order.

Pledge of Allegiance

PUBLIC COMMENTS

[NONE.]

Interim Superintendent Update

February 15, 2023

Dr. Kelly commented on the lockdown event at the High School yesterday. He said that the Police force responded quickly and thoroughly and the staff and faculty handled it as professionally as possible. The Administration took time to debrief at the end of the day and they are now analyzing the response and reevaluating their strategy to improve future responses.

Teaching and Learning

Early Bird Data. The District Data Team gathered to analyze the most recent Early Bird data. Principals and coaches met with the EB team to review the middle of year (MOY) results. The [presentation](#) can be accessed here. While there are several subtests in both K-1, Early Bird directed the team to focus on letter sounds and blending in Kindergarten and on the skills of deletion and non-word reading. An [explanation](#) of those skills can be found here.

	Kindergarten			
	Letter Sounds		Blending	
	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year
Above 40th	36%	58%	23%	76%
Between 20th - 40th	46%	26%	14%	12%
Below 20th	42%	16%	64%	12%

	Grade 1			
	Deletion		Non Word Reading	
	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year
Above 40th	72%	82%	61%	69%
Between 20th - 40th	37%	3%	16%	17%
Below 20th	11%	15%	23%	14%

Mental health and student services. Dr. Stetson and Dr. Dubé are pursuing grant funding via the [School Behavioral Health Workforce and Service Expansion Grants](#). This grant opportunity aims to bolster the work of school districts to ensure that all students have access to mental health clinicians, care, and programming in our schools. After many hours of work, Dr. Stetson and Dr. Dubé submitted the following application on behalf of the District on Friday the 10th. The grant submission can be accessed via the link [here](#).

Building Visits.



Interactive writing at Avery. Ms. Merritt's students using Google docs to write in a digital writer's notebook. Kids write. Ms. Merritt writes back an affirming message with feedback to help them grow as writers. Students write back and the cycle continues.



Morning meeting time at ECEC! Ms. DeLong's class prepares for a successful day of learning by building relationships and community within the classroom. Students and teachers greet one another and check in to see how everyone is doing.



DHS students enjoying the new flexible learning spaces in the recently renovated library.

Professional Development



Elementary Leadership Team. On Tuesday, February 7th the Elementary Leadership Team held instructional rounds at Greenlodge. Focus was on mathematics instruction with the guiding objective of "Listening to How Students and Teachers Talk about Math". Slides are [linked here](#). An intended outcome of this work, facilitated by Dr. Kobierski, is for district leaders to build a common vision for academically productive talk in mathematics instruction. This is connected to professional work of our instructional coaches and teachers that is focused on elevating practices that engage students in mathematical discourse across the district.



HSS Curriculum Pilot Update. The Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, elementary teachers and coaches met on February 7th to discuss how to pilot Inquiry Journeys this spring. [Notification](#) went out to families on February 8th and educators are planning to launch pilots after returning from break. The folks from Inquiry Journeys created a Dedham Community Page about Inquiry Journeys [which can be found here.](#)

District Leadership team. Our District Leadership Team met yesterday afternoon to continue its work focusing on supervision and evaluation. One of the primary goals of this effort is to ensure that all of Dedham's educators receive feedback and support that helps them grow and improve their practice. Yesterday's work focused on fostering effective dialog and framing feedback that is grounded in and based on student learning. [Slides can be viewed here.](#)



Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing (LiPS) Training. On February 8th & 9th, elementary interventionists, Occupational Therapists, Special Education teachers and related service providers attended LiPS training. [LiPS](#) is an evidence-based curriculum by Lindamood-Bell that supports students' literacy learning. The LiPS program will supplement the District's existing intervention toolkit to support student acquisition of essential early literacy skills.



OpenSciEd Curriculum (Grades 6-8). DMS is in year 2 of implementing the OpenSciEd units of study in grades 6-8 science classes. OpenSciEd science units are designed to address Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and focus on student driven inquiry based units centered around the investigation of a natural phenomenon. DMS has partnered with the OpenSciEd Equitable Instruction Initiative (OEI) from Boston College to support implementation of this award winning curriculum. DMS was selected to work closely with OEI to identify implementation challenges and collaboratively build solutions. The curriculum adaptations may be used by other districts in the Commonwealth to support their implementation of OpenSciEd.

Community Engagement

Oakdale Visioning. The Oakdale visioning team met on Tuesday February 8th to continue identifying instructional and programmatic priorities for Dedham's next new elementary school. The visioning team is composed of 40 representatives from the community including District leaders, principals, faculty, and parents from the Riverdale, Oakdale, and Greenlodge schools.

DCA Communications Survey. On February 7th, the District Curriculum Advisory met for a preliminary discussion about the Communication Survey for which we received 314 responses. The DCA will spend more time analyzing the survey over the next month and intends to hold focus groups during the month of March in order to gain further insight into how we can support families. Information about the focus groups will go out this week; the district will provide child-care and dinner for families who attend the focus groups.

Panorama Surveys. The District is preparing to begin administration of Panorama surveys to students, families, and faculty. These surveys were used extensively in the years preceding

COVID to monitor the District's efforts focusing on school safety, climate, culture, teaching and learning.

Management and Operations

DHS Turf Field. This week I met with DHS Principal Jim Forrest, Athletic Director Steve Traister, Facilities Director Denise Moroney, and Assistant Superintendent Wells to review progress towards replacement of the turf field and track. In the weeks ahead I will have a timeline for the project prepared for the Committee's review and reference.

DMS Distance Learning Lab. On Sunday February 5th we learned that the extremely cold temperatures caused a sprinkler head to malfunction in the DLL. As a result there was significant water damage to the room that will require extensive remediation in the weeks and months ahead. Fortunately Facilities Director Denise Moroney and her facilities team were monitoring our buildings closely over the weekend and discovered this issue before more extensive damage was done. We will keep the Committee informed as this rehabilitation project proceeds.

School Safety. I want to take a moment to thank our crossing guards for their service. Every day they ensure that our students and families safely navigate their walks to and from our school buildings. On Friday February 3rd temperatures had dropped to approximately 16°F with winds gusting from 20 to 40 mph. The conditions were far from optimal and our crossing guards were there to ensure safety for our students and families.

COMMENTS on the Interim Superintendent's Report

Mr. Donati said the feedback he heard about the response during lockdown was that integration of services and timeliness of notifications could be improved.

Mr. Polito thanked Dr. Kelly for providing the Early Bird data. He asked comparisons about rates of improvement could be added?

Ms. White said the lockdown went well, but there may need to be procedural responses reviewed. Also she cautioned that the event may have triggered mental health issues with the students and it is important that we make students understand that they are protected. She added that it may be important to undertake lockdown exercises to refresh the memories of staff, faculty and administration.

Ms. White thanked school staff for their efforts in making sure practices are conducted during the field renovations.

Mr. Hebert said he was shaken by yesterday's lockdown event. He feels we need to develop protocols that reflect the needs of each unique school.

Dr. Pearrow thanked the support staff for helping to communicate and protect the students during the lockdown.

Reports/Updates/Requests

Discussion & Vote of 2023-2024 School Calendar

Option 1: includes December 22nd half day

Option 2: includes September 25, 2023 Yom Kippur holiday and December 22nd half day.

Ms. White asked about the YMCA after-school availability to provide services to families who don't have those days off? Dr. Kelly said he talked to the YMCA director and she said the YMCA would be available for child care.

Motion was made to adopt the calendar that includes Option 2. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

School Building Project Education Plan Preview and Preliminary Draft

Dr. Kelly discussed the Education Plan requested by MSBA for the School Building Project. Final product is required by March 15, 2023. He said a more detailed plan will be available at the March 1st meeting. The Educational Plan will dictate the zoning for the building project. The School Committee will need to start looking through it and community feedback will need to be solicited.

Ms. White said she appreciated all the work that went into this preliminary draft. She said Ms. Briggs has been involved with the SBRC, Avery, and ECEC building projects and to date, she has been able to supply a history of building projects in Dedham. She thinks it will be challenging to explain to the community the need for this project and suggested developing a shorter version of the plan for easier understanding and consumption by the general public. Dr. Kelly replied that Sara Errickson will be working on developing a summary of the plan for dissemination to the community.

Ms. McCormick highlighted the monumental work that went into the educational plan draft. She thanked all the people who contributed.

Dr. Pearrow asked that the School Committee members share input on the plan.

Update from Vertex - Oakdale School Project Owner's Project Manager

[Chris Polito recused himself from the presentation and sat in the back of the room due to conflict of interest.]

Steve Theran, Project Manager from Vertex, presented an update on the Oakdale project. He said there was a sizable attendance at the SBRC hybrid meeting at Greenlodge. There will be a site tour of the remaining locations on Saturday for the public.

Mr. Theran reiterated what was presented at the last School Committee meeting. The Feasibility study and Schematic Design component have to be completed before vote at Town Meeting.

The next steps will be to evaluate options. He showed the key focus of the decision making process which includes play space and logistics for drop off and pick ups for students during renovation.

He reviewed the Responsibility Matrix and due dates for each step of the process.

He displayed the Upcoming Meetings for the project.

COMMENTS Oakdale Project update

Ms. White asked if there could be a visual overview of the sites? Ms. Briggs said that there are test fits available on the sites. Mr. Theran said that those visuals will be posted on the website.

Ms. McCormick thanked Vertex for providing a wealth of information to the public. She asked if there will be a community survey coming? Briggs said there will be a survey posted in the near future.

Mr. Donati thanked Mr. Theran for simplifying the plan for increased transparency.

Mr. Hebert requested that the materials being presented at the visioning sessions be provided in some form to the public.

Discussion and Vote of Contract with Cropper GIS Services LLC for Oakdale Project Demographic and Enrollment Planning

Mr. Donati reminded the group that the GIS part of the project has already been paid for in the original designer contract so that means there are sufficient funds in the initial appropriation.

Mr. Hebert said people get alarmed when they see redistricting but he said the goal of the redistricting is to gather data to be ready when decisions about enrollment are made.

Mr. Theran said the redistricting evaluation will take about six weeks and the completed evaluation will be presented to the School Committee.

Ms. White asked that acronyms be clarified in the information made public for the community.

Dr. Pearrow thanked Mr. Tocci from the SBRC for his attendance at this meeting.

Motion was made to approve the contract with Cropper GIS Services LLC for the Oakdale Project Demographic and Enrollment Planning. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Student Conduct and Support in Grades 6-12

Principals Forrest and Hillman and Dr. Stetson joined the meeting to present an update on student conduct support systems.

Dr. Kelly prefaced the presentation to explain the following key points:

- Data used in this report represents reportable offenses based on DESE 2021-22 student discipline data.
- Reportable offenses include any event that removes a student from their education.
- 95% of offenses are due to weapons, controlled substances, physical violence and substantial destruction.
- Student population is aggregated by need category, gender, and race and ethnicity.
- The percentages reflect the representation based on the full student body.
- The goal of all discipline efforts is to identify students who require additional support to help them thrive educationally.

Middle School report

Principal Hillman presented slides on the Middle School conduct and support systems.

She noted that the 2020-21 data is not valid data for comparison due to the skewed statistics from the Covid school year so comparisons were made to the 2018-19 year. Those comparisons showed that trends remained fairly constant. She said that a progressive discipline approach focuses on keeping students in the school environment.

Key points from Principal Hillman's presentation:

- Vape cessation programs were established last year due to an increase in vaping issues. Dr. Heather Dube worked with families and offered programs that included a two day in-school suspension combined with a vaping cessation online program. Vaping numbers this year are down.
- Out-of-School suspensions focused on serious incidents. Ongoing work is needed to support these students.
- Transition work needs to begin in 5th grade. Counselors and Middle School student ambassadors visit 5th grade classes to help the transition to the Middle School. Family Night held at the end of the year is now being attended by students.
- There are plans to start a new student orientation focused on students with a history of poor conduct because those students tend to struggle more in Middle School.
- Structure of the school day was changed to include less free time because students needed more structure throughout the day. The new structure is communicated at every opportunity and informed by the key principles of respect, responsibility, resilience.
- Summer retreat held this year with team leaders helped to reinforce this plan.
- Cell phone use, headphones and hoodies are not allowed at the school and the clarity of expectations has made this endeavor successful.
- Using software through Chrome Books to monitor student's location helps to identify missed classes and info is used to limit passes and other enabling activities.
- Students are learning that their voices matter. Student-led activities include clubs, dances, and lunches and these events are the most popular and successful.
- Programs for improving cultures were established 5 to 6 years ago. The Strength program involves all types of students and faculty.
- Health Classes are grade specific based on needs of age group. Lunch groups with School Psychologists help students to learn to apply real life situations.
- "Think Kids" program partners with MGH for professional Development. Builds skills such as frustration tolerance and problem solving.
- Partnered with DESE on Safe Schools Program for LGBTQ+ students.

Principal Hillman said you can feel the overall change to the environment at the School from five to six years ago. These programs have contributed to that change.

High School report

Dr. Forrest reported that he managed to realize the dream of the trip to Costa Rica. He said currently 27 students and chaperones are in the air right now on their way to Costa Rica.

Dr. Forrest said the High School numbers show a significant increase in vaping in 2019-20, but they were able to turn those numbers around for the 2021-22 school year to below normal levels across all

subgroups. The programs addressing student conduct seek to reduce disparity and enhance success in the classroom and school/community involvement.

Key points of presentation by Mr. Forrest:

- Data on student conduct is reevaluated during the summer.
- First focus of discipline is parent conversations and then after-school and Saturday detentions. In-school detention is not possible due to lack of personnel.
- First step is removal from one class followed by remediation and teacher input.
- Vaping cessation online program is used in addition to THC Cessation program that partners with Boston Children's Hospital.
- Goal is to ensure that the curriculum reflects the needs of all types of learning levels and includes a new commitment to enhanced English programs.
- Greater support for non-college track students includes new job and trade fairs and providing broader support for students who did not get into Blue Hills.
- Students who struggle at school need a plan for after high school. Guidance counselors form relationships within a multi caseload structure. MetroWest data is used to identify students in need.
- Trauma Informed Teaching allows for screening of students for depression and includes counselor referral.
- Building inclusive culture uses an approach similar to the Middle School programs:
 - Team building starts in the summer for 9th graders with Link Crew full day orientation program led by 30 high school ambassadors. Students Ambassadors follow assigned students through the semester.
 - Various award ceremonies are held to recognize diverse students for their hard work and progress.
 - Challenge Day walks students through their experiences and the opportunity to share experiences in a non-threatening environment.
 - Student Lounge provides student voices around a variety of issues.
 - Student's mental health groups are formed by type of need and led by the School Psychologist.

Mr. Forrest noted that during the lockdown the new student monitoring system helped to ensure security by helping to locate students.

Mr. Forrest said that every day students are greeted by administrators and it's the little things that help build the relationships in addition to the hard work of dedicated staff and faculty.

District report

Key points of the presentation by Dr. Sara Stetson (update since December):

- The district focus is on mental and behavioral health and the feeling of belonging.
- Showed a schematic of the care concept including revamping Tier 3 programs for students with emotional and behavioral challenges. Some of these supports are alternatives to discipline.
- Nationwide 20% of students get mental health support. Those percentages are about the same in Dedham. Health disparities exist between race and ethnicity.

- Clinic in the Schools program helps students with access to services. Includes more parent involvement.
- Care coordination software is being explored. eCare system is a wrap-around system that supplies interagency capability.
- Considering starting a Children's Hospital partnership that provides ongoing professional development and support with ongoing consultation. They will also help with funding sources.
- Submitted a DPH grant to support the Clinic in Schools program.
- Relationship mapping is being done related to belonging and trust.
- Researching the City Connects model. Boston College has a model for assistance for mental health that includes individualization to fit our needs.
- RENEW Wrap Around model is for High School students at risk of dropping out. High School staff signed up for a documentary on the model and the next step will be to recruit facilitators.
- Focusing on enhancing the existing Dedham TBL program for students with emotional and educational needs. This program would involve mindfulness and distress tolerance. The development of this model will utilize different strategic partners.
- Ensuring core curricula through all grades and providing different levels of mental health intervention training for each type of staff.

The Goal is to make a shift from behavioral to therapeutic models by building more internal capacity. Need to build more internal psychology. School Psychologists will be undergoing training to refresh their practice and standardize their practice. Clinical rounds will be implemented to expose teachers to a variety of interventions.

Dr. Kelly reported that these efforts are in response to state legislature mandates and he said their interventions will far exceed what the state asks for.

COMMENTS on Student Conduct and Support

Mr. Donati asked if there are other reasons for suspension other than drugs and violence? Mr. Forrest said there are other more extreme repeated behaviors that are used after exhausting all other tools. Donati raised the topic of subjective conduct issues not included in the data. He is worried that the vulnerable populations may be subjected to less objective decisions about discipline. The unreported subgroups may contribute to the recurrence of negative conduct. He thinks including student voices is important and he likes the ePass system. He would like to see more data about the teacher's experiences.

Ms. Briggs thinks a lot has changed already. She would like to see scheduling that is aligned to increase the availability for additional courses and programs. Mr. Forrest replied that he is open to other possibilities. Logistics are important. They are looking to hire an experienced Cessation staff to increase the services.

Ms. White said it is positive that there is more student/administration communication. Hearing student voices allows students to become friends with someone outside their usual network. The Link Crew is important to keeping students involved. She feels the schools have come a long way in their health and behavioral programs.

Ms. McCormick would like to know what is being done for the more marginalized populations. She appreciates targeting the vulnerable groups, but there is so much work to do to get to the root cause of student conduct.

Mr. Polito asked if it is common for students to have multi-disciplinary actions? Mr. Forrest said that qualitative data is the best indicator of success and forming relationships is the key to successful outcomes. Polito asked if the source of disciplinary action is identified? The source of the complaint could help to tease out subjective vs. objective discipline decisions. Ms. Hillman said it is up to the discretion of the Assistant Principal and Principal whether disciplinary action is taken.

Dr. Pearrow asked whether increased resources could help with in-house suspensions at the High School? Dr. Forrest said that additional staff would definitely support the ability for the high school to include in-house suspensions.

Subcommittee Updates

- Budget

Mr. Polito said there was a budget meeting this week and they are trying to advocate for level services and advocating is important. Next meeting will discuss substitute teacher rates. The current rate of \$75/per day is below market value and they are discussing whether to increase to \$120/per day.

- Communications

Ms. Briggs said they want to create a joint information system with the SBRC and Communications Department. Dr. Kelly said he talked to Sara Errikson and they are planning a weekly update to families. The format for summarizing information needs to be streamlined and standardized.

- Curriculum Advisory

Ms. McCormick said they talked about the 315 survey responses. Dr. Smith said there will be focus groups with parents held in March. Press releases for the event will be disseminated and they will also be inviting people to apply for vacancies on the committee.

- Policy - Second Reading of Policies

- o File: JRA-R - Student Records
- o File: IJNDG - Student Data Privacy Policy
- o File: IJM - Written Information Security Policy
- o File: ECAE - Security Camera System Policy & Guidelines

Mr. Donati reviewed the changes to each of the above categories from the first reading that was done at the last meeting. At the request of Mr. Polito, Dr. Kelly said he would review the policy to make sure references to positions are consistent. Vote will be taken at the third reading at the next School Committee meeting.

- SBRC

Ms. Briggs said they voted on the non-consideration of the Oakdale/Riverdale combination at Striar or Capen.

- Traffic Circulation

No updates

- Negotiations

Ms. White said they met last week and will meet again in March.

- Parks & Recreation

No updates.

Donations

No donations.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve meeting minutes from February 1, 2023. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0 (Ms. White abstained due to non-attendance).

Mr. Polito asked if the Chair would consider adding a report that updates the public about any conferences, events or meetings she has attended in her role on the School Committee. Dr. Pearrow said she would consider that request.

Mr. Polito also asked if the two Assistant Superintendent contracts could be placed on a subsequent School Committee meeting.

Old/New Business*

Ms. White announced that:

- the Girls hockey team won the tri valley.
- Cinderella will be performed at the High School on March 17-19.
- Emily Kadehjian, Covid Coordinator raised money from baking cookies to sponsor teachers to participate in a marathon charity for Christine Stec.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

NONE.

Motion was made to adjourn and approved by a vote of 7-0.

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday March 13, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jon Lemieux, Project Director	A	Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Kevin Coughlin	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
A	Victor Hebert		Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Philip Gray		
		A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM

There is no old business to discuss.

2. Previous meetings minutes reviewed:

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the minutes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Heffernan noted that the High School was built in 1959 and had an addition in 1975.

Motion: to approve the previous minutes with edits made by Mr. Heffernan

Second by: Mr. Hebert

Abstain: Mr. Gonzalez

Vote: Minutes approved 5-0-1

3. Invoicing:

Mr. Tocci requested Mr. Wells review the invoicing.

Mr. Wells noted there are two invoices that need approval. The first is the January 31st invoice and the second is the February 28 invoice. He stated the invoices packages include JLA and Vertex invoices. He requested committee approval.

Mr. Tocci stated he wanted to handle this the same way as the ECEC, the committee can review during the meeting, initial the package and vote at the end of the meeting. He asked Mr. Wells if there is anything of note in the invoices to mention.

Mr. Wells stated the invoices are straightforward as it's just the beginning of the project.

Mr. Coughlin asked who reviews the invoices prior to them being brought to the SBRC for approval.

A True Copy Attached

Paul M. ...
Town Clerk

Mr. Wells stated all invoices go through Vertex before they are passed along to the SBRC. Once the team is in construction the architect will review them as well. Mr. Wells and the Town accounting department also reviews the invoices. He noted the invoices go to the SBRC fist.

4. Project Timeline Update:

Mr. Theran explained the project timeline. He noted the Preliminary Design Plan (PDP) report will be submitted at the end of this month and the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) will be submitted at the end of June. The enrollment decision will be made between now and the end of June. The final selected solution will also be selected at the end of June. This allows the team to get to the October MSBA Board Meeting with the PSR. With approval from the MSBA at the board meeting the team can then move into the Schematic Design (SD) phase.

Mr. Tocci requested clarification on the acronyms and also on the dates for the PDP submission. He also asked if the SBRC Will have a chance to review the entire PDP prior to voting on the approval at the next meeting on 3/27. He also noted that the 3/27 meeting can be used to discuss input from the 3/25 community meeting.

Mr. Theran stated the PDP isn't a selection on what is moving forward but instead includes information on how we are narrowing down options. He also noted that on the 3/27 meeting the team will request a vote from the SBRC to approve submitting the PDP to the MSBA. He noted that the School Committee will approve the Educational Plan and Space Summary that are part of the PDP. Once the SBRC then approves the PDP submission the Town Manager, School Committee, and Superintendent sign the letter that accompanies the submission.

Mr. Bilafer asked how much time prior to the meeting the SBRC members will have to review the document as it's a very large file.

Mr. Theran stated the team can come up with a date that allows JLA enough time to format the submission and also gives the members enough review time.

Ms. Ellis stated the PDP includes the visioning report, the educational program, the initial space summary, the evaluations of the preliminary sites, and how the team narrowed down the site options. The next submission is the PSR and that includes continued evaluation of the remaining sites, the short list of options, the preferred project solution, and the final decision regarding enrollment. The Schematic Design (SD) phase is after the PSR and focuses on the design of the one selected option.

Ms. Ellis continued and explained which decisions will be made by which committee. School Committee: Space Summaries, Educational Plan, Enrollment. SBRC: Site Evaluations, final list of options, preferred solution.

Ms. Ellis stated the next School committee meeting is this coming Wednesday and they will vote to approve the Ed Plan and Space Summaries. The SBRC can have a draft PDP Friday March, prior to the vote to approve the PDP submission the MSBA on Monday 3/27.

Mr. Tocci stated the next Community meeting on Saturday 3/25 starts at 3:30pm at the Middle School Cafetorium.

5. Site Considerations/Space Summaries/Matrix:

Space Summary/Ed Plan:

Mr. Gray stated the team had a very productive meeting with Dr. Kelly to review the space summaries for the project that were also discussed with the School committee at their last meeting. He noted that the space summary along with the visioning report will be weaved into the educational plan.

Dr. Kelly stated he reviewed the existing space in all the schools and stated that is used as a comparison for the requested space for the new school. He also noted that his team is working making sure the space summaries and educational support each other.

Mr. Gray stated JLA has reviewed renovation and addition options for each site as required by the MSBA. He noted that renovations require significant structural work to create appropriately sized classrooms, cafeteria and gymnasium spaces.

Test Fit Options

Ms. Harris began the test fit add/reno options with the Oakdale School.

OAKDALE:

The Oakdale Greenlodge option renovates original building and adds two classroom wings that project out toward Cedar Street and one towards to rear where the existing playground is located.

Ms. Harris noted that the gymnasium is always the same size for all scenarios and the green space is showing two soccer fields just as a reference for the size of the remaining space.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if the classroom wings are two story or three story.

Ms. Harris clarified stating they are only proposing a two-story addition.

Oakdale Riverdale option just reduces the size of the two classroom wings.

Oakdale Only removes one new classroom wing entirely.

GREENLODGE:

Ms. Harris noted that the Greenlodge site has a lot of ledge and hills. The rendering shows an Oakdale/Riverdale combination. The front portion is the existing building, the rear is an addition. This scenario assumes temporary classroom usage during construction and includes a three story wing to minimize site disturbance due to the site topography.

RIVERDALE:

Ms. Harris stated the existing building would remain and be renovated and a new two-story classroom wing addition would be added.

CAPEN SCHOOL:

Ms. Harris noted that the rendering shows a combined Oakdale Greenlodge school. The orange shows the addition and it is working with the grades. The front of the building is at grade and then goes down toward the field, the second story is built into the grade change. The Gym would be located on the lower level. There is a long road that provides access to the fields on the lower level.

Mr. Tocci asked for clarification on where the classrooms are located?

Ms. Harris stated this rendering is only showing one floor plan, so there are classrooms on the levels that are not currently shown.

Mr. Coughlin asked why we have to look at the Capen for an add/reno if it's not being used as a school and it was already evaluated as part of the ECEC project.

Ms. Harris stated they were looking at all options as required by the MSBA.

Ms. Harris stated this concludes the add/reno options for the project.

Mr. Heffernan asked if the Capen School could reuse the classrooms in the old building?

Ms. Harris stated that the building requires substantial modifications to move walls to accommodate classroom sizes.

Mr. Heffernan requested clarification which options would be substantial renovations?

Ms. Harris stated Capan, Oakdale, and Riverdale would require substantial renovations and the buildings would not be occupied during construction and the Town would require swing space.

Mr. Gray noted this is important because it's expansive and potentially not available. He also noted that if it was an Oakdale Only renovation they would require swing space, however the Oakdale Greenlodge option could allow for building new wings, moving students to the new space, then renovating the existing building and then have Greenlodge move in as well. He also noted that if the school needs to be vacated temporary classrooms could be built as an interim solution, but again it is an added expense.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about building orientation and how that factor into the add/reno's.

Ms. Harris stated the building orientation can be maximized for Oakdale, Greenlodge, and the addition for Riverdale is advantageous. The Capen School is partially oriented correctly because it is an L shape.

Mr. Gonzalez also asked about the new construction renderings and if these are just mockups to show scale, is that still the case?

Mr. Gray stated the renovation options are more detailed because they have to be so the team can understand what can be fit within the existing building.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if this level of detail is acceptable for the MSBA.

Mr. Gray confirmed it is.

Mr. Heffernan asked how often JLA sees a district renovate a 100-year-old building? He asks because it took a tremendous amount of added steel and support for the Town Hall renovation.

Mr. Gray stated it's counterintuitive that renovation is more expensive than new construction until you get into it and then the stark fact is that it almost always is more expensive. He also stated JLA has done renovations, but not for the MSBA.

Community Question: What is the media center? Is it the art rooms? Also, there isn't one shown on the Capen Site, is it not part of that building?

Ms. Harris clarified and stated it is the library and there is a media center at the Capen Site, it's located on a different floor that isn't shown.

Zoom Question: On the FAQ page there is a question on whether the town can cover the increase in cost for added enrollment, is that feasible?

Mr. Theran stated the team has had discussions and the question has been posted to the MSBA and we are awaiting their response so we can provide a clear response.

Site Matrix Review:

Mr. Gray stated the add/reno options did not change the site evaluation matrix very much because the basic locations and technical aspects of each site are relatively the same. He also noted JLA will review the matrix with the working group and then bring the updated matrix to the SBRC at the next meeting.

Site Elimination Vote:

Mr. Tocci asked if the SBRC wants to entertain possibly eliminating any more sites at this time. He also noted this will be addressed with the school committee on Wednesday as well.

Mr. Hebert stated the school committee would like to have a conversation about sites prior to holding a vote to eliminate anything further. He also stated the school committee would like to see one more push to get feedback from the community via a survey. He asked if it would be beneficial to wait until the MSBA approves the PDP prior to eliminating any more sites.

Mr. Gray stated the MSBA wants to see a deliberate process that does move. The project is in a good place right now and the enrollment does not have to be done until June, so after that some more sites can be eliminated along with whatever enrollment option is eliminated.

Mr. Gray noted it is unusual to have this many sites with this many enrollments, it is also unusual to start a project with this many sites as well. However, it is done and it is not a problem.

Mr. Theran added that the matrix with the add/reno options, relative cost options, and durations will be another tool to help with the decision.

Mr. Hebert noted that the SBRC has seen all this information multiple times a month for the last few months, he wants to give the School Committee and community another chance to review prior to eliminating any more sites.

Mr. Heffernan asked if the Capen Striar combined option is still on the table.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC voted to eliminate that last week.

Mr. Heffernan agrees with Mr. Hebert's approach to waiting a bit longer before eliminating more sites. He also noted that the Paul Park and Striar properties had a lot of water running through them when the SBRC did their walk through of all the sites and he believes it would not be a tenable site.

Ms. Ellis stated there was not a vote on eliminating the Capen/Striar as a combined site.

Mr. Tocci stated Town Counsel stated the Striar property is not subject to Chapter 97. In their opinion that means the Town does not have to go through State Legislature to get an exception to Chapter 97. However, they do say the care and custody of the property can be transferred to a different board if two requirements are met. One – approval by 2/3 vote at Town Meeting, and Two – the Parks and Recreation commission must vote the land is no longer needed for the intended use under which it is held.

Mr. Gray stated there still could be problems if those two conditions are not met prior to submitting to the MSBA if that is the site chosen by the SBRC.

Motion: by Mr. Bilafer to remove the Capen -Striar combination from the list of potential sites for the Oakdale School.

Second: Mr. Hebert Seconds

Vote: 6-0-0

Mr. Bilafer stated a hard discussion on Striar should be next, but he will defer to the School Committee before making a motion. He also stated he does not want to eliminate the Riverdale option until after the school committee gives their input.

Mr. Tocci agrees.

Mr. Gray stated the Striar property is difficult to access from the Safe Routes to School point of view. It is a tricky and somewhat dangerous to access with the bottleneck entrance.

Mr. Coughlin noted that the Striar site is also surrounded by warehouses that could bring a lot of truck traffic. He does not like that site for an Elementary School. He also noted that Parks and Rec is going to Town Meeting to request funds to develop that site for fields.

Mr. Gray stated the MSBA will certainly want the Town Meeting and Parks & Rec votes to happen this summer prior to the site being put into the PSR. If those conditions haven't been met the MSBA will not consider the site.

Mr. Theran noted it's a timing issue and could push the project out a bit, but it can be done.

6. Community Meeting:

Mr. Tocci stated he pictures the community meeting as interactive with displays with the community able to ask questions and approach the team members. It will allow the team to gather real input from the community.

Mr. Gray stated JLA was thinking of having a meeting similar to the visioning sessions, with an intro, then break into smaller groups, then meet back up at the end and share feedback.

Mr. Hebert stated the majority of the meeting should be free-flowing conversation with display boards. He thinks individuals should be able to speak and it's easier to do in smaller groups. Then bring the questions from the smaller groups back to a larger group to share.

Mr. Tocci likes the idea of mock-ups, renderings, and charts. He also stated some of the people at this meeting may not have been able to attend any of the past meetings so it's the first opportunity to get information and give input.

****The SBRC discusses how to run the Community Meeting, small groups vs. large groups vs. conversational structure.****

Mr. Tocci stated the team did something similar for the ECEC and they had a stickers to put onto boards to represent thoughts/concerns.

Mr. Bilafer stated there are 5 sites so there should be a station for each site where people can ask questions and look at the different options for each.

Mr. Hebert noted he hopes the community will give feedback that the committee can use going forward.

Mr. Theran noted the details for the community meeting can be finalized in the working group meeting next week.

Mr. Tocci suggested providing site matrices for the community to fill out themselves and rate each site on various categories.

Mr. Gray noted that when individuals fill out the matrices no two are alike and that might draw people away from the big picture of which site is best for a school.

****The SBRC discusses how/if to use the site matrix and survey as part of the community meeting****

Mr. Gray noted that there hasn't been much discussion on the enrollment part of the decision. The team noted that the sites are tied to enrollments so the two go hand in hand.

Mr. Gray suggested providing photos of the existing schools to show the shape they are in.

Mr. Theran noted that everyone is aware of the condition, but it may help to show that if one option is chosen, the other remaining schools still need work.

Mr. Gray thinks it will help to show that all three schools are in tough shape and using MSBA money could help get more kids into a new facility faster.

Dr. Kelly stated he wants everyone to understand the implications of what a stand-alone Oakdale means for the students at the remaining schools and the Town as a whole. It will be decades before all the schools are rebuilt and all the students are in new facilities and the community needs to understand this is broader than the neighborhoods and it impacts the overall operating budget for the school system.

Mr. Coughlin asked when we start discussing costs and do any of these scenarios blow the budget out of the water costs wise?

Mr. Theran noted that the next steps is the discussion about relative costs, not the dollar amount cost. The renovation with an extended schedule is a \$\$\$ vs. a new construction is a \$ cost. The other option is to put real dollar numbers to the different options. However, there is concern with the dollar values the discussion will be come the Town can't spend more than X dollars instead of how to make the project move forward.

Mr. Heffernan stated the Town is looking at the long-term plan and there is a good chance this project will be a debt exclusion. A combination school will cost more than a single stand-alone school, but it would double the number of kids in a new school. The debt exclusion would happen for a large or small school.

Mr. Coughlin stated that once the cost for a stand-alone Oakdale School is known that can be used to explain the cost the Town for replacement of three separate schools vs. two schools.

Zoom Question: Mr. Ralyea stated it's hard for the community to look at the options outside of the context of plans for the remaining schools. Will there be redistricting, what happens to Riverdale down the road. It might make sense to start giving out some of these scenarios in more detail. What is the timeline for all the elementary schools?

Mr. Tocci stated we need to look at this from the standpoint of what we know. The masterplan in place has called for replacement of all 3 elementary schools. The Oakdale got the Town into the MSBA program right now. Dedham is unlikely to get into the MSBA program again anytime soon, this is the fourth project in the last 20 years. It will be more likely than not that another elementary school project will be the Town doing it on its own dime. The answer to that question is tied up in large part on whether the Town is willing to foot that expense, when, and if we are capable of doing so.

Ms. Ellis stated that once the price options are available that will help with the discussion on how to proceed.

Mr. Ralyea stated that if the project will be brought to Town Meeting next spring the sooner the discussions around the larger picture can be brought up the better.

Mr. Tocci agrees.

Mr. Hebert stated that once the site for this project is figured out then we can move onto dealing with the next schools and with the existing structures that are left. The work will continue even after this project.

Mr. Tocci added that if the Town moves forward on its own with another project they own the process and it's not on the MSBA timeline.

7. School Committee Update:

Mr. Hebert provided an update on the School Committee meetings. He stated that the Ed Plan has been accessible to the committee in its evolving form for weeks so they can hopefully move forward with approving it this week.

Mr. Gray stated that David Stephen reviewed the Ed Plan and was very impressed.

8. Upcoming Meetings:

Mr. Tocci stated the upcoming meetings include:

Community Meeting on 3/25/23 at 3:30pm at the Middle School.

SBRC Meetings are scheduled for 3/27/23; 4/10/23; and 4/24/23. Locations still TBD.

9. New Business:

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business.

Mr. Costa suggested a joint SBRC/School Committee meeting or a couple of joint meetings.

Mr. Tocci stated there was a joint meeting back in September. He is sure they will have a joint meeting.

Mr. Hebert suggested joint meetings around milestones.

Mr. Tocci stated maybe that can be in May and it can be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Hebert asked if there was a schedule of meetings.

Ms. Ellis stated there is a schedule in the presentation.

10. Adjourn:

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Heffernan

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez

Unanimous vote to adjourn

Meeting Adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Attachments:


Vertex/JLA SBRC Presentations

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk



MSBA FEASIBILITY / SCHEMATIC PROCESS & BEYOND VERTEX



PDP: Preliminary Design Plan | PSR: Preferred Schematic Report | SD: Schematic Design Report
 • Aligned with MSBA Board Meetings and Town Ballot | Dates shown are approximate

★ = Dedicated Community Forums (Suggested **MINIMUM** amount of meetings) in addition to other committee meetings
 1) Kick-off: Process & Timeline 2) Pre-PDP: Options 3) Pre-PSR: Selected Option 4) Pre-TM Info 5) Pre-Construction



MSBA Deliverables



Feasibility & Schematic Design Deliverables

Preliminary Design Program (PDP)	Preferred Schematic Report (PSR)	Schematic Design Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visioning • Educational Program • Initial Space Summary • Evaluation of Existing Conditions & Facilities • Site Development Requirements • Preliminary Evaluation options and siting options • Submit to MSBA in March 2023 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Evaluation of Existing Conditions • Detailed Options Analysis & Evaluation ALL enrollment scenarios • Short-list Options • Preferred Solution FINAL DECISION regarding enrollment MOST Cost Effective and Educationally Appropriate solution • Submit to MSBA in June 2023 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schematic Design (30% thru Design) • Final Design Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Analysis • Environmental Assessment • Geotechnical • Code Analysis • Sustainability • ADA / MAAB Analysis • Room Data Sheets • Project Delivery System (CMR/DBB) • Construction Cost Estimate(s) • Total Project Budget • Project Schedule • Maximum MSBA Reimbursement • Submit to MSBA in December 2023

Heavy District / SC involvement and/or decisions



RESPONSIBILITY MATRIX





Decision / Deliverable / Task	Time Frame	SC Review	SC Vote	SBRC Review	SBRC Vote	Notes
Visioning	Jan-Feb '23	X		X		
Educational Plan	Feb-Mar '23	X	X	X		
Space Summary	Mar-Apr '23	X	X	X		
Site Evaluations	Feb-Mar '23	X		X	X	
List of all Concepts	Feb-Mar'23	X		X		
Preliminary Design Program (PDP)	March '23	X	X	X	X	CEO, SC chair, Supt sign submission
Evaluation Criteria	Mar-Apr '23	X		X	X	
Enrollment Decision	Mar-Jun '23	X	X	X		Multiple SC meetings
Shortlist of Options	May-Jun '23	X		X	X	
Selection of Preferred Option	Jun '23	X		X	X	
Redistricting (if applicable)		X	X	X		
Preferred Schematic Report	June '23	X	X	X	X	CEO, SC chair, Supt sign submission
Schematic Design	Sep-Dec '23		X	X		
Schematic Design Estimate	Dec '24		X	X		
Total Project Budget / Schedule	Dec '24		X	X		
Schematic Design Report	Dec '24	X	X	X	X	CEO, SC chair, Supt sign submission



MARCH MEETING/VOTE CALENDAR





	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
	27-Feb	28-Feb	1	2	3	4	5
	SBRC Meeting: REVIEW: Test fits, Space summaries, & Visioning Report.	Gather information for CropperGIS redistricting	School Committee Meeting: REVIEW: Educational plan and space summaries				
	6	7 WORKING GROUP	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	SBRC Meeting: REVIEW: Test fits, Evaluation matrix, Cost Estimates		School Committee Meeting: VOTE: To accept the Educational Plan and Space Summaries		JLA To submit DRAFT PDP report to OPM, SBRC		
	20	21 WORKING GROUP	22	23	24	25	26
	27	28	29	30	31		
	SBRC Meeting: REVIEW: Test fits, evaluation Matrix VOTE: Accept Educational Plan & Space Summaries VOTE: Approve OPM to submit PDP				SUBMIT PDP TO MSBA		



**OAKDALE-550 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

A.1 - R/A OAKDALE +GREENLODGE
85,550GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3VANS



■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated



**OAKDALE-450 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

A.2 - R/A OAKDALE +RIVERDALE
72,000 GSF
92 SPACES, 3 BUSES, 1 VANS


■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated



**OAKDALE-235 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

A.3 - R/A OAKDALE ONLY
50,000GSF
44SPACES, 1 BUS



■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated



**GREENLODGE ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

B.1 - R/A OAKDALE +GREENLODGE
85,550GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3VANS



■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated



**RIVERDALE ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

C.1 - R/A OAKDALE +RIVERDALE
72,000 GSF
92 SPACES, 3 BUSES, 1 VANS



■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated







**CAPEN-550 ADDITION/RENOVATION
TEST FIT DIAGRAM**

D.1 - R/A OAKDALE +GREENLODGE
85,550GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3VANS

■ New Construction
■ Existing to be Renovated







**Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
March 15, 2023**

A True Copy Attest

Paul M. Munchbach
Town Clerk

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Dr. Melissa Pearrow
Victor Hebert
Mayanne Briggs
Joshua Donati
Christopher Polito
Cailen McCormick
Tracey White
Tara Duncan (absent)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Dr. Ian Kelly, Interim Superintendent
Matthew Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance (absent)
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Heather Smith, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum

Meeting Location:
Avery Elementary

School Committee Meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.

Open Meeting
Dr. Melissa Pearrow called the meeting to order.

Pledge of Allegiance

PUBLIC COMMENTS


[NONE.]

**Dedham Public Schools
Interim Superintendent's Update**

Teaching and Learning

STAR Phonics. Given the disruptions to learning that Grade 3 students experienced during COVID, the District has implemented specific word study instruction to ensure that all students continue developing critical literacy skills and concepts. As a result of this supplemental support, Dedham's students continue to learn and make strong progress. The chart below provides a summary of data for grade three students across the data. Assessments are grouped by skills along the horizontal (x) axis. Within each skill student results are grouped by beginning

of year assessments results (BOY) and middle of year assessment results (MOY). For beginning and middle of year assessments of each skill, results appear in green (% of students meeting benchmark), yellow (% of students progressing towards benchmark), and red (% of students not making adequate progress towards benchmark). Definitions and examples of the skills assessed and represented on the chart below can be can be found here.



Instructional Rounds. On March 8th, the elementary leadership team (principals, instructional coaches, and curriculum coordinators) conducted instructional rounds at the ECEC. Instructional rounds provide district leaders with important insights into teaching and learning in classrooms around the district. Rounds focus on specific areas of practice or strategic improvement that the District is targeting. This series of rounds at the ECEC focused practitioners on the extent to which children have opportunities to engage in oral language skill development. During the visit, the leadership team observed students engage in discussion with peers and adults through buddy reading and teacher modeling, sing songs, practice reading words that follow the consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) pattern, and build words and sentences collaboratively with their peers.



Bren Bataclan Visit. Bren Bataclan (Boston based artist) visited the district for a week-long artist-in-residency involving all 5th-grade students across the elementary schools. Mr. Bataclan's residency focused on spreading kindness through art and the creative process. He visited each school for an entire day (Monday-Thursday) spending time discussing spreading kindness in our community and creating artwork with students. On Friday Mr. Bataclan conducted a 45 min workshop at each school to help students write artist statements about their work highlighting the importance of literacy and writing in the art-making process. This was made possible by a generous grant from the Dedham Education Foundation (DEF) and the hard work of the elementary visual art teachers (Kristin Prata, Sarah Altone, and Sarah Oliveri). Mr. Bataclan's residency was a great success and an important part of *Youth Art Month*. [Additional photos from Mr. Bataclan's residency can be found here.](#)



Johnny Appleseed. Nearly 50 Oakdale students presented the mini-musical, Johnny Appleseed, under the direction of music teacher Christopher Molinaro, assisted by teachers Bridget Kelly, Claire Eisenberg, and Michelle Blanchard. Students and families enjoyed exuberant singing, adorable dances and clever dialogue that told the story of this great American pioneer, his respect and appreciation for nature, and his kind hearted reverence for all humankind.



Visit to Costa Rica. Ms. Abby Zuckerman and Ms. Allison Guiffaro accompanied 26 sophomores, juniors and seniors to four regions of Costa Rica. The trip focused on the students not only expanding their language skills, but expanding their knowledge about the biodiversity that Costa Rica has to offer the world. The first three days were spent in the Monteverde region, in the northern cloud forest of Costa Rica where the students learned first hand about coffee growing from bean to cup, they were guided through the process as well as organic and self sustainable farming. Then they continued on by doing different community service projects and it was inspiring to see them grow in character.

The next three days were spent in the rainforest of Arenal and its surrounding beauty. We hiked towards the volcano in Arenal National park, We only got as close as was allowed and we were impressed by the lava formations. One of the pictures shows us in front of a 400 yr old tree in the rainforest which is very uncommon. We enjoyed a nice break in the hot springs! We visited the ASIA Preserve where they rehabilitate animals back into the wild. We learned why it is against the law to keep macaws, monkeys, and sloths and why they should not be kept as domesticated pets. We then visited a butterfly preserve in the middle of the rainforest where the environmentalists shared with us each stage of the butterflies life and we touched and got to play with them. The owner also roasted cacao and took us through the process of how chocolate is ground and we sampled 100 percent pure chocolate which was a staple of the natives to the country. While leaving we challenged a local group of Costa Rican students to a game of fútbol which was entertaining to watch especially since our side was stacked with some phenomenal DHS players from the girls' team.

For entertainment at night we had the students put on a good old fashion talent show. Our guide, Adrian and our driver Hector were the judges. It was a fun night and certainly one to remember because we were awoken at 5am by howler monkeys which Ms. Guifarro thought was a puma outside our lodge. The noise they make is incredible and in the morning as we left the monkeys were playfully swinging from the trees as we left. Clearly they got more sleep than we did!

Our last day was spent in the capital city touring around and using our Spanish to buy souvenirs. Costa Rica left a lasting impression in our hearts and we are proud of the students for getting out of their comfort zone in Dedham and learning about self sustainability among other things, and ultimately becoming global citizens of the world.

Additional photos [can be found here.](#)




Professional Development

Inquiry Journeys. On Tuesday, March 7th, our team of instructional coaches participated in a workshop on differentiation with Inquiry Journeys to support teachers and students participation in the pilot.



LiPS Training (Part II). On March 8-9, special education teachers, related service providers and interventionists participated in LiPS training. LiPS is a phoneme sequencing program developed by Lindamood-Bell.

Early Release Day. On March 2nd, educators across the district participated in professional development. [Topics may be found here.](#)



Community Engagement

Avery and Greenlodge voluntary faculty meetings. On March 6th and 8th I visited the Avery and Greenlodge schools for voluntary faculty meetings as part of my continued efforts to connect with faculty and staff and continue developing a deep understanding of the strategic needs of the District as we prepare to onboard our next Superintendent of Schools. Meetings were well attended and I am grateful for the thoughtful and honest dialog and feedback that faculty and staff provided during these conversations.

Tri-County Superintendent’s Legislative Breakfast. On March 3rd I attended the Tri-County Superintendent’s legislative breakfast at Newton’s City Hall with Dr. Pearrow and incoming Superintendent Nan Murphy. Superintendents from Norfolk, Middlesex, and Worcester Counties along with School Committee Chairs, and legislators convened to discuss pressing fiscal issues for FY24 and their direct impact on students and schools across the state. The Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS) has established key legislative priorities which target economic relief from the state to offset extraordinary increases to the costs of goods and services in FY24.

District Curriculum Advisory Focus Groups. On March 13th, members of the District Curriculum Advisory facilitated focus groups for families. The first of two events held in March, took place at Dedham Middle School where families had dinner and our DELTA high school volunteers provided babysitting. The agenda for the evening can be found here, as well as a list of the focus group questions facilitators asked.

Management and Operations

DHS Turf Field. The turf replacement project at the high school is moving through the administrative phase of the project. The turf design has been approved with the help of our Athletic Director Steve Traister, and the order has been placed with the factory for the production of the carpet. The bid documents for the installation of the turf are being developed by the town Procurement Officer Rana Mana-Doerfer and are expected to be released by the end of March with an anticipated bid due date in mid April. Twice monthly meetings have been scheduled for the high school team and will be held internally until the project is completed.

COMMENTS on the Interim Superintendent update

Ms. White asked if we could send info to the neighbors about when the work will start on the DHS Turf Field.

Dr. Kelly replied that once they have the schedule, they will send a flyer out to the neighbors.

Reports/Updates/Requests

- Literacy Strategic Planning – Dr. Heather Smith and Dr. Sara Stetson

Dr. Sara Stetson and Dr. Heather Smith presented slides that showed an overview and update of the literacy strategic plan.

Strategic Plan

The Mass. Literacy Guide was launched by DESE in 2021 as a guide on how to support students with core literacy skills. Dr. Smith was a team member on the development of that plan. This past summer a two-day leadership conference was held in Dedham on literacy. The DPS literacy strategic plan strives to support general and special education literacy needs with a focus on equity.

Dr. Stetson has been active in educating administrators about dyslexia including those outside the district and country. She is pleased that the Mass. Legislature just adopted important legislation to support dyslexia education.

Dr. Smith said that they will start piloting new instructional materials now that a curriculum is in place. Each year a new content area will go under review in Pre-K-12.

The DPS Curriculum Review Cycle will put in place a seven-year academic review cycle. The phases of that cycle are as follows:

- 2022-23: Curriculum Analysis, Piloting of new materials and programs.
- 2024-25: Develop and adopt new curriculum and train educators
- 2026-27: Train all teachers, implement and monitor curriculum
- 2027-28: Evaluate the success of the new programs.

Dedham applied for, but was not awarded, the Growing Literacy Equity Across Massachusetts (GLEAM) grant. However the application process afforded the district with the opportunity to jump start goals and helped to write the strategic plan.

The Literacy Leadership Team involved Dedham administrators, faculty and administration. They looked into bringing on board the Early Bird and Start Phonics assessments and they are currently evaluating the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment. Dr. Stetson said the DIBELS8 is a strong assessment for undertaking Universal Screening for all grades. The screening process needs to be done carefully because we don't want to miss anyone. The adoption of new literacy assessment tools will allow Dedham to move past the Level Literacy Intervention (LLI) program that was used in previous years.

DIBELS8 is currently being piloted in classrooms in grades K-5. If the DIBELS8 demonstrates successful outcomes then it will replace Early Bird, STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy assessment programs. DIBELS8 allows progress monitoring on whether the target intervention is helping the student.

Dr. Smith discussed the new programs that are currently being piloted.

Dr. Stetson talked about an oral language curriculum that uses visualization for students with learning disabilities and added that they are running the Orton Gillingham training program for teachers.

The overarching goal is to develop a full menu of targeted programs for literacy, and by June 2025 it is expected that all students in Grade 3 will be in the proficiency category for literacy.

COMMENTS on the Literacy Program

Ms. Briggs commented that historically DESE gives us mandates without providing any funding. Dr. Stetson said they have been successful in diverting some contracts to targeted areas for training and implementation of specialized instruction. She said they will continue to work for creative funding sources.

Mr. Donati asked about DIBELS vs. Early Bird. Dr. Stetson said that K 1 classrooms are piloting the DIBELS assessment. Others are still using the STAR Reading.

Dr. Stetson said she spent a lot of time on dyslexia advocacy across the state. Dr. Kelly said the decision to have an Asst. Superintendent adds to heightened collaboration and more successful programs. Dr. Stetson and Dr. Smith are working to leverage all of our resources. Dr. Stetson applauded Dr. Smith's efforts and Dr. Smith said the feeling is mutual and she said we have been trying to utilize the trainer model.

Mr. Polito asked if other states have state funding for literacy programs. Dr. Stetson said there is a mixed funding model. Mr. Polito asked if there was a followup to make sure no students are missed during evaluation in Grades 1-3. Dr. Stetson said they can keep testing in 4th and 5th grades to capture any missed students. She is hoping that they will get so good at early intervention, that we won't need to continue the constant evaluation.

Mr. Polito asked about the timing and flexibility of assessments. Dr. Stetson said teachers could evaluate a class in one week using these assessments. Interventions can be modified and implemented almost immediately.

Dr. Stetson said that dyslexia is not diagnosed with screeners, we are notifying parents directly when there is risk identified in that area. If the first level of intervention is not successful, then we will move to higher levels of intervention.

Ms. McCormick thinks that we should be better at sharing the work we are doing with students on a regular basis. It's important to let parents know that our district is at the forefront of learning. She asked about feedback on the grant that was submitted.

Dr. Smith said that the grant application received strong scores, but there were more grants than could be funded. The state needs to support districts and we are told that there will be more opportunities in the future.

Ms. Briggs hopes that there is still success even if we don't reach 100% of our goals.

- Discussion & Vote of School Building Project Education Plan

[Polito recused himself from the School Committee due to conflict of interest.]

Dr. Kelly said he needs the Committee's support tonight on the Education Plan. A draft document was presented at the March 1st School Committee meeting. The Visioning Committee, composed of 35 parents, faculty, central office administration and district leadership and led by New Vista Design, has been collaborating to develop the educational model to inform the MSBA about our needs in the new space. Each section talks about the current educational situation in Dedham and then what we want to change. Dr. Kelly said he met with the architects to ensure that the current space summaries supported the Education Plan accurately. The plan is 95% complete.

Dr. Kelly said the Education Plan includes a broad overview of who we serve and the age of the current facilities. This section clarifies grade spans and policies. The desired class size is 16-18 for Grades 1-5. Current class configuration and scheduling is summarized.

The Educational Philosophy and Mission section states the overarching goals. This will inform the broad architectural design of the new school. He said the focus was on how the new facility reflects Dedham and the communities served by the school.

Jon Levi, director of design for the project came to the podium. He said the visioning group wasn't a committee, it was an open call that had input from a wide variety of people from the community.

Dr. Kelly said that in addition to defining spaces for general instruction, physical space was defined for performing arts, special education, breakout small groups, and other school services. The transportation section will require further work, but should be completed in a couple of weeks.

Space summaries for the 235, 450 and 550 enrollments reflect different space structures and cohort groupings. Includes MSBA guidelines for enrollment and program recommendations.

More work needs to be done on food services and transportation.

COMMENTS on the Education Plan

Mr. Donati acknowledged the clarity of the document. He said he would be comfortable voting on this tonight.

Ms. White thanked everyone for the work that people did on this to make it readable and understandable.

Ms. Briggs commended the team and the document.

Mr. Hebert appreciated that the document showed what we do now and how we can make it better.

Motion was made to approve the School Building Project Education Plan as presented tonight. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Subcommittee Updates

- SBRC

Mr. Hebert said the SBRC Subcommittee met on Monday with the architects and Vertex.

Jonathan Levi commented that the educational plan is distinctive from other districts. The educator planning and development section is an important aspect that has not been included by other districts.

Steve Theran, Vertex Project Manager, reviewed the schedule for the Oakdale Project.

- Community meetings will be held about the Enrollment decision.
- Submit PDP by end of March
- Once one location/design option is selected, schematic design and cost estimates are due by the end of December 2023.
- Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) includes enrollment decisions.

COMMENTS on the Oakdale Project

Ms. Briggs asked about the community survey they had talked about. She also feels that making a decision by June with two new School Committee members coming on in April may be difficult. She asked what the impact would be if they did not submit the PSR in June?

Mr. Donati asked who approved the timeline change?

John Tocci, Chair of the SBRC explained that several members didn't want to have such a big submission take place at the end of July due to summer vacations. He said there is still a possibility to submit in July.

Ms. White wanted to know why they could not have the extra four weeks to get newer members up to speed. John Tocci said they never took a vote on it so that the deadlines could be flexible.

Dr. Kelly asked if we don't submit the PSR in June, how would it affect the timeline? He said we need to plan on a May 2024 Town Meeting vote.

Mr. Tocci said we need to submit the schematic design by December 2023. We could still work out the timeline and make the 2024 Town Meeting date.

Dr. Pearrow asked about the community forums. Mr. Tocci said there will be additional community meetings and joint School and SBRC meetings other than the ones that are currently showing up on the calendar.

Ms. White said that the School Committee promised that a survey would be delivered.

Mr. Hebert said that at the least SBRC there was talk about taking major sites off. He asked that the decision about eliminating more sites should wait until the School Committee could be involved in that decision.

Mr. Hebert said we have time to do the survey before the next public forum. The Committee agreed about the importance of doing a community survey.

Mr. Tocci said there are 16 options on the table now. We don't want people to vote on all those options. The only option voted off was the Striar/Capen option. The SBRC did not vote on the 450 combined Oakdale/Riverdale at Riverdale or combined Oakdale/Riverdale at Oakdale. We are now left with 14 options. He said they have solicited a good deal of input from the public, but we have not done a survey.

Mr. Donati said he would have been shocked if the Oakdale/Riverdale sites would have been voted on without the School Committee input.

Ms. Briggs said we are down to five sites: Riverdale, Oakdale, Greenlodge, Striar and Capen.

Ms. White said she didn't mean that there has been no public input. The School Committee talked about a survey, however, the idea may not have been conveyed to the SBRC.

Mr. Hebert said the SBRC had a working group meeting coming up and the survey idea will be raised. Dr. Kelly said that the schools could help develop and disseminate the survey.

They discussed Amanda Smith and Sara Errickson's involvement with the survey.

Dr. Pearrow said we need systematic feedback from the community and she is hopeful that there could be next steps discussed at the next SBRC meeting for developing the survey. She appreciates that the SBRC is hearing our requests. Mr. Tocci wants more guidance from the School Committee on how the survey should look. He thinks it may be early, but he agrees that we should not have more sites eliminated without larger public feedback.

Dr. Pearrow said Dr. Kelly will be the point person on the design of the survey. Dr. Kelly reinforced that he will need help to know what the School Committee wants to learn to help frame the survey. Then he will work with JLA, Vertex and SBRC to keep it moving.

- Budget

Mr. Polito said that will be hearing from FinCom but the meeting was canceled due to weather. Rescheduled for Tuesday.

- Communications

Ms. McCormick said there are no updates, but they are happy to schedule a meeting to collaborate about the Oakdale Project survey.

- Curriculum Advisory

Dr. Smith said the first set of focus groups were held on Monday. Delta students from the High School attended. Participation from eight families and more families registered for March 30.

Dr. Kelly said the School Committee and Dr. Smith has been on the forefront of this topic. The Newton school district contacted him about what we are doing. Ms. McCormick said that it's great to involve the community.

- Policy

No updates.

- Traffic Circulation

No updates.

- Negotiations

Ms. White said they met a week ago and there will be information to discuss at the next meeting.

- Parks & Recreation

No updates.

Donations

No donations.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the minutes from March 1, 2023 and approved by a vote of 6-0. (Ms. Briggs abstained because she was absent at the March 1, 2023 meeting).

Old/New Business

Mr. Polito asked if the Executive Session minutes could be reviewed before the School Board membership changed in April.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

- Mr. Donati said he attended a 5th grade students fundraiser where the students were waiters and waitresses.
- Ms. White said Cinderella is this weekend from Friday – Sunday.
- She acknowledged that so many teams got into post season play. She acknowledged that Catherine Sargent has broken records and is a national winner in shot put.
- Spelling Bee is next Thursday for 3-5 graders.

Executive Session – Exemption 3 – To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation

Roll call vote was taken to adjourn the meeting and move to Executive Session.

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Avery School and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – Approved

Monday March 27, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Kevin Coughlin	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
	John Heffernan		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
A	Victor Hebert		Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Philip Gray		
			Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM

There is no old business to discuss.

2. Previous meetings minutes reviewed:

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the minutes from the previous meeting.

Motion: to approve the previous minutes made by Mr. Gonzalez

Second by: Mr. Bilafer

Vote: Minutes approved 5-0-0

3. Community Meeting Feedback:

Mr. Tocci stated the Community Meeting opened with him and Mr. Theran addressing the group about the project history and that the purpose of the meeting was to gather feedback of the remaining five sites. There were five stations set up, one for each remaining site, and each had a large poster board showing the massing studies/building test fits for each enrollment option available at each site. For example, the Oakdale station had a board showing the test fit options for a stand-alone Oakdale, a combined Oakdale/Greenlodge, and a combined Oakdale/Riverdale.

After the introduction, the attendees broke into groups to visit each station and ask questions or discuss the different sites, buildings, and positive & negative aspects of each. There were two team members at each station to field questions and run the discussions. This lasted for about an hour and half and provided a lot of feedback that was captured on large whiteboard style paper for each site.

Mr. Tocci stated there were approximately 60 attendees in total and 25 of those attendees returned the filled-out questionnaire with a matrix to rate the sites on various aspects and also include comments.

Mr. Gray noted that each station had a large whiteboard style paper to capture community comments.

Paul M. Amerson
Town Clerk

Mr. Tocci noted the results of the matrices showed that the Oakdale School site was rated as most advantageous followed by Greenlodge, then Riverdale, then Capen, and Striar was last. This was based on rating of location, impact on sports, impact to neighbors, overall student safety, parity with other schools, proximity to student households, and traffic/offsite congestion. He noted that some people wanted to take the questionnaire home and that it can be mailed to Nancy Baker at Town Hall.

Mr. Gray said the questionnaire had a section for attendees to fill out which noted the neighborhood they live in. Most respondents came from the Oakdale Neighborhood (11) total, followed by (6) from Greenlodge, (5) from Riverdale, (3) From Paul Park, and (2) from Striar and Avery. It is noted that there are more responses with comments because some people did not fill out the matrix portion of the questionnaire but did fill out the comment section.

Mr. Theran was at the Capen School station, and he noted that almost everyone who attended visited all of the stations. He also noted that most people did not think highly of the Capen School site when they first came to the station but after discussions about logistics and the fact that the school is currently empty it became a more popular choice. The biggest positive for the site is the fact that it does not disrupt the current students as the building is unoccupied. People also liked the idea of the play area being behind the school because it is sheltered from the roadway.

Mr. Gray was at the Oakdale site then moved to the Striar Site station. He noted there was nothing positive said about the Striar site. The main concern is safety due to the busy roadway and industrial setting with eighteen wheelers entering around a blind corner and down a hill. Another concern is the lack of on street parking for full school events and making a parking lot large enough to hold the entire school population would be a waste of space. On the flip side the Oakdale site garnered a lot of interest. People were especially interested in how to save the existing original building and how that would look with the MSBA process. He noted that there were some questions about the enrollments, however he deferred to keeping the discussion about sites themselves separate of enrollment.

Mr. Hebert was at the Capen site also. He stated a lot of people did not picture the site as viable but after a discussion on design and how it can be worked into the existing topography along with the fact that it is vacant makes it more appealing. He also noted that the abutters did not have much negative feedback and overall. The biggest concern was traffic through the neighborhood and Mr. Hebert noted that would be addressed through a traffic study. Overall, it was a great discussion about the sites and people left very interested in the site.

Mr. Tocci stated he was at the Oakdale site and his feedback was similar to Mr. Gray's. There were lots of comments from neighbors who love the idea of keeping the Oakdale school at that site. They were also concerned about traffic on the smaller side streets. Mr. Tocci explained that what is shown on the test fit plan is not the final design and prior to finalizing a design the team will enlist a traffic consultant to address these concerns. Most neighbors want to keep the entrance on Cedar Street and not have the entrance moved to Madison Street.

Mr. Tocci also noted that people are interested in an add/reno option at the site as there is a lot of emotional pull to keep the old original building and also keep the school up toward Cedar Street and not further back on the existing fields. There was also discussion on what it would cost to keep the existing school and Mr. Tocci noted that renovations are usually more expensive. There was also a discussion on

what it will cost the Town to combine schools vs. keeping the smaller neighborhood schools. The emphasis was on the fact that there are 700 students who need to get into new facilities and the best most cost-effective way to do that.

Mr. Gray stated a lot of people want to understand the traffic impacts and they were reassured to know that a traffic analysis will be done as part of the design once the site is selected. This will make the selected site safer than it is today because it will be designed to accommodate the additional traffic and drop off/pick up queuing needed for the school. He also noted that once the final site is selected the team will look at lots of alternate ways to fit the building, parking, play areas, etc. onto the site prior to selecting a final layout and the community will again have an opportunity to weigh in on which layout they prefer.

Mr. Gonzalez was at the Striar site the whole time. He stated most parents with children in schools right now are picturing a drop off/pick up as it is currently at each school and it is important to note that it won't look the same as it does now, it will be greatly improved no matter which site is chosen. He also stated most of the comments were concerns and/or comments with people sharing the history of the site. Some comments included information about the site being contaminated from past military and industrial uses as well as an asphalt plant that was in the area. Residents also had concerns about the Chapter 97 designation for the site and Mr. Gonzalez he explained the guidance received from Town Counsel. He also stated this was a good opportunity to explain the process we are undertaking to the community. He stated a lot of people did not understand why Striar was even on the list, and he explained it was included because the committee is being diligent and evaluating all sites based on advantages and disadvantages. He said that was helpful for people to hear and understand that just because a site is on list doesn't mean everyone believes it's a great site.

Mr. Hebert wanted to note that the population that was in attendance at the meeting is not a fair representation of the entire Town and they wanted to know how to get more people involved. Also, he noted that the feedback received today will help inform what will be asked in the upcoming survey. He also assured people that the SBRC is not going to make any more large decisions right now without additional feedback.

Mr. Tocci stated it is also important for folks to hear what has been done over the past year to six months, including community meetings, SBRC meetings, School Committee meetings, PTO informational meetings, site walk throughs, etc. He also noted the School Committee will take charge of a survey and the SBRC will not be making any decisions until more feedback is received. He also noted that the school committee and SBRC will be working together and they are planning a joint meeting in the near future.

Mr. Lemieux was at the Riverdale site, and he said it was interesting because everyone loved the Riverdale site, and the only negative comment was about the heavy traffic on Needham Street. The site is great for building since it is flat. There was also a question from a resident about how to get all the Oakdale Students Riverdale if the schools are combined. There was concern because the Oakdale students live a significant distance away. Mr. Lemieux clarified and said there would be redistricting involved and it would not necessarily be all the Oakdale students being bussed to Riverdale but rather a shifting of students around the entire Town so students still go to the school closest to them. He also noted that people thought the only option for a combined Oakdale Riverdale school would happen at

Riverdale and nowhere else. Mr. Lemieux stated this was a great format for a meeting and the team gathered great feedback from the community.

Mr. Theran stated some folks wanted to make it known that no matter what final site is chosen through this process it ultimately needs to be supported by the Town as a whole at Town Meeting.

Mr. Gray also noted that there were a lot of questions about what will happen to the vacated school. A lot of people like the idea of creating an ECEC #2 and he believes the team will need to have an answer for that question.

Mr. Tocci stated in the past there was a School Reuse Committee appointed to make that decision. He noted he heard a lot of the same concern and questions about if the buildings would turn into condos or housing.

Mr. Gray read through the comments about the Greenlodge site: it is the prettiest site, has the least amount of traffic, lots of ledge in the field that would be a huge cost, sustainability with the east/west orientation, a stream runs under Greenlodge. Those were the comments from the flip chart at that station.

Mr. Gonzalez stated there was a question that was asked at each station about if the access points for the schools would be preserved for students. It is something to consider.

Mr. Bilafer added that it will be interesting to see what happens to the vacated building if consolidation happens. He also stated the SBRC doesn't have the authority to make that decision, it starts with the School Committee. He believes the process to get some direction on what to do with the needs to be part of the conversation and some of the other committees need to make this a focus. There is a process that will flow in behind what we are doing that will provide answers to those questions and the conversation needs to start sooner than later because the Town cannot agree on a solution for a new building without a decision on what to do with the remaining buildings.

Mr. Lemieux stated it is important to note the MSBA will want to know what is going to happen with the remaining building and if the Town wants to demolish the building and have the cost included in this project it needs to be decided prior to the Project Funding Agreement being signed. He also noted that costs to cover demolition should be included in the overall project cost just so the Town is covered regardless of the final chosen path.

4. Preliminary Design Plan (PDP) Update:

Mr. Tocci stated the Education Plan was approved by the School Committee at their last meeting. He stated that Mr. Heffernan had emailed a question about the teachers noting that the number of teachers listed in the existing space summaries does not add up the number of teachers requested in the new space summaries, specifically in regard to the Special Education teachers. Mr. Tocci stated he would ask Dr. Kelly for clarification on that. He also noted he returned some feedback to the team via email including some typos as well as a note to include the in-person Site Walk through as a meeting and that the elimination of Rustcraft was not a unanimous vote.

Mr. Theran noted the PDP submission will be delivered to the MSBA this Friday 3/31/23.

Mr. Bilafer stated under item 6.4 there are two options listed for the Striar Site for add/reno. He noted that there should not be any add/reno option as there is no existing building on that site.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the Educational Plan had some highlighted fields with missing information and needs to be updated.

Mr. Theran stated the School Committee voted to approve the Ed Plan and Dr. Kelly is diligently working on updating those missing pieces.

Mr. Tocci noted there needs to be a vote to approve the PDP submittal scheduled for this Friday.

MOTION by Mr. Hebert To approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager, Vertex, to submit the Feasibility Study related materials for the Preliminary Design Plan (PDP) to the MSBA for its consideration.

SECOND: by Mr. Coughlin.

VOTE: Unanimous vote to approve 6-0-0

5. School Committee Updates/Survey

Mr. Tocci asked for any additional feedback from Mr. Hebert from the School Committee.

Mr. Hebert stated the School Committee (SC) will be sending out a survey and they are working with their communications personnel to get something out. He said he will be the go between for the two committees. He can also bring dates to the School Committee for a suggested joint meeting.

*The SBRC discussed possible dates for an upcoming joint SBRC/School Committee meeting.

The team decided April 26, 2023, is the best day and Mr. Hebert will discuss with the School Committee at the next School Committee meeting.

Mr. Bilafer noted they can start the joint meeting then adjourn and the school committee can continue with their own meeting.

Mr. Tocci asked for clarification on the survey and how is it distributed, how long do you give for feedback to be received, what to do with the feedback received.

Mr. Hebert stated the School Committee can utilize Town resources to get the survey out to the larger community via mail and/or an email blast that will direct people to an online link with information. He can also get clarification on timing at the upcoming school committee meeting as he is unsure of timing. Part of the timing of the survey will depend on how quickly we need feedback and how quickly we can get information out to the public.

Mr. Bilafer stated people need to time respond to the survey and the Town should have an idea on what they have done in the past. He also asked what the goal is and how much time we want to request from people. He also wants to make sure we allow enough time for people to know its available and then respond.

Mr. Tocci asked how many surveys the team wants to do? He would also like to discuss narrowing down the sites further at the joint SBRC/School Committee meeting. He also wants to know if we want the survey to request what site people like the best.

Mr. Bilafer stated that without any cost context it is hard to make a decision. He also stated the enrollment option should be part of the conversation along with cost.

Mr. Hebert stated that the community meeting was a good start to how the greater community input will look as well. He also stated the Board needs to decide what they want to get out of the survey.

Mr. Bilafer noted that the next big decision is the enrollment decision, and the School Committee should discuss what they want to see from the survey as well.

Mr. Hebert will discuss all of this with the School Committee.

6. Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) Timeline:

Mr. Tocci wants to discuss setting a date for the PSR submission deadline. He stated that even though the team has until July we may want to have a final option chosen sometime in June. At the recent SC meeting the point was made that there will be two new school committee members in April that need to be brought up to speed and they may want more time to make this decision. He also noted that some of the candidates have been attending the SBRC meetings and are aware of the project and what has been going on. He asked Mr. Theran what the final deadline is to make it the October MSBA Board meeting.

Mr. Theran stated the latest the PSR can be submitted is in August 2023 and the team needs a final site selected prior to that to allow for estimates and package preparation. He also noted that the MSBA meets every two months, and the August deadline backs us right up to Spring Town Meeting. He also stated the team wants to have the MSBA approval in hand prior to Town Meeting, so the latest the enrollment decision can be made is July 3, 2023.

Mr. Tocci asked when a financial analysis will be done noting that the cost will be a big part of the discussion relating to the final site selection.

Mr. Theran stated the financial analysis ongoing and will be presented at the next meeting. It will include real numbers for each scenario as well as relative costs for each different option.

Mr. Tocci asked if 6/26/23 or 7/10/23 is better since 7/4/23 is a holiday and that week will be difficult to hold a meeting. He asked if 7/10 is too late.

Mr. Theran stated 6/26/23 is the better date.

Mr. Hebert stated that the 6/26/23 date should be fine with the new school committee members. Also, he wants the decision to be made before the summer break while people are still around.

Mr. Tocci stated Ms. Briggs had concerns that making a decision by 6/26/23 isn't enough time for the committee.

The SBRC discussed possible dates around the end of June and early July.

Mr. Tocci stated that before the committee makes this a firm date via a vote, he would like to discuss the schedule with the School Committee.

Mr. Hebert stated he will discuss the timeline with the School Committee at the next meeting and report back to the SBRC.

Mr. Gonzalez noted that the new Superintendent start date is July 1, 2023, however this should not impact the decision-making process.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC will continue to meet every two weeks, next meeting is 4/10/23 and potentially a joint meeting with the School Committee for Wednesday 4/26/23, if not they will meet Monday 4/24/23. He also noted they will try to get back to Town Hall for the next meeting.

7. New Business:

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business.

There is none.

Mr. Tocci noted before the committee adjourns, he would like to send his condolences to the Stec family and that Christine Stec's passing is a terrible loss to the entire community.

8. Adjourn:

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Bilafer

SECOND: by Mr. Hebert

Unanimous vote to adjourn.

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Meeting Adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Attachments:

Community Meeting Matrix Results

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Oakdale Elementary School
 Site Comparison Technical Evaluation
 Public Input Survey

3/25/2023

Average	Oakdale	Greenlodge	Riverdale	Capen	Striar
Convenient Location for Community Use	1.6	2.0	3.8	3.0	4.3
Impact on Town-Wide Sports	2.1	2.7	3.5	2.9	3.8
Impact to Neighbors	2.4	2.4	4.0	2.8	3.8
Overall Student Safety	1.7	2.2	3.0	3.2	4.3
Parity with Other School Sites	1.6	2.8	3.0	3.0	4.3
Proximity to Student Households	1.4	2.3	3.9	3.1	4.4
Traffic - Offsite Congestion	2.2	2.8	3.7	2.9	3.8

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Avery School and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **Approved**

Monday April 26, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director	A	Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
	Kevin Coughlin	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan (ATTENDED VIA ZOOM)	A	Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
A	Victor Hebert	A	Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Philip Gray		
		A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Meeting called to order at 7:42 PM

Mr. Tocci opened the SBRC portion of the joint School Committee & SBRC meeting at 7:42pm.

Mr. Polito from the School Committee recused himself from this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Tocci introduced himself and noted that the purpose of this meeting is to have the two committees discuss the construction of the Oakdale School project. Mr. Tocci provided a quick background on the project noting there have been approximately 30 meetings held to do date. The team has winnowed down the possible sites for the Oakdale School project. He noted the MSBA will be funding a large portion of the project and the options on the table are a stand-alone Oakdale School, a combined Oakdale/Greenlodge school, or a combined Oakdale/Riverdale school.

Mr. Tocci stated it is the school committee that will make the final decision on enrollment and the SBRC will make a final decision on the site for the school. Both decisions are guiding one another. Mr. Tocci stated there are five potential sites still on the table, each of the three school sites, the old Capen School site, and the Striar property.

Mr. Tocci stated the team has received very rough cost estimates for the different enrollment options at each potential site. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Theran to discuss the project timeline and future meeting schedule.

Ms. Smith from the public asked if any of the information being presented this evening will be new?

Mr. Tocci stated there will be new information as well as some old information that has been presented previously.

2. Project Schedule Review:

Mr. Theran provided a review of the timeline slide for the project. He noted that the team just submitted the PDP (Preliminary Design Plan) and the next big decision will be made on ~~June 23, 2023~~ June 28, 2023 and that

Paul M. Macintosh
Town Clerk

is the enrollment decision. The next milestone MSBA submission is the PSR (Preferred Schematic Report) at the end of August. The report after that is the Schematic Design Report (SD) at the end of December. After the SD report the project will be ready for a Town Meeting vote in Spring 2024.

Mr. Theran moved on to the next slide which provides details all of the upcoming meetings through the end of June for the SBRC, School Committee, and potential community meetings leading up to the enrollment decision in June 2023.

Mr. Tocci noted that May is a very busy time for the Town, and he stated that SBRC and School Committee members are going to make themselves available to answer questions at Town Meeting and Mini Town Meeting. He also stated the SBRC is planning to hold another Community Meeting on 5/22/23; it will be similar to the last one that was held on a Saturday at the Middle School.

Mr. Theran then turned the floor over to Mr. Gray from Jonathan Levi Architects (JLA) to review the detailed overall project schedule slide.

Mr. Gray went into more detail about what will happen between now and December. He stated the team has submitted the PDP which lists all the rooms and adjacencies that will be included in the school for each of the three enrollment scenarios. He stated that going forward there are 6 meetings scheduled to evaluate and select the preferred enrollment option and we are currently in meeting #2. By Meeting #6 the team will need to vote the preferred enrollment and site. The JLA team will then create detailed alternative building designs for the selected enrollment on the selected site. Then the team can decide if they want an add/reno, a straight reno, or a new building. The team will also provide estimates for each of the options being presented as part of the evaluations.

Mr. Gray stated the meeting agendas are noted on the schedule being shown on the screen. At each meeting the team will review the options and bring the feedback from the meeting back to the estimators so they can revise accordingly. Then the team will meet again and review. In Mid-August JLA will request a vote on the preferred option which will then be incorporated into the MSBA submission at the end of August. Mr. Gray stated he has never seen the MSBA not approve the preferred solution, but they also want to see that all the options have been vetted.

Mr. Gray stated that once the MSBA approves the PSR the JLA team will have 2 months to finalize the Schematic Design. He stressed how important it is to have a detailed SD because that is what the project scope and budget agreement will be based upon and that will also be the cost estimate that is brought to Town Meeting for approval. The MSBA will then make the grant based on the Schematic Design Scope and Budget Agreement.

Mr. Tocci asked for confirmation stating if once the school committee votes on the enrollment and the SBRC votes on the site, then JLA comes up with at least 3 options. And if there is an existing building on the chosen site, one of those options will show what a renovation might look like and the other two will be two different new construction options.

Mr. Gray confirmed. He stated in a standard MSBA process the team would already be providing those options, but since this project has multiple sites and enrollments the team has to wait a little longer to provide those options.

Mr. Hebert requested questions from the committees.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked the School Committee if they have any questions, specifically the two new members.

Mr. Gray stated that at the moment there are 16 options in play between the enrollments, sites, and add/reno vs. new construction options. He stated the team will eventually get down to a single selected enrollment and site by June.

Mr. Hebert asked for audience questions.

QUESTION: Ms. Wilmar stated the team will select a site and then do cost estimates, she said that seems backwards.

Mr. Gray clarified and stated the team already has the first round of cost estimates complete for all 16 options still in play. He noted the estimates are very rough costs because there are not completed designs for any of the options.

Mr. Theran stated the cost estimates are the next item on the agenda for discussion tonight.

Ms. Wilmar asked if there has been any evaluation of the land at each location.

Mr. Gray stated there has been quite a bit and the PDP that was already submitted included some of that information.

Mr. Hebert stated the team has a lot of information that was collected during the Avery School and ECEC projects. He said there will also be more evaluations done as the project progresses and noted that there is a lot of information available already.

Mr. Tocci stated the estimates will become more refined as the sites continue to be evaluated.

Mr. Gray presented the next slide which shows the updated site evaluation matrix. He noted he distributed hard copies for the audience to review. The red indicates Very Disadvantageous, white is neutral, and green is advantageous.

3. Cost Assessments:

Mr. Lemieux presented the cost estimates slide. He stated this is the first pass at what the potential project will cost. The estimates are very rough and are based upon the estimated square footage of the building, enrollments, and what is special about each site. For example, there is ledge at Greenlodge and the estimates include additional costs for ledge remediation.

Mr. Lemieux explained further stating the first three columns show the site location and the enrollments. The next column shows new construction or an add/reno. He noted that for the add/reno options there is also a cost in the adjacent column for temporary classrooms. Any renovation option will need to include a cost for relocating the kids that are in the existing building to be renovated. The next column shows the estimated cost of construction. The soft costs in the next column include the cost for all the furniture, technology, consultants, and anything else that "if you picked the building up and shook out would fall out." The last purple column is the overall project budget (construction, temp classrooms, and soft costs added together). Then the next column shows what the potential MSBA grant would be. Dedham's base reimbursement rate is 47% of *eligible costs* and there are also incentive points for energy efficiency and a facilities plan. So assuming Dedham will achieve those points that brings the reimbursement rate to 50%. But that is for eligible costs only. As an example, the MSBA will only reimburse 50% of the first \$360/SF but actual costs are closer to \$750/SF. So, you get 50% reimbursement on that first \$360 and 0% reimbursement on the remaining \$400/SF. The final column shows the total project costs less the anticipated MSBA Reimbursement which will be the Town Share; the total anticipated amount the Town will have to pay for the project. The Town of Dedham costs range from \$44.9 million to \$80.7 million depending on the site and enrollment selected.

Mr. Lemieux paused and asked for questions.

Ms. White confirmed it's 50% reimbursement on eligible costs which is \$360/sf.

Mr. Lemieux stated there are different percentages for each category. So for example, the MSBA will pay \$1200 per student for technology, \$1200 per student for furniture, sites costs that exceed 8% of construction costs are ineligible. So, the reimbursement numbers change for each site location because for example Greenlodge has a lot of ledge and that will likely not be reimbursed. He also noted that as design progresses so will the estimates. They will become more detailed as the design does as well. The level of detail grows as the project continues.

Ms. White stated that once the site and enrollment decisions are made then the team will have a better idea on actual costs.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed and stated the final reimbursement rate will be set in the future. He also noted that the MSBA does not reimburse for temporary classrooms, which is something for the committees to consider.

Ms. White stated temporary classrooms were not required as part of the ECEC project.

Mr. Lemieux stated the committees also need to consider the students who will be in the schools during construction and what the construction does to their experience.

Mr. Tocci stated that the ECEC school, the most recent build with the MSBA, the final contribution by the MSBA was about 35% which amounted to approximately \$10.5 million.

Mr. Lemieux moved on to the next slide. He explained that the MSBA recognizes that Dedham has three schools that are in need of repair. This slide is a wholistic look at what the Town is looking at to fix all three schools and it shows the benefit of doing a combined school now vs. three individual schools. Basically, if the Town decided to proceed with three single schools, assuming there would be a 5 year period of time between each construction project, it would cost about \$248 million over ten plus years. This includes an estimated 5% escalation per year. If the Town proceeds with a combined school now, and a single second school in about 5 years there is a significant savings. He noted that construction costs are always increasing.

Mr. Lemieux asked for questions.

Mr. Czazasty stated that Striar property costs look very expensive, and it looked like it had a lot of red squares on the matrix. He wants to know if there is any reason it is still being considered.

Mr. Tocci stated that topic is up for discussion tonight as part of the next agenda item.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that 5 years between large capital improvement projects is a very tight timeline, it's closer to 7 years or more between each project. She also stated that the Oakdale project is likely the last time Dedham will receive MSBA funding as the Town has been very fortunate in receiving their help for various past projects. She also stated that as time goes on costs continue to increase and if we proceed with three separate schools it will probably cost closer to \$300million by the time Dedham actually proceeds with addressing all three.

Mr. Tocci noted that the Town can always decide to do two schools at the same time.

Ms. White asked if there are two projects happening at the same time, Dedham is only being reimbursed for whatever fixes the Oakdale School situation. So even if we did a combined school and addressed the third school separately, that other school does not receive reimbursement. She wants everyone to understand that point.

Mr. Tocci confirmed.

4. Site Considerations:

Mr. Tocci stated the next agenda item is talking about the sites and potential site eliminations.

Ms. Gemma Martin asked what a new stand-alone Riverdale school would cost right now, would it be \$88 million?

Mr. Tocci stated a stand along Oakdale right now is about \$67 million.

Mr. Lemieux stated we don't know the cost, but based on square footages and enrollment it would probably be around \$60 million because it's slightly smaller than Oakdale. That is purely a guess for new construction.

Mr. Tocci added that the Town footing the bill for their own school means the Town is not bound by the MSBA parameters so they can build to whatever enrollment and specifics we want.

Mr. Lemieux stated the process without the MSBA also does not require the MSBA Submissions and subsequent review waiting periods.

Mr. Tocci stated there are 249 students at Oakdale right now, but the MSBA is only offering an enrollment for 235 at a standalone Oakdale. The enrollments offered are clearly showing that the MSBA prefers a combined school to get as many kids into a new facility as quickly as possible. The actual combined Oakdale Greenlodge enrollment right now is 510 students, but the MSBA will build a school for 550 students. Same with a combined Oakdale Riverdale, current enrollment is 410 but the MSBA is offering 450 student school.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that history has shown that when a new school is built it ends up over capacity every time. So that is something to be considered because inevitably more kids will want to enroll in a brand-new facility. So, if the Town moves forward with a school on its own they can build in that extra capacity. She also stated it would be a shame to have all of the students in a new facility with the exception of 200 remaining in a "less than" facility. She also stated the overall plan needs to be to get all the students in the right facilities for their needs.

Mr. Bilafer stated the SBRC has heard a lot of concerns from the community about the need for flexibility and this is an opportunity to think in terms of units and capacity with flexibility built into the system. And it's important to have a facility that isn't to the strict designations being offered by the MSBA.

Dr. Kelly stated the MSBA is pushing in a specific direction but there are also education benefits to moving in that direction. For example, the rising first grade numbers are going to require a 4th section of 1st grade at one of the elementary schools, and that can't be anticipated because budget season is in October but Kindergarten registration happens now. So now the budget needs to find about \$125,000 of extra money for a teacher, classroom suppliers, etc. to account for that added classroom. A larger building can absorb that bubble by dispersing those students across 6 sections without creating a large additional cost to the school budget. That change also has educational implications. A larger school gives more opportunity to allow for matching students to educators, grouping children in a way that allows them to perform optimally in a classroom. You can also bring professional expertise into a larger building and bringing it together serves the students better.

Mr. Tocci stated that over the past couple of months it has become clear that there are a lot of issues with the Striar Property including parking, the small access road to get into the property, and the issue of transferring ownership to the school Department which would cause delays.

Mr. Tocci asked the SBRC for comments.

Mr. Bilafer stated there are significant hurdles with Striar when it comes to custody and control. Of the five sites being considered in the final cut, four are fully under school control and this one is not. If there was some overriding reason to look at Striar from a logistical standpoint, or a cost standpoint then it would be worth continuing to look at, but those don't exist. If you look at the evaluation matrix, the bright red squares, which represent "very disadvantageous" are all lumped under Striar.

MOTION: Mr. Bilafer makes a motion to remove Striar from the list of options and go from 16 options down to 14 options by removing the two options that are at the Striar Site.

SECOND: Ms. MacDonald Briggs Seconds the motion.

Mr. Hebert asked if any School committee members wanted to weight in on the conversation.

Mr. Tocci clarified that this is an SBRC Vote.

Ms. White asked of all the sites and combinations, is there anything that shares what the community input is from all the community meetings? Do we have any data to share with the School Committee.

Mr. Tocci stated that at the Middle School meeting the SBRC had surveys for people to fill out before they left. The SBRC received about 30 responses to that survey and of all the responses Striar was rated last by almost all of the responders. At public meetings and SBRC meetings there has been a good amount of public feedback stressing the negative aspects of Striar.

Mr. Bilafer stated the experts have also told the SBRC that the single small road to get into and out of the site is not ideal.

Ms. White asked about the survey.

Mr. Hebert stated the School Committee wanted to get the survey out before this meeting but that it was an aggressive timeline, and it has not been circulated yet. There is also time between now and late June when we need feedback. For the Striar this has been an ongoing conversation for a long time, maybe longer than it should be, just to get more feedback.

Ms. White stated she agrees with the issue surrounding the Striar and she agrees with the motion. She requests that going forward she would not feel comfortable with anyone eliminating a site until we have the survey results.

Mr. Hebert stated the Striar can be voted off without the survey because of all the issues surround the site.

Mr. Bilafer stated the other issue everyone is aware of, is that once you get past Striar, if the SBRC starts eliminating any more sites, then the SBRC starts to get in the way of the School Committee decision. So, the next major decision will be the enrollment decision and that will drive where we head next on site. Each enrollment option takes some of the site options off the table. So, in the interest of protecting the school committee authority, no more eliminations will happen. The Striar does not impact the School Committee authority.

Ms. White agrees, she just wants to make sure that going forward we have more input from the community.

Mr. Gonzalez continued and stated that the Middle School Public Meeting was structured so that there were team members at different stations and each station represented a potential site. Mr. Gonzalez was at the Striar station and that site did not receive any positive feedback. There were a lot of active concerns about the site. He would say that folks were not feeling like Striar was the optimal location and concern has consistently been the overriding tone of the conversation around Striar.

Mr. Tocci asked for questions, there are not. He took a vote:

SBRC VOTE: 5-0-0 Unanimous vote to approve the motion to eliminate the Striar Property.

Mr. Tocci for any further discussion on sites.
There is none.

7. **Adjourn:**

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Bilafer

SECOND: by Mr. Hebert

Unanimous vote to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Attachments:

Vertex Powerpoint Slides


JLA Slides

A True Copy Attest

Paul M. Munchbach
Town Clerk



MSBA FEASIBILITY / SCHEMATIC PROCESS & BEYOND **VERTEX**



PDP: Preliminary Design Plan | PSR: Preferred Schematic Report | SD: Schematic Design Report

• Aligned with MSBA Board Meetings and Town Ballot | Dates shown are approximate



= Dedicated Community Forums (Suggested **MINIMUM** amount of meetings) in addition to other committee meetings

**Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
June 7, 2023**

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert
Stephen Acosta
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant
Callen McCormick
Christopher Polito
Tara Duncan (absent)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Dr. Ian Kelly, Interim Superintendent
Matthew Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Heather Smith, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (absent)

Meeting Location:

Dedham Middle School Auditorium

School Committee Meeting commenced at 6:30 p.m.

Executive Session – Exemption 3 – To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation

Motion was made to move to Executive Session and return to public session after Executive Session. Motion was approved by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Ms. McCormick was absent from vote.)

Return to Regular Session (7:00 p.m.)

Pledge of Allegiance

Open Meeting

Mr. Victor Hebert, Chair, called the meeting to order.

RECOGNITIONS

Dr. Linda Kobierski, PK-8 STEM Curriculum Coordinator came to the podium to introduce the winners of the Science Fair and the New England Math League (NEML) awards.

Awards were grouped as follows:

A True Copy Affect

Paul M. ...
1 Page
Town Clerk

Science Fair awards Grades 3-5

NEML High Scorer awards Grades 4-5

NEML High Scorer awards Grades 6-8.

• Science Fair Award Winners

The Elementary Science Fair included 118 students sharing 60 exhibits that were presented in the Greenlodge gym. Each project was judged using scientific discovery parameters. Judges were chosen from university and industry leaders.

Dr. Kobierski displayed slides with the names and titles of the 2023 Science Fair award winners. Names of the winners were called from each grade (3-5) and grouped by • All Star Scientist • High Honors • Special Recognitions. Each student lined up on stage as their name was called.

• New England Math League High Scorers (Grades 4-8)

Dr. Kobierski explained that each year students participate in the NE Math League (NEML) nationwide problem-solving competition. The students are asked questions that reflect different levels of math expertise.

This year, 213 students from grades 4-8 participated in the NEML and 84 students qualified as high scorers. The competition included eight different counties.

DPS Grade 6-8 rankings:

- Grade 6 ranged 11th across 41 schools,
- Grade 7 ranked 14th out of 47 schools.
- Grade 8 ranked 17th out of 48 schools.
- Grades 6 and Grade 7 ranked 3rd and 4th in the region out of 8 surrounding districts.

Grade 4-5 rankings will be reported at the next School Committee meeting.

NEML Elementary High Scorers (Grades 4-5)

Names of the winners of the competition from Grades 4-5 were announced. Awardees lined up on the stage as their names were called.

NEML Middle School High Scorers (Grade 6-8)

Names of the winners of the competition from Grades 6-8 were announced. Awardees lined up on the stage as their names were called.

• ECEC Retirement Recognitions

Principal Taylor from ECEC came to podium to recognize four long term employees who are retiring this year

- Cheryl Scarsciotti
- Janice O'Connor
- Laurie McGuire
- Sharon Harrington

Ms. Briggs expressed her gratitude to the retirees for working with the youngest learners for so long.

Mr. Hebert expressed how difficult it will be to replace their knowledge and expertise.

Dr. Kelly said that the results we see tonight with our 4th to 8th grades are a tribute to the education experienced by our youngest learners.

• Christine Stec Rockstar Award & Spring Grants – Dedham Education Foundation

April Wilmar, President of the Dedham Education Foundation came to the podium to announce their Spring annual grant recipients. Ms. Wilmar explained that the Dedham Education Foundation raises funds that are converted to grants for specific projects.

Teachers submit grants to the Foundation, applications are reviewed by a board and then candidates are chosen based on the merit of their application.

The Spring grants cycle included the following five grants:

1. Avery School SEL
2. Avery/High School lunch group
3. High School STEM
4. ECEC STEM
5. Oakdale and Avery STEM

Ms. Wilmar reported that over \$38K was distributed for DPS funding this 2023-24 year.

April Wilmar reported that this year a new grant was created to honor Christine Stec. Ms. Stec was an Oakdale 4th grade teacher who passed away recently from cancer. This grant will allow her legacy to live on.

Ms. Wilmar announced that the winner of the inaugural Christine Stec Rockstar Award is Brianna Campo. Ms. Campo was chosen out of 40 nominees. Brianna was part of the 4th grade team who worked closely with Christine Stec. Ms. Wilmar read quotes from the nominations about Ms. Campo's merits and accomplishments. Ms. Campo came to the podium to express her thanks to everyone for their support. Ms. Wilmar said the final group of nominees will receive certificates that will include quotes from their nomination letters.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ryan O'Toole Lincoln St. asked if the School Committee could ensure that the community receives more specifics on the impact the new building will have on neighbors so decisions can be made with community input.

Dedham Public Schools Interim Superintendent's Update


Teaching and Learning



Superintendent's Academic Dinner. On Monday May 22nd we held the District's annual Superintendent's Academic Top 30 Dinner. This was a wonderful opportunity to honor members of the class of 2023 who have demonstrated the very highest levels of academic achievement over their time at DHS.


Class of 2023 Commencement. This Saturday we celebrated the 170 members of the graduating class of 2023 at our annual commencement ceremony. While it was chilly and a little damp, the morning was full of the honor and celebration that our graduates have earned over many years of hard work. Congratulations again to the class of 2023.

Inquiry Journeys Update (Elementary History/Social Sciences). This year's Inquiry Journeys pilot is wrapping up. Feedback from families, students, and teachers has been outstanding and, as a result, implementation of Inquiry Journeys will continue and expand into next school year. 29 teachers have requested to participate! Featured below are a few "kindness rocks" from Ms. Fay's students in 2F. The inquiry question that guided the particular unit that Ms. Kieffner and Ms. Fay taught was: "How do people work together to help their communities?" After learning a great deal about needs and wants, students identified a need in the community and developed an action plan to address the need. As a class, they decided to create "kindness rocks" to spread joy and kindness throughout the school. Students created prototypes on paper before painting their rocks and completed a planning and reflection sheet.



Grade 8 Trip to Washington, D.C. Last Wednesday-Friday, 138 eighth grade students and 16 chaperones traveled to Washington, D.C. This marked a great return for this important field trip after a 3 year hiatus due to COVID. In addition, this is the first year that students were able to see civics in action while also having a year of civics education within the history department. On the trip, students visited all of the important DC highlights: multiple Smithsonian Museums including American History, Natural History, the recently renovated Air and Space, and the Museum of African American History and Culture. In addition, students learned about and visited the various memorials including the Lincoln, Jefferson, FDR, Korean War and Vietnam War. One of the annual highlights is the dinner and dance boat cruise down the Potomac River during sunset! At our visit to Arlington National Cemetery, Dedham had the honor of performing a wreath laying at the site of Ruth Bader Ginsburg. At the Capitol, Senator Ed Markey took time out of his schedule to meet our students and discuss their educational opportunities here in Massachusetts. And we also had an impromptu meeting with Throughout the trip, DMS students embodied our "3 R's" - being respectful, responsible, and resilient. In fact, multiple fellow travelers and our bus drivers commented on how respectful our students were throughout the trip. And while the travel home may have been challenging due to weather, our students exemplified resilience at the airport and were even happy for the delays

as it extended the trip! We look forward to continuing this tradition for DMS 8th graders.




Visual and Performing Arts



William B. Gould Memorial Dedication. Several DHS band students along with seven 5th graders performed the National Anthem at the William B. Gould Statue Unveiling Ceremony, Sunday, May 29, under the direction of Heather Kirby.

Spring Concerts at DHS and DMS. DHS and DMS presented their Spring Concerts on May 16 and 23, respectively. Each concert featured chorus, concert band, and jazz band. The high school also featured a string ensemble, in partnership with the Dedham School of Music. Choral directors were Andrew Wray (DMS) and Heather Kirby (DHS), band directors were Kevin Martins (DMS) and Heather Kirby (DHS), jazz band director was Joseph Borsellino, III (DMS & DHS) and string ensemble director was Zoe Chau. Nearly 200 musicians performed in all!

DPS Art Show. On May 25, 2023 that DPS PK- Grade 12 Art show was hosted at the Dedham Middle School. This was by far one of the most well attended art shows in recent memory. There were over 1,000 pieces of student works on display. Thank you to the visual art teachers: Kristin Prata, Sarah Altone, Sarah Olivieri, Bridget O'Leary, Courtney Sousa, Joanna Mears, Amy Vega and Miranda Jang.



Athletics

Track. Senior Catherine Sargent won the MIAA Division 5 Shot Put State Title with a school record throw of 42 feet. In the discus she won the MIAA Division 5 State Title & was the MIAA Meet of Champions Winner. She was named the Tri-Valley League Girls Track MVP

MIAA Tournaments:

Softball won a MIAA Div 3 First Round game vs Bishop Stang and are still awaiting their next opponent.

Boys Tennis won a MIAA Div 3 First Round Match vs Hanover before falling to Bedford.

Baseball won a MIAA Div 3 Prelim Game vs Essex North Shore before falling to Weston.

Girls Lacrosse fell to Swampscott in a MIAA Div 3 First Round game.

Girls Tennis Fell to Belchertown in a MIAA Div 3 First Round Match.

Community Engagement

Unified Game Day at ECEC. The ECEC held its first, of hopefully many, Special Olympics Unified Game Days on Thursday, May 25th. The unified athletes have been working with their staff coaches during this school year to learn many skills such as throwing, batting, running, jumping, and most importantly, teamwork!! The students had an opportunity to showcase all they have learned at the Game Day with their classmates, families, staff members, and members of the DHS Unified Basketball Team cheering them on. They ran, they galloped, they threw, and they completed an obstacle course that morning, and all athletes received a medal in a very special ceremony at the conclusion of the games. A huge shout out to Lauren Lydon, ECEC Physical Therapist and Marie Madden, ECEC PE/Wellness teacher for their enthusiasm in organizing and



facilitating such a wonderful event.

Visit to ECEC. On Tuesday, May 30th, the ECEC hosted a visiting team of educators from the Boston Renaissance Charter School. They contacted us with the hopes of learning about our inclusion practices in preschool and kindergarten as they seek to shift their practices in early childhood special education service delivery. The group had a chance to talk to members of our teams and observe 5 of our classrooms.

Management and Operations

DHS Turf Field Replacement. The procurement for the turf field installation firm was completed in May. The firm Field Turf supplied the lowest responsible and responsive bid for completion of the project. Work will begin this week with project staff onsite for a project kick-off meeting, and to provide a project schedule and to start work in removing the old field turf carpet. A more detailed schedule will be available in the weeks ahead. Please note that parking along Recreation Road and at the top of the track/football field will be used for storage of materials for this project.

Summer Capital Projects. A number of capital projects are currently in process for work over the summer. The high school kitchen freezer replacement project has the freezer boxes

ordered, and the assessment of the current electrical systems for possible upgrade is underway. The middle school safety vestibule bid came in near the most recent projection. The initial projected schedule has the vestibule work on site starting in late June with projected completion in mid October. The replacement of the Greenlodge fire panel has received updated quotes and the replacement work is scheduled to begin in early July. The district has more projects that will be discussed after a new Director of Facilities is hired.

COMMENTS on Interim Superintendent's Update

Mr. Polito noted the Art Show that was held last week. He also asked for an update about the interactive exhibit about the Roman Trials. It was reported that the exhibit will be held next week at Town Hall and added to the calendar.

Dr. Flynn Gallant commented on the success of the unified games held at the ECEC. It's special to have High School students supporting the younger kids. She commended Kim Taylor and her teams.

Ms. McCormick asked about the impact of the Turf Field replacement on the summer programming. Dr. Kelly said it will only affect parking and transportation issues. He feels that the functioning of programs will not be affected, but he said they will discuss any issues with the construction contractor.

Mr. Acosta commended the graduation speaker at high school commencement.

Reports/Updates/Requests

- School Improvement Plan Discussion & Vote

Mr. Hebert asked for comments on the School Improvement Plan. He noted that discussion about the plan occurred at the last School Committee meeting.

Motion was made to approve the 2023-25 School Improvement Plan. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

- Discussion & Possible Vote of Enrollment Configuration for New Elementary Building

[Mr. Polito recused himself from the discussion about the Oakdale project due to conflict of interest.]

Dr. Kelly said the School Committee requested him to state his opinion on enrollment. He said his recommendation includes the site choice along with the enrollment recommendation because they are intrinsically linked.

Dr. Kelly's recommendation is for a 550 student enrollment with Oakdale/Greenlodge combination located at the Capen site.

Benefits of the Oakdale/Greenlodge combination:

- Will not disrupt education and preserve outdoor space.
- Larger schools give better chances for flexible groupings. Teachers can be better matched with students.
- Curriculum consistency and continuity because fewer buildings to coordinate across.

- Better preparation for Middle School student adjustment because students will have exposure to department structure.
- Maximizes the number of students who will be able to benefit from new facility
- More professionals under one roof, helps to preserve institutional knowledge and provide more expertise.

Equity Considerations

- Majority of economically disadvantaged students in Dedham are currently located at Riverdale and Avery.
- The combination of Oakdale/Greenlodge allows us to build more equitability.
- Maps were displayed that showed the concentrations of economically disadvantaged areas and the distribution of ELL students.
- The creation of three zones instead of four zones will redistribute equity needs.
- A slide showed the number of students who would be re-zoned. The numbers equal 25% of the overall student population but it is an impact that cannot be avoided in the pursuit of the overall goal of more equitable distribution of ELL and economically disadvantaged students.
- Fiscal considerations slide was shown with MSBA eligible costs vs. Town costs for each site/plan option. Dr. Kelly feels that the recommended plan makes fiscal sense because it maximizes the MSBA reimbursement and energy conservation savings.

Educational top priorities reflected in Community Survey

1. Maintain current class size
2. Access to modern facility
3. Preparation for Middle School
4. Professional learning and collaboration.

Fiscal top priorities reflected in Community Survey:

1. Maximization state funding
2. Sustainable design
3. Understanding potential costs.

Dr. Kelly noted that Option 4 – Oakdale/Greenlodge combination with 550 enrollment, maximizes costs.

Enrollment configuration priorities from Community Survey

- The 550 enrollment choice was preferred
- The 235 enrollment choice was the least favorable.

Site preferences from survey:

- Oakdale #1
- Greenlodge #2
- Capen #3.

Dr. Kelly commented that he feels that the Capen site is best educationally for our students. He showed a table created from survey data that reported ratings by neighborhood.

SCHOOL COMMITTEE COMMENTS about site and enrollment recommendation.

Ms. McCormick commended the SBRC on the community outreach. She asked why it is advantageous to expose EL students to different linguistic populations and experiences.

Dr. Stetson replied that it is important for children to be exposed to different communities and experiences to ensure equal opportunity. It encourages the building of background knowledge and discourse with peers.

Dr. Kelly replied that it's important that the schools reflect the same composition as our community.

Dr. Flynn Gallant commented that there are clear divides in our community. She hopes that the redistricting will help to stimulate equity within the greater community.

Ms. Briggs asked about walkability and transportation.

Dr. Kelly affirmed that this issue has been considered, but more discussion is needed on the subject. One data point was provided that included the current door to door average distance for all individuals is .82 miles. Option 4 increases that average by 1/4 of a mile. Mr. Wells said that the impact on transportation costs is not really fully known yet.

Dr. Kelly confirmed that tonight's discussion is about enrollment, but it's difficult to separate site from enrollment. The enrollment is the purview of the School Committee/Administration and the site decision is the purview of the SBRC.

Ms. McCormick reiterated the magnitude of the decision and said she appreciated the incorporation of the survey results into the final decision.

Mr. Acosta said he is in support of the 550 enrollment plan. The plan allows the most students to take advantage of the newest resources. MSBA funding needs to be optimized now because it may not continue in the future.

Ms. Briggs said when the Town Meeting re-voted the budget, it was clear that they wanted us to find ways to cut costs and carefully evaluate our fiscal choices moving forward. The School Committee needs to continue to make decisions informed by the community.

Mr. Hebert said that the School Committee works in conjunction with the SBRC. He implored the public to reach out to the SBRC or School Committee with questions going forward about the Oakdale Project.

Motion was made to accept the 550 student enrollment plan as recommended tonight by the Interim Superintendent. Motion was approved by a vote of 5-0. (Mr. Polito abstained from the vote due to conflict of interest.)

Subcommittee Assignments – Discussion & Vote

Mr. Acosta asked for clarification on the number of members that were assigned to the Park and Rec and Fields Subcommittees. Ms. Briggs said that it was agreed that one of the designees from the Parks and Rec working group would be chosen to attend the Fields Subcommittee.

Motion was made to approve the subcommittee assignments as presented. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

• Subcommittee Updates

o Budget

Mr. Polito asked about fee increases that were approved to offset the budget. Mr. Wells confirmed that they will be recommending an increase to bus fees and to High School and Middle School technology and sports fees. Also recommending a 10% across the board increase for building rental fees. There have been no increases to building rental fees since 2007. Mr. Wells said the new fee structure will be added to the website and is also available in the folder.

o Communications

This Subcommittee was dissolved.

o Curriculum Advisory

Ms. McCormick said the Curriculum Advisory Subcommittee met last night for the final meeting of the year. She said there are vacancies to fill next year. She also reported that the members got a preview of the new DPS website from Sarah Errickson. The new website will be rolled out in August 2023.

o Policy

No updates

o SBRC

Update provided earlier in the meeting.

o Traffic Circulation

This Subcommittee was dissolved.

o Negotiations

No updates.

o Parks & Recreation

No updates

o Financial Policy

Mr. Polito reported that the Financial Policy subcommittee met with the Select Board and Finance Department and the goal is to have a report from the School Committee by October 2023 for approval.

Donation

Mr. Wells announced that the Endicott Greenhouse donated \$500 to each elementary school grade in Dedham to support agricultural initiatives.

Motion was made to accept the Endicott Greenhouse donation of \$500 to the DPS. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the May 3, 2023 School Committee minutes as amended by Mr. Polito. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Motion was made to approve the May 10, 2023 School Committee minutes as presented. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Motion was made to approve the May 17, 2023 School Committee minutes as presented. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

Old/New Business

Mr. Acosta asked about the plan to replace the student representative. Ms. Briggs said that Principal Forrest usually recommends students. Mr. Hebert said he would follow up with Principal Forrest on this matter.

Mr. Polito asked for updates to the appointment process for the School Committee vacancy. Mr. Hebert reported that the process is still in the posting phase and he said he would announce the date for the joint meeting with the Select Board once it has been determined.

Mr. Polito also asked for updates in the response by the Administration to the Metro West survey that reflected a degree of student unhappiness with the schools. Ms. Briggs reminded Mr. Polito that an update was provided at a recent School Committee Meeting on this subject by Dr. Stetson. Mr. Polito replied that he wanted to ensure that continuing updates would be on the agenda.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

Ms. Briggs acknowledged the value of Tara Duncan's role as the student representative to the School Committee. Tara took an active role as the student representative and went beyond expectations by her attendance at outside meetings like Town Meeting and Finance and Warrant. She was also instrumental in maintaining the momentum of the turf replacement project.

Motion was made to adjourn and approved by a vote of 6-0.

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Oakdale School and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday June 21, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Denise Moroney, Directory of Facilities
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal
A	Victor Hebert	A	Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez		Philip Gray		
A	Stephen Acosta	A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business:

Mr. Tocci opened the SBRC meeting at 7:30 pm. He noted this has been a long process that started last September; the SBRC has been working hand in hand with the School Committee to solve the problem of the Oakdale School. The School Committee made a decision a couple of weeks ago to proceed with a 550 enrollment school combining the Oakdale School with the Greenlodge School to get more children into a new building as quickly as possible. Now the SBRC has to decide on a campus for the new school. Mr. Tocci turned the floor over to Jonathan Levi for his presentation.

2. Site considerations and Public Comment on remaining sites under consideration:

Mr. Theran began with an overview of the project schedule. He stated the team is currently working on making a final site decision. Once that decision is made the remainder of the summer will be spent working through different building and parking layouts for the new school. That report will be submitted to the MSBA at the end of August. Then the team will focus on the schematic design, which will show in more detail what the final selected plan for the new building will look like. It will also include cost estimates for that design. That final cost will be brought to Town Meeting next Spring, then the final design process will continue through the next year and construction will start in Spring 2025.

Mr. Levi then began his presentation on several preconceptual studies to demonstrate the potential of each of the three remaining sites. He noted that the first slide is the Oakdale site. The yellow line is the property line, the red line is the 25' setback required for all residential properties, the white lines indicated the slope for the site, and the dashed blue lines indicate the outline of the existing school. The layouts show parking, which he noted is not a final design. South is always to the bottom and North to the top.

A True Copy

Paul M. Harris
Town Clerk

The team is looking at three different approaches to the Oakdale School, all with the assumption that the historic 1902 building will remain on the site. He noted that the placement of the new building is always respectful of the existing building because the existing building will remain in operation throughout construction.

Mr. Levi reviewed the first option called "Academic Courtyard" at the Oakdale site. He noted there are potentially two entrances to the building, one for the older kids and one for younger kids. The cafeteria, media center, and gym are at the other end of the building. He stated that there is about 48,000 SF of temporary Usable Open Space (UOS) during construction and approximately 96,000 SF of permanent UOS. If the existing 1902 building were to be demolished it would add an additional 35,000 SF of UOS. The next slide provides a 3-D view of the building to provide a visual of building size.

The second approach is called the "common core Welcome" with the cafeteria and media center in the center of the building with an upper and lower school wing off either side. This provides approximately 53,000 SF of temporary UOS during construction. The permanent UOS provided in this layout is 120,000 SF with an additional 35,000 SF if the 1902 building is demolished. Again, there is a 3D model to provide a visual on site.

The last approach is a partial renovation/addition option for the school. In this option a new wing would be built to the North of the 1902 building with the existing building remaining in operation. Once the new wing was complete the Oakdale population would move into the new wing and the existing building would be renovated and another south wing constructed, then the Greenlodge population would join the Oakdale school as well. This yields 100,000 SF of temporary UOS and 111,400 SF of permanent UOS. Again, there is a 3D model showing a visual of the massing.

Mr. Levi moved on to the Greenlodge site models. He noted that the entire site is ledge and very hilly. The first layout is the same "Academic Courtyard" building that was shown on Oakdale as the layout is very suitable to the topography and shape of the Greenlodge site. He noted that the temporary UOS is very small, only about 19,700 SF, while the permanent UOS is about 81,000 SF. Each model provides a 3D View from the road for a visual.

The next site is the Capen school, he noted the building is not currently being used by the school department. This is an advantage because it does not disrupt school operation for the current elementary population and all the construction could be done in one fell swoop. On the flip side the site has a 30' slope drop off that will require additional site work. The first layout is the "Playfield Destination" which puts the building at the bottom of the site. This layout provides 68,000 SF of permanent UOS, which is less than at Oakdale but well within what is required for a school of this size. The second approach is having the building terraced down the slope, this is called "Cascading Terraces." All of the parking is provided at the top of the slope and provides a relatively small amount of play space for the school.

The last approach is the Hillside Village which places the building on the top of the slope itself and yields 84,000 SF of permanent UOS. He noted that if the town were to build on Capen site, it provides two surplus sites, Oakdale and Greenlodge, for other uses.

To evaluate all these sites the team has created an Evaluation Matrix which lists a bunch of criteria developed by the SBRC. The matrix then evaluates them based on how they affect community use, traffic, open space, site difficulties, etc. In summary there is a list of evaluation highlights. The Oakdale school is flat, easy to build on and yields the most usable open space. No swing space would be required for a building at the Oakdale site either. The Greenlodge site is sloped and has extensive ledge, has less usable open space, and also would not require any swing space for a new construction building. The Capen school has a challenging slope, less usable open space, but offers a site free of disruptions to students.

Mr. Levi turned the floor over to Mr. Theran to review project costs. Mr. Theran stated the current slides shows the option of probably costs, the top three are the new construction options and the bottom two are the renovation options. The MSBA requires a study of each add/reno option. The costs for the total project budget are in close range, \$73.6 million to \$79.3 million. He also noted there is a construction cost and soft cost budgets which then total in the columns to the right. There is also a projection for the probable reimbursement by the MSBA and a column for the cost to the Town after the MSBA Grant.

Mr. Tocci opened the floor to questions from the in person audience as well as those attending via zoom.

Mr. McDonough thanked the committees for their time. He stated that although the cost is a huge discussion right now, it is not part of what will be remembered about the project. He stated that the price difference is only about a 7% spread between least and most expensive options. He stated the existing 1902 building should still be used as a school; it would be sad to lose such a beautiful building. There hasn't been much discussion about what will happen to the building and it's a huge opportunity to keep the building. He also noted that the access for the Capen School is very challenging. He wants the committee to consider how children will be dropped off once the school is complete.

Mr. Hayes stated Mr. McDonough made a great point about the existing historical building and the cost for renovating it should not be a deterrent. He stated the community survey was clear that the community prefers the Oakdale site. The usable space is drastically different at Capen, 60% smaller than Oakdale. He noted it has been demonstrated that there is enough space at the Oakdale Site to build a new school and continue to have students in the existing building. He noted the redistricting done by Cropper shows that the Oakdale site is closer to the students that would be served by the new school and help with the equity efforts. The Oakdale school has better walkability. Moving the school to Capen drastically changes the social patterns to the Town and should be considered a negative. Selecting Oakdale as the site allows for the possibility to renovate the existing school or build a new school. Renovation allows for more open space and state money would help pay for the renovation now as opposed to in the future. He also noted that the least expensive option is a new school on the back of the Oakdale property.

Mr. Stockman agrees with everything Mr. Hayes stated. He stated this decision seems like a no-brainer that the Oakdale is the best site because it is centrally located and the best option price wise, square footage, traffic flow, etc. He is also in favor of providing the best modern school possible for the students. Given all of the data involved, he believes the Oakdale is the best site for the project.

Ms. Mercer stated she has reviewed all of the previous presentations and knows a lot of work has gone into this process. She is partial to the Oakdale School site as her children attended the school. She also noted that she has been in favor of all the building projects the Town has done to date and she noted that it is unfortunate the town did not spend any money for decades on town building and that now it's all hitting at once. She noted that the existing school is not ideal for the students, and she knows that each neighborhood feels some type of ownership over the school but she has concerns about the Capen School site for pick-up and drop-off and the lack of walkability. She also noted that building at Capen would take away the Oakdale community by redistricting. She closed by stating she is in favor of the Oakdale site.

Mr. Moore stated he is in favor of the Oakdale site as he has three children who are current or future students. He stated that all of the data points to the Oakdale site as being the best option and he was thrown when the Capen is still being considered as a serious contender. The access, usable outdoor space, and site itself are better at the Oakdale school. He then asked how is disruption limited during construction for the students currently attending the Oakdale school if construction were to take place on the site?

Mr. Theran stated that some of the sketches shown the open space and dividing lines of the construction vs. student space. He stated it takes a lot of planning to show bus lanes, parent drop off, and construction laydown areas with the construction team and the existing school faculty and staff. It also takes coordination on site to ensure all activities take place safely and without too much disruption. When unexpected things come up the on-site management communicates to fix the issue. He noted that construction isn't mayhem, it's very organized and careful, however there will be noise which cannot really be mitigated. However, the students get used to the noise as discussed with a principal of a previous construction site. Scheduling is also a large part of mitigation, the team tries to get the noisy work done over the summer or earlier in the day.

Mr. Moore thanked Mr. Theran and stated his explanation makes him still favor Oakdale.

Mr. Mongilly stated he believes the Oakdale site is the no brainer and why he moved to the area along with all his neighbors. He noted that the Capen site is on a very busy road, and that is concerning. Oakdale is the best fit because it's architecturally easiest, has the most open space for student, and sports, and it will preserve the neighborhood feel. Capen is on the corner of Town and Oakdale is more central and closer to the density of the students. The Greenlodge is not viable with ledge and blasting, Capen is off a busy road with complex terrain, so Oakdale is the best option.

Ms. Stevens asked if there are requirements for outdoor usable space for a new construction project of this size.

Mr. Levi stated he does not know have the exact number at his fingertips, but he is quite certain that we far exceed the required number on any of these sites and he will get back to everyone with the numbers.

Ms. O'Conner stated that the Oakdale School was a huge attraction when they moved to Dedham four years ago. She said the site is central and will serve the population well and preserve the walkability. She also stated that using Capen would leave two open properties for the Town, but she stated there will still be two properties at the end of the day because Capen is still there.

Ms. Buttermore stated her biggest consideration is that the interior of the building, and the exterior will fit the needs of the students. Also, she stated the usable outdoor open space is very important and the school uses every inch of what they have now so she can't imagine that having double the enrollment with half the space makes sense. She stressed that cutting the outdoor space on the long-term investment should be a consideration.

Ms. Deluca stated she has three children who will attend the school. She stated she came here thinking that Capen was the best option but has since reconsidered because the parents at the Oakdale are ok with the disruption. She is still concerned hearing about the drop off issues at the Capen when it was the old ECEC with fewer students and Sprague is already has heavy traffic. She is most in favor of the Oakdale site for these reasons. She also wanted to mention that she is part of the Active Transportation group and works with the Safe Routes to School program and noted there are a lot of issues related to walkability at Oakdale. Most of that is related to people parking on Cedar Street which blocks the sidewalk for walkers. She stated the team should think about how to fix this with the project design to make sure school drop off flows better to facilitate easier access for walkers.

Ms. Finnerty commented that walkability should be a factor. Her family chose their neighborhood so they could walk to school, and walkability provides so much pride and independence for a community. The value of children being so close and able to walk makes the Oakdale a better choice.

Mr. McDonough asked if there is a meeting on this coming Monday as well.
Mr. Tocci confirmed.

Ms. Miller stated she has four boys and her husband's family has all gone to the Oakdale School. She noted that there are plenty of fields in Dedham that cannot be used because the Town does not invest in maintaining them. She stated that Dedham is a community and Oakdale is a huge part of the pulse of Dedham and that should be maintained to best ability possible.

ZOOM COMMENTS READ BY MS. ELLIS:

Ms. O'Brien stated that the schools currently do not have enough parking. She asked if that will be taken into consideration during design to provide enough parking spaces for staff and visitors?

Mr. Tocci stated we are still far away from final determinations of parking and layouts.

Mr. Levi stated his team has made an assumption based on what is currently provided, but they will get into much more detail as time goes on.

Mr. Humphries thanked the entire SBRC and their consultants for all of the great work they've been doing. The schemes all feel well considered and give us quite a bit to think about. If I read the slides correctly, the cost to the Town is pretty similar in all schemes (and the reimbursement rate is much lower than had been talked about in the past), so the decision would seem it needs to be founded in factors of benefits of final outcome, disruption during construction, and the potential benefits to the community in the two sites not chosen. That said, I believe the choice is between the Capen with building built into the site or the Oakdale original building with new wings.

Mr. Tocci stated the estimates used for the MSBA contribution is about 30-33% based on what the state kicked in for the ECEC school.

Peter Reynolds stated: Oakdale is the clear choice in my mind. I love the combo of the new & old. We can provide an excellent, modern learning environment while preserving our history - the old, original building is so beautiful and has many memories for so many of us. Many of our historic buildings have been taken down over the years - but this is a chance to keep one. - As far as construction while school goes on - kids will love watching the process - they love big trucks - and it will be a learning experience.

Ms. Grimes states: I'm a Greenlodge parent. I think Oakdale and Capen are superior sites to the Greenlodge one as much as I wish we could keep our neighborhood school. I personally have no compelling love of the Oakdale building to feel that it must be salvaged *as a school building* but I appreciate the parents here who feel that it's central to the neighborhood. I was leaning toward Capen especially as to reduce the burden on current students and staff but the traffic patterns and access issues as well as the challenges of the site/open space at Capen make Oakdale the preferable site to me.

Ms. Campbell-Hegarty asks: Where do the kids play while construction goes on at the Oakdale school over the course of three years?

Mr. Levi stated that one the slides that were presented there are noted as "Temporary usable open space" is where children would play during construction.

Ms. Saba states: that as a teacher with all of the struggles our children have gone through (pandemic, online school, emotional health and social struggles) some are struggling to still have academic success and to add construction noise to the mix would be so hard. Yes, they would love it but the teachers might have even more trouble getting children to focus and learn. I just feel like it's something to think about. Thank you.

Ms. Diangelis says: I grew up in Oakdale I live in Oakdale and work at DHS. To me it seems only appropriate and worthwhile to have the new school at Oakdale with lower cost and more usable open space.

Ms. Keaveney commented: that she grew up in Dedham and wish to have Oakdale as the 1st choice. The location, and history is so important and central. Capen makes me uncomfortable being on Sprague street which is filled day/night with trucks. Greenlodge is my 2nd choice. Thank you. Joanne K

End of zoom comments.

Mr. Tocci asked for questions and comments from school committee members.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs thanked everyone for sharing their opinions this evening. She stated that this decision is more complicated than people may think. She stated that the drop off issues at the Capen currently would be addressed through this design process. Walkability is a huge concern for her and she noted the Oakdale students can walk to the Middle School and High School, different neighborhoods would be able to walk to Capen. She then requested that JLA remove the tree covered areas be from the usable open space calculation to provide a fair comparison between the sites. She also noted that having worked on other construction sites, all of the previous projects have been completed on time and on budget and for everyone to be aware that there are unknowns at all of the sites.

Ms. Macdonald Briggs stated that the redistricting should be part of the vote so she asks Dr. Kelly what the redistricting would look like if the chosen site was Oakdale.

Dr. Kelly stated that the redistricting option being referenced was the one where students were distributed more equitably throughout the district. In that instance the town moves to a more "vertical" zone that splits the current Oakdale population. He noted that this is based on the current population and that will change in the coming years. He stated that no matter where the new school is built, the redistricting can still happen to better balance the schools. He noted that he also reached out to the Dedham Transportation person and confirmed there would not be any additional transportation costs associated with a Capen school location.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she just wants people to understand that just because you live in the current Oakdale district, with redistricting on the table that does not mean that you will continue to go to the Oakdale School if that is the chosen site.

Mr. Hebert stated he would prefer people not use certain terminology that paints certain parts of town as "different than us" when discussing this project.

Dr. Gallant thanked everyone for speaking this evening. She stated she would love more clarification on traffic patterns prior to making a decision on sites. She also noted that there are walkable neighborhoods around Capen, and she wants the town to take into consideration which neighborhoods are being thought of as central to the town and also consider the neighborhoods that are not always thought of during these discussions.

Mr. Acosta asked when looking at using one of the occupied sites, what is the timeline considering that parts of the existing schools get demolished and used as part of the final design, can that happen over the summer? Is that enough time?

Mr. Tocci stated that when the new school is built all the students will be move into the new building and then the demolition of the existing can occur and the parking or whatnot installed.

Mr. Theran stated the time depends on exactly what needs to be done. If there is abatement that needs to be done first, then there is usually drainage and underground work. It's hard to know at this time, but summer is short.

Mr. Acosta stated he is concerned with putting a two-story school 25 feet away from the existing houses and we need to take into account the dramatic change to their properties. He asked how wide the road needs to be around the entire building for emergency services?

Mr. Levi stated it needs to be 20' wide.

Mr. Acosta continued and stated that regardless of what site is chosen there will be two buildings left empty and there will be plenty of time for public input and solutions on what to do with those buildings. He also noted that there is a heat map of student density that shows that Avery is also central to that population being reference, not just Oakdale. He also stated he knows not everyone will be happy with the chosen site, however his preference is Capen, and he urges people to look beyond what affects their personal life and look at what benefits the community. He also apricates everyone's involvement and opinions.

Ms. McCormick stated she also appreciates everyone's involvement. She noted there are so many variables being taken into consideration and reiterated that with redistricting on the table she wants everyone to understand that their school could change.

Mr. Donati thanked everyone for their feedback as well. He stated that in the cropper report it appears that the Capen site was the only that was looked at for equitability and he's not sure why that is, but he would like to see that same information for all the sites. He also noted that if children were being pulled

from East Dedham, they would be walking past the Oakdale school to get to Capen. Counterpoint is the families in the Manor and Greenlodge, but those neighborhoods can still walk to Oakdale. He also noted that Oakdale has more usable open space. He agrees with Mr. Acosta on the building height concerns and the 25' setback from the neighboring properties. He noted there are more available routes for getting to the Oakdale site than there are for getting to the Capen school. He also noted that the Oakdale site was the first choice from the Oakdale Communities as well as the Greenlodge and Avery communities. He also stated there are considerations to be made after a site is chosen, for example what to do with the existing 1902 building.

Mr. Heffernan also thanked the community for their comments. He stated his first choice is already off the board, he wanted a Riverdale/Oakdale combination to take care of the oldest schools in the Town. He stated he was very impressed with the tours the SBRC Took of schools that were built into a slope and how they took advantage of the topography. He stated he has concerns with the renovation of the existing 1902 school if Oakdale is the chosen site since they are still paying for the renovation of the Ames School into Town Hall. He is prepared to vote out Greenlodge for all the issues with the site.

Mr. Tocci stated he also has concerns with a potential renovation of the existing 1902 school. That said he believes the Oakdale site is the better site and provides significantly more usable open space. The issue with Greenlodge and Capen are the unknowns, such as ledge and topography.

Mr. Donati asked Dr. Kelly if he can speak to the long-term considerations that led him to recommend the Capen site.

Dr. Kelly stated the school committee requested he make a presentation on what he believes is the best decision educationally. He noted that his presentation also was only inconsistent with community feedback when it came to site recommendation. He stated his recommendation is really about a 2-3 year disruption to learning during that time. He stated that his recommendation is based only on an educational benefit to students, he did not consider traffic or any other criteria.

Mr. Gonzalez thanked everyone for sharing their comments. He stated he had three children go through ECEC at Capen and the Oakdale School and he understands the issue with drop off at both sites. He stated for clarity and for better discussion on Monday he would open to removing the Greenlodge site from the running tonight.

Mr. Bilafer stated he also appreciates everyone's thoughts and comments, he has been thinking about this back to when he was on the school committee. He said there are a lot of arguments to made for two of the sites but not a lot of compelling arguments for the Greenlodge site.

MOTION: by Mr. Bilafer to remove Greenlodge site from consideration and leave Capen and Oakdale as the two finals sites.

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

VOTE: 6-0-0 Unanimous.

Mr. Tocci noted the final decision will be made Monday evening. He asked for final thoughts or questions before the meeting closes.

Mr. McDonough stated it's not the age of the building but more the façade of the old building that is treasured by the Town.

Mr. Hayes requested to see the data supporting the Capen as a site because the graphs and metrics do not point to Capen.

Mr. Bilafer stated one reason he is still undecided is having full control of the empty site factored into the ability to bring the project in on time and under budget. An empty site eliminates the need for phasing.

Mr. Moore stated the ECEC is busting at the seams and there is not enough space on the site.

Mr. Tocci stated the ECEC was special circumstance because the MSBA dictated they could only build a school for 300 students.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs requested more information on the design for the second Oakdale option, she would like to see the 3rd floor be moved away from the neighbors and put closer to the middle of the field. She would like to see how a 3rd floor impact the lighting and shadows on neighbors.

Mr. Levi stated he can provide that.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC is still taking comments and has received hundreds of comments through the website over the last week.

3. Adjournment:

Mr. Tocci asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by

SECOND: by

Unanimous vote to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Attachments:

Vertex/JLA Slides

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham Elementary School


Dedham Public Schools

Joint School Committee and SBRC Meeting

June 21, 2023



MSBA FEASIBILITY / SCHEMATIC PROCESS & BEYOND



PDP: Preliminary Design Plan | PSR: Preferred Schematic Report | SD: Schematic Design Report

• Aligned with MSBA Board Meetings and Town Ballot | Dates shown are approximate

★ = Dedicated Community Forums: #5: June 17: Community Meeting


Preliminary Concept Studies

Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies

Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies

Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies

Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'B' - 'Common Core Welcome'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation




Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation



Preliminary Concept Studies




Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation



Dedham Public Schools
America's first tax supported, free public school



Preliminary Concept Studies



Oakdale 'C'
Addition/Partial Renovation



Dedham Public Schools
America's first tax supported, free public school




Preliminary Concept Studies

Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard' New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies

Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard' New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies




Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Dedham Public Schools
America's first tax supported, free public school



Preliminary Concept Studies



Greenlodge 'A' - 'Academic Courtyard'
New Construction



Dedham Public Schools
America's first tax supported, free public school



Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination'
New Construction



Capen 'A' - 'Playfield Destination' New Construction



Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces' New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies

Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces'
New Construction



Preliminary Concept Studies

Capen 'B' - 'Cascading Terraces'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village'
New Construction




Preliminary Concept Studies



Capen 'C' - 'Hillside Village '
New Construction





Site Selection Alternatives Technical Evaluation Matrix (1 of 2)

Dedham - New Elementary School Site Selection Technical Evaluation

Note: Not Including Redistricting Impacts

Amended with SBRC Input

6/15/23

RATINGS - RELATIVE BETWEEN SITES:

+	Advantageous
0	Neutral
-	Disadvantageous
-	Very Disadvantageous

(Approx. Site Size (GIS)
Cursory % Useable Area

	A Oakdale 6.9 Acres 100% Cursory % Useable Area		B Greenlodge 15.7 Acres 30% Cursory % Useable Area		D Capen 5.2 Acres 80% Cursory % Useable Area		NOTES
	NEW	ADD/RENO	NEW	ADD/RENO	NEW	ADD/RENO	
	Notes	Notes	Notes	Notes	Notes	Notes	
Location Factors							
L.1	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	1. Potential for preservation of prominent building.
L.2	+	+	+	+	+	+	2. Not large enough for additional fields beyond those for school.
L.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	3. Good site frontage on multiple streets.
L.4	+	+	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	4. Site is oriented east west.
L.5	+	+	1	-0-	-0-	-0-	5. Potential complex reno of existing building.
L.6	+	+	5	-0-	-0-	-0-	6. Assumes combination of new and renovation which would require complex phasing.
L.7	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	7. Site is less central.
L.8	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	8. Limited useable site size.
L.9	+	+	+	+	+	+	9. Existing non-school field use will be impacted.
L.10	+	+	+	+	+	-0-	10. Site not oriented east west.
L.11	-0-	-0-	-	-	B	-0-	11. Consolidation would require significant redistricting
L.12	+	+	+	+	+	-13	12. Single street frontage
Site Size, Configuration, Characteristics							
S.1	+	+	-0-	-0-	B	-0-	13. Because of topography, site remaining after school construction may be difficult to configure for fields.
S.2	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	14. Not used
S.3	+	+	-	-	-	-	15. Not Used
S.4	+	+	-	-	9	+	16. Wetland restrictions
S.5	-0-	-0-	2	-	-	+	
S.6	-0-	-0-	-	-	-	+	
S.7	+	+	-0-	-0-	-	B	
S.8	-0-	-0-	-	-	-	-0-	



Site Selection Alternatives Technical Evaluation Matrix (2 of 2)

Dedham - New Elementary School Site Selection Technical Evaluation

Note: Not Including Redistricting Impacts

Amended with SBRC Input

6/15/23

RATINGS - RELATIVE BETWEEN SITES:

+ Advantageous
 - Neutral
 - Disadvantageous
 - Very Disadvantageous

	A Oakdale			B Greenlodge			D Capen			NOTES
	NEW	ADD/RENO	RENO	NEW	ADD/RENO	RENO	NEW	ADD/RENO	RENO	
Approx. Site Size (GIS)	6.9 Acres			16.7 Acres			5.2 Acres			
Curiosity % Usable Area	100%			30%			80%			
S.7 On-Site Drop-off/Pick-up Queuing / Parking Access	+	+		-	-		-	-		16. Wetland restrictions.
S.8 On-Site Bus Access / Drop-Off	-	-		-	-		-	-		17. Not Used
S.9 Service Access-Deliveries, Refuse	-	-		-	-		-	-		18. Potential storm water relocation.
S.10 Separation of Pedestrians and Vehicles	+	+	3	-	-	12	-	-	8	19. The smaller enrollment options are less efficient compared to the 550 enrollment, increasing cost per sf.
S.11 Not Used - Now redundant with S.10										20. Site Premium for grading / ledge removal.
S.12 Security - Controlled Access to Students	-	-		-	-		-	-		21. Renovation options require swing space, increasing costs and complicating logistics.
S.13 Topography	+	+		-	-	20	-	-	20	22. Renovation option does not require swing space, but has longer timeline than new construction.
S.14 Floodplain Storm Drainage	+	+		+	+		+	+		
S.15 Impact to Neighbors	-	-		-	-		-	-		
S.16 Underground Obstacles	-	-		-	-		-	-	20	
S.17 Geoenvironmental	-	-		-	-		-	-		
S.18 Orientation for Natural Light	+	+	4	-	-	10	-	-	10	
S.19 Wetlands/Riverway/Conservation/Tree Removal	+	+		-	-	16	+	+		
S.20 Nature Amenities/Views/Outdoor Learning	-	-		+	+		+	+		
S.21 Utilities	-	-		-	-		-	-		
S.22 Existing Structures Reuse or Cost to Remove	-	-	5	-	-		-	-		Other Sites Evaluated and Rejected by the SBRC: Paul Park: This site is the smallest of those considered and will not accommodate any enrollment size along with necessary site amenities on a par with other schools in the district.
S.23 Geotechnical	+	+		-	-	20	-	-	20	Dolan Center: As a unique valued recreational asset with river frontage and recent parks and rec. investment cannot be replaced in kind. It is an unlikely candidate for a land swap.
S.24 Legal Encumbrances	-	-		-	-		-	-		Whitcomb Woods: This property is listed as being in a land trust. It also has wetlands issues which appear to limit useable area.
S.25 Infrastructure Premiums - New Construction	+	+		+	+		+	+		Rustcraft Road: This town-wide recreational center would represent difficulties in process and approvals for a land swap. It is also remote.
S.26 Fit to Educational Program - New Construction	+	+		+	+		+	+		Capen - Striar Combined: Concern about access to Striar from Capen given wetland and drainage conditions, and long walk through woods with very young students as a safety concern.
S.27 Fit to Educational Program - Add./Reno.	+	+		+	+		+	+		Striar: Safety concerns and the fact that the property is not controlled by the School Department could delay project.
Schedule and Cost Risk Factors										Riverdale: Not appropriate site for consideration with Oakdale Greenlodge combined enrollment
R.1 Construction Duration	-	-	22	-	-	8	+	+		
R.2 Construction Phasing	-	-	6	-	-	8	+	+		
R.3 Existing Building Demo	-	-	5	-	-		-	-		
R.4 Hazardous Material Soil Removal	+	+		-	-		TBD			
R.5 Hazardous Materials in Existing Buildings	-	-		-	-		-	-		
R.6 Swing Space	+	+	22	+	+	21	+	+		
R.7 Development Process Complexity	-	-	22	-	-		-	-		
R.8 Acquisitions - Schedule	+	+		+	+		+	+		
R.9 Acquisitions - Cost Certainty	+	+		+	+		+	+		
R.10 Potential Open Space Challenge	+	+		+	+		+	+		
R.11 Potential Historic Building Demo/Alter. Challenge	-	-	5	+	+		+	+		
R.12 Deed Restrictions	+	+		+	+		+	+		
R.13 Permitting - Zoning	+	+		+	+		+	+		
Relative Cost per SF	5	5.5	19	5.5	5.5	20	5.5	19	20	



Site Selection Alternatives – Summary of Evaluation Highlights

Oakdale Site:

- Relatively flat site, easy to build on
- Most usable open space
- Neither the new construction nor the addition/ partial renovation alternative would require swing space, however the renovation alternative would add cost and an additional year to the schedule.

Greenlodge Site:

- Sloped site, wetlands and extensive ledge make Greenlodge challenging to build on
- Has less usable open space than Oakdale
- All-new construction would not require swing space - a renovation alternative would require swing space.

Capen Site:

- A steep 30' slope makes it challenging to build on and access from adjacent roadways.
- Has less usable open space than Oakdale
- No swing space would be required – No noise disruption to students





Opinion of Probable Cost



Site	Enroll.	New or A/R	In \$1M's				In \$1M's		
			Construction Cost	Temp Classrooms	Soft Costs (@30%)	Total Project Budget	Less MSBA Pot'l Grant	Town Share	Per Student (in \$100K)
Oakdale	550	New	\$ 80.9		\$ 24.3	\$ 105.2	\$ (31.6)	\$ 73.6	\$ 133.9
Capen	550	New	\$ 83.3		\$ 25.0	\$ 108.2	\$ (32.5)	\$ 75.8	\$ 137.7
Greenlodge	550	New	\$ 83.6		\$ 25.1	\$ 108.7	\$ (32.6)	\$ 76.1	\$ 138.3
Greenlodge	550	A/R	\$ 79.4	\$ 4.9	\$ 23.8	\$ 108.1	\$ (31.0)	\$ 77.1	\$ 140.3
Oakdale	550	A/R	\$ 87.1		\$ 26.1	\$ 113.2	\$ (34.0)	\$ 79.3	\$ 144.1

Selected Enrollment: 550 students - \$73.6 to 79.3 M

Assumes base MSBA reimbursement rate of 47% plus 3 incentive points (50%), reduced to an effective rate of 30%

All costs are rough order of magnitude estimates for the purpose of comparison and discussion.



Q&A / Contact Information



Questions or comments?

To submit a question or comment at a later date, please use the dedicated project email address:

oakdaleproject@dedham.k12.ma.us

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) will be compiled and posted to the project's website:

<https://www.dedham.k12.ma.us/Page/2802>

Previous Test Fit: Greenlodge Add/Reno. Requiring Off Site Swing Space



GREENLODGE ADDITION/RENOVATION TEST FIT DIAGRAM

B.1 - R/A OAKDALE +GREENLODGE
85,550GSF
104 SPACES, 2 BUSES, 3VANS

- New Construction
- Existing to be Renovated



Dedham Public Schools
America's first tax supported, free public school



Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday June 26, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jon Lemieux, Project Director	A	Dr. Ian Kelly, Acting Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager		Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager		Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
A	Steven Acosta, School Committee	A	Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez		Philip Gray		
		A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business:

Mr. Tocci opened the June 26, 2023, SBRC meeting at 7:00pm: He stated the SBRC will have their meeting and then hold public comment at the end. He noted the SBRC member have received well over 100 emails over the past week, and he summarized the meetings held to date regarding the project. He requested approval of the minutes from the June 5, 2023, meeting.

MOTION: to approve the June 5, 2023, meeting minute as submitted made by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Heffernan

Mr. Acosta abstains from voting.

Motion passes 6-0-1

2. Site Considerations:

Mr. Theran began with an overview of the project schedule which is the same slide that is shown at all of the public meetings. He stated at the end of August the team will submit the selected design to the MSBA. Then at the end of December the Schematic Design documents, which are about a 20% design set of plans, will be submitted to the MSBA. He noted that that design is what will be brought to Town Meeting in Spring 2024. After town Meeting approval the team will spend approximately 6-8 months developing the final set of construction documents by January 2025 for bidding to happen from February to April 2025. Then construction will start in Spring 2025.

Mr. Levi ran through his slides showing different layouts for both the Capen and Oakdale sites. The first plan view is of the Oakdale Academic Courtyard approach. He noted that the plans are meant to show the overall size and general parts to be included in the building and site. The yellow is the ~~Limit of Design~~ ^{Limit of Design}

Paul M. Hermes
Town Clerk

the red is the worst-case zoning set back (25' all around), and the dashed blue line is the existing building footprint. The white rectangle is the existing 1902 school building. This layout has a courtyard and an upper and lower school with the cafetorium and gym in the center for use by all students.

Mr. Levi also noted that although there are a lot of trees, the students can still use the space around and between trees for play space. He then provided an overview of Usable Open Space (UOS) during construction and permanently once the building is complete.

Mr. Levi also stated the DESE guidelines state there should be a minimum 75 sf of open space per child when they are using the open space at the same time. For this project, if every student were outside at the same time, it would require 41,000 sf of open space for the building. The temporary UOS for the building phase 1 is approximately 48,000 sf. The permanent UOS with the 1902 building remaining is approximately 96,000 sf. If the 1902 building were removed it would add an additional 35,000 sf. Mr. Levi then showed a slide with a 3D model of the building on the site, and also a shadow study for the building which provides a view of shadows in the morning and afternoon at various points throughout a year.

The second approach arranges the building into a line which again has an upper and lower school, and all the common spaces are in the center of the building. This provides approximately 40,000 sf of temporary UOS and 120,000 SF of permanent space. An additional 22,000 sf can be added if the 1902 building were demolished. He again provided a shadow study for the second layout.

One final approach is to retain the 1902 building and incorporate two new wings to the North and South of the existing building. The North wing would be built first, the existing Oakdale students would move into the new wing, the existing building and South wing would be built, then the Greenlodge students would move in as well. This provides 100,000 sf of temporary UOS and 111,000 for permanent UOS.

Moving to the Capen site which is steeply sloped. This first scheme puts the building on the lower portion of the site. This provides 68,000 sf of UOS. He shows slides of a 3D building for perspective. The next version shows the building spanning over the slope. He also noted that the layouts provide a North/South orientation for the building. This layout yields 36,000 sf of permanent UOS, which is the least of all options. The last version places the building on the slope itself and provides 84,000 sf of permanent UOs. Again, he shows 3D renderings of the building.

Mr. Acosta then presented some slides for consideration on equitable distribution and walkability. The maps show the walking radius for each of the elementary schools, which is approximately a 1-mile radius for each school. There is significant overlap for all the schools, and he noted that there are some cut throughs that are not accounted for on these maps. He also noted this is not a direct representation of who does actually walk to school.

Mr. Acosta noted that all of Greenlodge and the Manor are walkable to the Greenlodge site. If the Greenlodge school is removed there is significant overlap with the Avery and Oakdale school walking radii. If the Capen School is also removed, all of Greenlodge and all of the Manor are left out of the walkability radius for the Oakdale site. The next slide shows the Avery and Capen walk radii and there is very little overlap and provides more options for walkability for more students.

Mr. Acosta continued stating that the Capen site is walkable site, and it was an elementary school previously and students did walk there. He also stated that there is a lot of concern with Sprague being a very busy street, and while that is true, bringing 550 students to any site will create a busy situation and that is something that will need to be mitigated at any site. He also noted that elementary school is the only time students from the Manor, Ahscroft, and Greenlodge will have an opportunity to walk to school, Oakdale and Avery students can walk to the middle and high schools.

Mr. Acosta moved on to equitable distribution with a new slide. Option #2 is for the Oakdale Site and Option #4 is for the Capen site. Per the spreadsheets Option #4, Capen site, brings the equitable distribution of free lunches to more evenly distributed across all schools. That is not the case for the Oakdale site. The same can be said for English Language Learners, Option #4 makes the distribution more equal across schools.

The next slide provides a heat map of the free and reduced meal density, the next slide shows the student density heat map. Oakdale is centered around a hot spot, but Capen also runs along the edge of a hot spot from Greenlodge into Ashcroft, while the Avery school splits two density hot spots. He stated this is important to consider when considering walkability.

The next slide shows the potential redistricting for option #2, Oakdale site. The following slide for Option #4 shows the more equitable distribution of students which also cuts the existing Oakdale district into two separate districts. He noted that with this updated district it takes a handful of streets that are walkable to the Oakdale site and move them to a different school district. He also noted that redistricting is a school committee decision, not an SBRC decision, however the SBRC should consider this information when making a site decision.

Mr. Acosta stated he wants to be clear that the SBRC takes everything into consideration. He also noted that he is looking at this as a school committee member as well and putting two schools in such close proximity does not allow for much flexibility. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Donati

Mr. Donati asked Dr. Kelly to speak to the redistricting maps that have been provided and to clarify if the Oakdale site is chosen can equity still be achieved.

Dr. Kelly stated the options were built around the site and the enrollments, but they can be divorced from each other. Option #4 provides the most equity for the Town regardless of where the school is located within that zone. However, the walkability distance within the zone will change, but what is shown in option 4 can be achieved at a school located anywhere within that zone.

Mr. Donati thanked Dr. Kelly for the clarification and confirmed that even if the zone boundaries are changed slightly to include all streets surrounding the Oakdale school equity can still be achieved.

Mr. Donati then began his presentation. He noted the top line is a typo and please disregard. This table provides a summary of distances from each neighborhood to the different school sites. He confirmed these distances are based on Option #4 which is the optimal way the district boundaries can be drawn. Mr. Heffernan clarified and stated that the top line is Greenlodge to Oakdale, Mr. Donati confirmed.

The next slide summarizes the usable open space for each of the sites, he noted this is based on the numbers from the last set of slides from the previous meeting, these numbers have since been updated for tonight's presentation by JLA. He also noted he included Rustcraft field as a reference point for people to use as visual comparison.

The next slide shows the different access points to the Oakdale School. There are some larger streets that flow into the Oakdale site. The following slide does the same for the Capen Site. These slides are meant to represent how people will come and go from the site which has been a large topic of discussion.

Mr. Donati moved on to the next slide which summarizes the survey results. He noted this is only one data point and does not represent the entire town. These show a representative choice from all of the four elementary schools and how they felt about the different sites. The next slide shows the breakdown of site preference based on all of the 100+ emails received over the last week.

Mr. Tocci stated that the ability to develop equity across the district has been a topic of discussion over the past few weeks. He noted that option #4 is the best option for achieving this equity. He noted that using this map the equity can be achieved by providing a school at either Oakdale or Capen. He noted that this map shows a handful of the presidential streets, which have great walkability to Oakdale, are districted elsewhere. He asked Dr. Kelly if those streets were to be districted to Oakdale, can equity still be achieved?

Dr. Kelly stated the consultant used best practices to create these zones, including using main streets as boards, and considered walkability. He stated in short, yes, it can be done and achieved.

3. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci opened the floor to public noting they will start with the zoom comments.

Ms. Ellis read the first comment from Leah Gallant: Out of the 485 responses, what was the breakdown of percentage of people who responded? For example, out of 485 what was the percentage of Avery families that responded?

Mr. Heffernan stated Oakdale was 40%

Mr. Tocci stated there were 53 from Avery, 141 from Greenlodge, 194 from Oakdale, and 102 from Riverdale.

Ms. Ellis read the next comment from Bernadette O Connor who said: 485 people took this survey; we have a population of 25,000. Can we put something in the Dedham Times for older residents that pay huge taxes and unfortunately don't necessarily know what is happening within our town.

Mr. Tocci stated they generally do, and they tried to get the survey into as many hands as possible, he thanked her for the comment.

Ms. Ellis read the next comment from Sarah Budlong who states: I want to thank the SBRC for this detailed presentation. I appreciate the clarification that equity can be achieved at both Capen and Oakdale sites. I remain a strong supporter of the Oakdale site. However, I urge the SBRC to pick the site that has the best chance of passing town meeting in 2024. That is our next battle, and we all need to commit to supporting this new school.

Mr. Tocci requested comments from the room.

Ms. Linari stated she lives in the Ashcroft neighborhood and for 22 years they have had a viable school. She noted that getting across Cedar Street to the Oakdale school prevented students from her

neighborhood to walk to school. She advocates for the Capen site for equity purposes and is concerned with the noise level during construction at the Oakdale school if that site is chosen. She also noted that Oakdale and Avery schools are very close together and the Town should build something new for everyone.

Mr. Polito stated the Capen school is currently being used by the Blue Hills Regional Communications center and he noted that the school will be moving to a new site in the fall. He noted that when people purchase homes in the Oakdale area they do so for the school and ability to walk there. He noted that the Capen school has not been an elementary school for 22 years. He also noted that the biggest problem with the middle school project was dirt which will again be an issue at the Capen site.

Mr. Tocci clarified and stated that although there wasn't an elementary school at the Capen site, there was the ECEC school until the new ECEC opened in 2019.

Mr. Donati asked for clarification on a construction schedule and how long it would last.

Mr. Theran stated it is very early on in the process, but we generally consider a two year time period which includes building a new building and then demolishing the existing.

Mr. Teehan thanked the committee members for this long process and their service to the community. He believes the Oakdale is the superior site even though you can make an argument for both sites. Oakdale is flat, already has a school, provides more open space, Capen has the tough slope and Sprague Street has heavy traffic. Equitable redistricting can happen regardless of school site. He also noted it is unfortunate for Greenlodge to lose a school and if Oakdale lost the school that would be two neighborhoods losing a school. He also reminded the board that the project needs a 2/3 vote at Town Meeting, and they should consider that when making a final decision.

Mr. Pepoli stated he is here to represent Greenlodge. He stated that from the beginning the matrix has been flawed and he sent an email in January calling out 13 issues with the report. He stated the matrix was performed by someone who does not understand the neighborhood or Town. Cost is not an issue once the 550 enrollment was made, there is only a 3% difference in cost for the remaining options. He stated Greenlodge was unfairly removed from the process, he noted it is the only thing the neighborhood has in the area. He stated it is irresponsible to put two schools within two miles of each other cutting off the southern portion of the Town.

Ms. McDonough thanked the committee for their work. She stated she firmly believes the Town has always been committed to a neighborhood school system and the issue isn't Oakdale vs. Capen but rather 235 vs. 550. She believes the larger school is the wrong model and there is no parity with three schools of such varying sizes. She knows the SBRC is tasked with fixing all the aging schools in the most cost-effective manor, however being forced into a larger school is not the way to go.

Mr. Czazasty stated he believes Greenlodge is the best site for the school, and he is unhappy that it was eliminated. He stated he believes the support for the Oakdale site is biased and the residents have been more engaged because it's called the Oakdale project, the site selection meeting was the Oakdale school, the email address is Oakdale school @, and the list goes on. He stated the perception is that the school only affects the Oakdale population.

Ms. Hegarty stated she lives in the Manor which is the neighborhood that everyone forgets. She stated she has attended all of the meetings and she agrees with why Greenlodge was removed. She supports the Capen School because it's an empty site, doesn't disrupt current students, was a school previously, and the play areas are moved away from the main road. She also stated the survey was skewed and it should have been resent as a new survey once only two sites were remaining. Her concerns with Oakdale include the construction noise the students will have to endure. She also said if Oakdale is chosen she does not like the renovation option because it requires the students to move 3 times.

Ms. Keaveney thanked the committee for all their work. She stated she feels there has been dismissiveness with the comments, specifically regarding the Capen school traffic. The comment "every site has traffic" is a dismissive statement, she also noted that Sprague Street is a truck route and that is a huge safety concern. She also noted that there is a significant amount of traffic already without inviting 550 students to the area. She closed by saying her choice is the Oakdale site.

Ms. Caruso stated she is in support of the Oakdale site; she also prefers a stand alone smaller Oakdale school. She agrees with the last speaker stating Sprague is not a walkable street for the Greenlodge population. She also noted Oakdale has more usable outdoor space which is a huge benefit to the children.

ZOOM COMMENTS:

Ms. Ellis read the following zoom comments:

Leah Gallant said Thank you - so the results could be skewed a bit based on what was presented in terms of preference of families from area - meaning that there was more Oakdale families that responded vs. Avery

Zach Wassmouth asked How much is space for on-site pickup/drop-off taken into account for buses/caretakers during this preliminary screening to understand potential traffic impacts?

Mr. Levi stated his team needed to make some assumptions for these schematics.

Emily Haven said: I completely agree. Survey responses were presented that were received when there were 4 options versus what now appears to be 2. Send it again and get a true read on what the neighborhood communities prefer in this new situation. We now face the prospect of losing the presence of any elementary school in the Greenlodge/manor side of Dedham.

Kelly McNulty asked: Can I clarify whether an Oakdale single school has already been ruled out?
Mr. Tocci confirmed.

Derek Gillis said: The survey data that suggests that the Oakdale site is preferred by a majority of respondents, especially outside of Oakdale, is now outdated and based on very limited information. I had no information about the potential impact on redistricting when I filled out the survey. The survey should have been redone after the 550-enrollment decision was made with two or three options. It should have been redone with more information available about possible redistricting and more study of the comparative costs for building and long term maintenance.

Britt Teravainen asked: Are there plans for what happens to the current Greenlodge site?

Mr. Tocci stated in the past the Town has appointed a Re-Use committee to decide what to do with the empty building, he anticipates that will happen again in this case.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the School Committee will discuss whether or not to declare the building as surplus before the Town would be able to appoint a committee for discussion on reuse. She noted this process also includes community input.

Maria Thornton said: I live on Sprague Street at the bottom right before the entrance at the Manor. Very concerned with traffic. There have been four car accidents in front of my home in the past four years, one car hitting the car my child was in. I feel it is very unsafe to have children walking on this street and crossing at that bottom at any point.

END OF ZOOM COMMENTS.

Mr. Hayes asked if the Dedham Police or Fire departments have been consulted about any of the sites and their access.

Mr. Tocci stated they have not.

Mr. Hayes asked what the solution would be if a traffic study found there are traffic issues that need mitigation. Would a new road project be an option and potentially add more cost to the project?

Mr. Tocci stated it is impossible to say without knowing what the issue is. For the ECEC project there was a huge traffic concern with the traffic, and they were able to create speed mitigation measures as part of the project and it still came in under budget.

Mr. Hayes asked if that is part of the plan here or will it push the project over budget? Especially with the terraced landscape that is already a challenge at Capen.

Mr. Bilafer stated all of these plans and schematics are subject to approval by the town boards (planning board, public safety, etc.).

Mr. Heffernan stated through the Finance committee and through past discussions with the Police Chief about response times, they pointed out that response times for police are different because the police force is out patrolling, and it will depend on where they are located at the time of a call. Unlike the fire station who will always be coming from the center of town.

Mr. Acosta noted that the Capen site is 2 minutes further than the Oakdale site from the East Dedham fire station.

Mr. Donati noted that the select board has also had discussions with public safety about response times and they take it very seriously.

Ms. Ellis read a zoom comment from Britt Teravainen who stated: As a resident who lives across from Greenlodge, with a student in ECEC, I would love the opportunity to get these surveys done again. I bought this property because of the school. I agree with past comments about the survey being flawed. I took the survey and had no idea that the closure decision was so imminent. I know I am not the only one in the neighborhood who feels the same. Thanks for your consideration and the work you all are doing to figure it out.

Ms. Ellis read another comment from Elizabeth Doris-Gustin asked Will new sidewalks be installed at the new school?

Mr. Levi stated that each project will include some improvements to the surrounding sidewalks and student safety efforts. It is very likely that there will be improvements.

4. SBRC Member Statements:

Mr. Tocci stated that they knew from early on this was going to be a very difficult decision and through the deliberate process they narrowed down nine sites to the remaining two. He noted that through this process he has changed his mind many times on what he thinks would be the best solution. The primary motivating factor for his decision is what is best for the children of Dedham long term. He stated it is unacceptable that there are 759 students currently in substandard schools, and the state will kick in a lot more money for building a larger school. He stated he intends to vote for the Oakdale option because Capen has less usable land and outdoor space. The Oakdale option yields 140,000 sf of open space which is important for the students. The site also yields enough space to work in any fixes for parking, drop off, and student safety. Capen does not provide the same flexibility in the future. He also noted that traffic concerns are also a huge reason that the Striar property development did not pass at Town Meeting. Oakdale has better driving and walking access. He also noted that the technical evaluations were discussed, and each member came up with their own evaluations. He also noted that equity throughout the district can be achieved at either Oakdale or Capen sites. He also noted that the cost at Oakdale is less, and the team is very budget conscious. He also noted that there are fewer unknowns at the Oakdale site. Mr. Tocci also noted that the community survey came in overwhelmingly in favor of an Oakdale/Greenlodge combination school and the Oakdale site was clearly a top choice. He stated the only advantage to Capen over Oakdale is the fact that it is an empty site that will allow for zero disruptions to students. He also noted that the SBRC has had discussions with teachers and principals who have stated that the disruption becomes minimal because the students get used to the noise. He noted that most new schools are built this way in Massachusetts. He also noted that the abutters do not have any qualms about the construction happening on the Oakdale site. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Bilafer.

Mr. Bilafer stated that he likes to remind himself of his duties when he is faced with difficult decisions. Based on the Town By-Laws the SBRC is tasked with the responsibility to direct engineering and architectural studies to determine the current physical condition of the Town School Department buildings and to make recommendations to the Town relative to proposed rehabilitation, expansion and/or new construction projects. He stated there is another part about the recommendation aspect detailed in the bylaw that states the committee should maximize the state funding for new projects. He noted both sites under review have advantages and disadvantages. He noted the new school will save the town money on operating costs, and that the price tag will be considerable so he thinks the committee should give themselves the best chance of staying within budget. He noted the Town will still have another school to address after this one and that the Oakdale site will give the committee the best chance of having a successful project. He stated that although the site may not feel as central to all the neighborhoods it does provide better traffic flow for bringing students to the school and for getting vehicles off the street for pick up and drop off. He stated he hopes that those who are disappointed with the recommendation will be able to look past that and see that there is a beautiful new school for the Town, and it will address equity, provide a better environment for teachers and students, and create a new learning environment for students. He believes the new school will provide a new community which will be just as vibrant, for the larger student enrollment.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated this process has been going on for 5 years, not just since September. She then requested to wait to make her statements.

Mr. Heffernan stated this is a very difficult decision. He feels that no matter which option is decided he can work with either. He also noted that there is mitigation required for both sites, disruption for Oakdale students at that site, and traffic at the Capen site. He noted his decision is the Capen site because he is looking at the long term benefits. The student density map shows that the Capen site is in the middle of the population being serviced by the new school. He also noted that after visiting the schools in Westborough and Weston he no longer believes the topography is disadvantageous as the matrix makes the public think it is. Building into the hill provides additional playspace for the students. Lastly he thanked everyone present for their input and he hopes they will understand and respect the decision that is made tonight.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs continued stating these sites have been talked about for 5 years and it started with the update to the Master Plan. She stated that there are just as many unknown's at the Oakdale site, the dirt was an issue at the ECEC site and the Avery Site and it will be a problem at both Capen and Oakdale. She also stated that if the team was able to work with Mass State Highway to mitigate traffic for the ECEC project, they can do it again. She also noted that they did a traffic study before and after the ECEC and the traffic slowed down 20 MPH. She also noted that current designs will do their best to make the drop off and pick up lanes as large as possible. She stated that a 550 enrollment may feel big, but the 235 student enrollment presented for a stand alone Oakdale would not cover the current enrollment so it was not a viable option. She stated that the Manor students have not been able to walk to elementary school since 1982 and it doesn't make sense to have those students walk past the Capen site to get to the Oakdale site. The Oakdale students can walk to Middle School and High school, she wants to give the Manor students an opportunity to walk to a school as well.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the Town has also discussed the lack of fields, and the only place that could fit two full size regulation fields is the Oakdale site. Maybe that site can become a sports complex for the Town. She stated that for her it's about acknowledging the outlier areas of Town and giving them a community building.

Mr. Gonzalez thanked everyone for coming out tonight and for all the emails. He stated he has heard from the start that this was a done deal and he said nothing could be farther from the truth and he has tremendous respect for the committee members. He stated that everyone is in this for the Town of Dedham and he requested people continue to stay engaged. He stated that although there are pros and cons to each site, they need to provide the best school possible and also keep the budget in mind. He stated that he wishes there were many sites throughout Town the size of Oakdale, but that is not the case and they have to work with what they have. One of the considerations is flexibility and Oakdale provides greater flexibility to serve the large number of students who will use the new school. For Capen the Hillside Village is the only option that would provide any flexibility. Oakdale provides options in the short term as well as the long term.

Mr. Donati stated he has children at the Oakdale school and a four year old who will likely be school age when this project is completed, however with redistricting his children may end up at Avery. He also stated that disruption to learning has been a hot topic, but he noted that the students have had disrupted learning being in such old facilities. He also referenced the costs to build three separate schools and the major price tag for the Town if the MSBA money is passed over. He stated he feels strongly that open space is really important and even with a school at Oakdale it could potentially still have a great field space. He also stated there are more ways to come and go from the Oakdale site than the Capen site. He also noted that the new school will take a huge population of students from East

Dedham down to the manor. He also noted that the Oakdale school has a better/faster response time for public safety due to its central location. He stated that although traffic is a concern at the new ECEC, no students walk to that school so it's less of a concern. He also noted that the Avery school still has traffic issues for walkers and it's a fairly new school so he doesn't weigh traffic mitigation as heavily. He stated he believes Oakdale is the better site and he respects everyone on the committee's perspective as well as the that of the public.

Mr. Acosta stated he knows the votes are there in favor of Oakdale, however he has a preference for the Capen site. He stated the three MSBA projects that have been completed to date have been done at alternate sites and that has allowed the town to come in under budget with beautiful new buildings. He also stated he believes Capen provides more benefit to the Town noting that some people's pros are other people cons and vice versa. He stated the Oakdale site already lends itself to a community space and that is something missing from the Greenlodge and Ashcroft neighborhoods. He believes Capen is more centered on the student population which makes more sense for bus transportation. He also noted that East Dedham students may not qualify for free or reduced lunch as well as free bussing due to proximity to the school but may still require that service. He also noted that Capen closed only 5 years ago, and the fields and school are in really tough shape and generally unsafe. He stated there is a lot of data, some opinions, some facts, that are being considered. He is also concerned that the Capen site has been neglected and he is worried that renovation of the site will not have full community support. He believes Town Meeting will be favorable to Oakdale, however there are still three very different options at play on that site and these will create challenges for the committee going forward. He then stated he believes the will of the committee is to vote in favor of the Oakdale site, and requested to make a motion:

MOTION: by Mr. Acosta to exclude the Capen site from consideration for the new 550 enrollment school.

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

Mr. Heffernan stated it is difficult to think that Capen would be removed so quickly.

Mr. Bilafer stated he believes the MSBA recognizes that site selection is the hardest part of any process and seeing split votes is not detrimental to the project. The vote coming out within 1 vote shows that the SBRC has done the work and he prefers to just take a vote on the site. He does not feel the need to have a unanimous vote.

Mr. Donati agrees that a split vote is not necessarily a bad thing, it shows how closely the sites are ranked. He stated the SBRC will have to work really hard to get the community on board.

WITHDRAWAL: Mr. Acosta withdraws the motion

Mr. Tocci thanked everyone who has attended in person and online throughout the last year. He appreciates the work of everyone at the table and he values their input. He thanked the committee and consultants for doing a phenomenal job to get to this point. He then requested a motion.

MOTION: by Mr. Bilafer to select Oakdale as the site to present forward in the preferred schematic report to the MSBA

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Acosta - No
Ms. MacDonald Briggs -No
Mr. Donati -Yes
Mr. Bilafer- YEs
Mr. Tocci - Yes
Mr. Gonzalez- Yes
Mr. Heffernan – No

Motion carries 4-3-0

5. Adjournment.

Mr. Tocci asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Acosta

Unanimous vote to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:35 pm.

Attachments:

Vertex/JLA Slides

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday August 7, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Dr. Ian Kelly, Asst. Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee (Attending via Zoom)		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager	A	Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):	A	Dr. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee	A	Jonathan Levi		Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal
A	Phillip Gonzalez (attending via zoom)		Phillip Gray		
			Carol Harris		

Distribution: SBRC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business:

Mr. Tocci opened the August 7, 2023, SBRC meeting at 7:00pm. He requested approval of minutes from the July 17, 2023, meeting. Mr. Tocci noted that Mr. Gonzalez noticed Mr. Maher’s name was spelled incorrectly and needs to be updated.

MOTION: to approve the July 17, 2023, meeting minutes with correction noted made by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

Roll Call Vote and all members vote to approve minutes.

Motion passes 7-0-0;

2. Schedule Review / Presentation by Paul Munchbach on Vote Timelines:

Mr. Tocci noted the Schematic Design is scheduled to be submitted to the MSBA at the end of 2023 and should be approved by the MSBA at the February 2024 board meeting. At that MSBA board Meeting they will approve the scope and budget for the project. Mr. Tocci then read an excerpt from the MSBA website stating what happens if the Town does not appropriate the money for the project after the Board approves the project and budget.

He stated the Town has 120 days from the 2/28/24 Board Meeting to appropriate the funds for the project. The MSBA policy states in part:

The MSBA appreciates the challenges that school districts face, but the MSBA’s regulations specifically include this 120-day deadline for a local appropriation to ensure that the MSBA’s capital program funds are targeted toward projects and school districts that are ready and able

to make the financial commitment and move forward in a timely manner. Given the overwhelming capital needs of school districts across the Commonwealth and the MSBA's limited capital program funds, the MSBA cannot indefinitely tie up funds allocated for a project that lacks local support.

In the event that a school district fails to approve funding for a proposed project within the 120-day deadline, by no later than 10 business days following the failed vote, the school district must submit to the MSBA a plan that: (1) presents the vote results, (2) explains the school district's understanding of the reason(s) for the failed vote, and (3) sets forth the school district's plan to remedy the failed vote and a suggested timeline for such a remedy. The MSBA will review the plan and determine whether it can continue to set aside MSBA funds for the proposed project. However, a failed local vote likely will result in the school district being required to submit a new Statement of Interest to the MSBA and await a second invitation from the MSBA to enter the feasibility study phase of the MSBA's process.

Mr. Tocci stated this is in line with what the SBRC thought, and he stated that if the project does not pass the Vote, then the Town is back at the end of the line and will need to resubmit to the MSBA.

Mr. Donati asked what remedying the vote means?

Mr. Tocci stated the example they have is that we have is a local municipality that held a special town meeting before the town wide vote and the project fell short of passing by about 7%. They felt if they could get the vote approved by the ballot vote, which requires 51% of the voters to approve the project, that they could then call a special town meeting and the project would pass. They asked the MSBA for additional time to acquire the votes, unfortunately for that town they only received 49% of the ballot votes so it still did not pass. But that is ultimately what the MSBA means, they will give more time to figure out a way to get the votes to approve the project. you can't change the project or design, just try and get the required votes.

Mr. Tocci turned the floor over to Mr. Munchbach to review the voting schedule.

Mr. Munchbach, the Town Clerk, stated he is here to give some guidelines on voting procedures.

Mr. Tocci stated the big question is if we decide to hold an election and votes after the MSBA approves the project on 2/28/23, can we have a special town meeting, then town wide vote, or vice versa. It has to be within 120 days and there is currently a town wide vote scheduled for 4/13/24, what are the rules around notice that needs to be given out?

Mr. Munchbach stated Town of Dedham bylaws dictate when Town Election is (second Saturday of April) and Town Meeting is always the third Monday in May. He noted that only the Selectboard can call a Special Town Meeting, or 200 registered voters can petition for a special town meeting. He also noted that the town requires 90 days from the time of the election is when you can have a special town meeting. For example, the Town election is April 18, 2024 so the earliest you can have the Special Town Meeting is January 5, 2024. Before you have are able to add a question to the election ballot you need to put in the request 35 days prior to the election, which would be before March 8, 2024.

Mr. Donati asked if that's for the special town meeting.

Mr. Munchbach agreed. He stated even though it's within the 90 days from the time of the election, it would have to be realistically 55 days from the day it starts from because he needs 35 days to put the question on the ballot. He also noted that there is an information to voters' law that states any every household with a registered voter needs to be notified by mail with a summary of the ballot

question and a pro statement, con statement, and a summary of what a yes vote means. This has to be sent to all voters at least 10 days prior to the election.

Mr. Munchbach noted that when the Select Board calls for a special town meeting it would have to be some time in December 2023 because they have the vote 45 days after calling the meeting. Within those 45 days the notice can be posted, and the finance committee can have their hearing. The difference between an annual town meeting and a special town meeting is that anyone can submit to have a question on the annual town meeting ballot, but the Selectboard decides what is on the special town meeting ballot. Residents can put an article on the ballot with a 100-signature petition and then the selectboard can place that article on the special town meeting ballot.

Mr. Munchbach noted that regular Town Meeting is Monday May 20, 2024. He stated the Town Moderator is unavailable from February 19, 2024, to March 1, 2024. He stated the SBRC could request a special town meeting for March 4, 2024, timing would be tight, but it could be done. He also noted a special town meeting could be on a different day from a Monday when elections are generally held.

Mr. Tocci stated the deadline for the project, if the MSBA votes on 2/28/24 would be June 26, 2024.

Mr. Acosta stated that a couple of years ago there was a special town election and the week before they had a special town meeting. In theory the SBRC could do the same. He stated instead of having special town meeting put this on the ballot, petitioning the select board to put this on the ballot would be a separate action from a special town meeting being called.

Mr. Munchbach stated that as long as the special town meeting is called 35 days ahead of time you can have the special town meeting within that time frame. The other alternative is if you go to the May Town Meeting. He noted that the Town has special town elections on Tuesdays instead of Monday's, so you could do a special town election as well.

Mr. Bilafer stated that given the fact that the SBRC won't know if we are approved until the end of February, there isn't anything that dictates which vote comes before the other correct?

Mr. Munchbach confirmed. He stated you need a majority vote at the election and 2/3 at Town Meeting regardless of which comes first. He also noted someone asked if this can be placed on the presidential primary vote in November, and the answer is no, you would have to notify the state ahead of time for approval.

Mr. Tocci stated there needs to be 35 days between both votes, correct?

Mr. Munchbach stated that prior to placing anything on the ballot, he needs at least 35 days to place it on the ballot.

Mr. Tocci asked if we could just have the Town Wide vote on April 13, 2024, and have regular town meeting without any special elections.

Mr. Munchbach confirmed. He stated if you were to place the ballot question on the April 13 ballot, the selectboard would also put out the statements for pros and cons and that would meet all the requirements for getting information into households at least 10 days prior. He stated we can put a more definitive timeline as the project moves forward.

Mr. Donati asked about costs for Special Town Meetings and Special Town Elections

Mr. Munchbach stated the Special Town Election costs about \$30,000, most of that is for staffing for the 7 voting precincts. The Special Town Meeting is probably under \$1,000. It is for mailings and the custodians.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about the pro and con statements, is there a process for reviewing what is said? He stated he brings this up because there is some inaccurate information circulating about what has happened and he wants to make sure the information circulated is accurate.

Mr. Munchbach stated the selectboard will decide who writes the statements and if nothing is submitted, Town Counsel would write the statements. Once they submit the statements, they cannot be challenged or argued because they are opinions, so there isn't much you can do about inaccuracies at that point.

Mr. Heffernan stated that based on state requirements we can still hold a special Town Meeting before the general election.

Mr. Munchbach confirmed.

Mr. Bilafer asked if there is anything on Fincom requirements? Because we won't have any approval until February 28.

Mr. Munchbach stated that as far as the Finance Committee they would not make any recommendations prior to the election, but they could make a recommendation on Town Meeting floor. As long as the warrant is proposed ahead of time, they can schedule the hearing accordingly and it would still give you a month for them to have hearings and deliberations. That would be plenty of time, also the language of the article can be amended if needed.

Mr. Tocci asked Mr. Heffernan if he has any comments on that timeframe as he is a member of Fincom.

Mr. Heffernan stated Fincom can do the hearing up front and even before February 28, 2024, with the understanding the vote can happen after that.

Mr. Lemieux stated there is time between when Schematic Design is submitted and when it approves, there is also communication with the MSBA between that submission and approval on what the reimbursement to the Town will be.

Mr. Heffernan stated there is a lot of information Fincom will need and it will be a benefit to have discussions earlier even if it's not the finalized numbers.

Mr. Munchbach also noted that there is a meeting the Monday prior to the vote to allow for the team to tighten up any numbers if needed.

Mr. Tocci thanked Mr. Munchbach for everything he has done for the committee.

3. Consideration of School building Design and Matrix, Vote on preferred Design Concept:

Mr. Tocci requested Mr. Levi run through the four options still under consideration right now.

*Mr. Levi presented the four options on the screen

Mr. Levi stated this is the same presentation as the last meeting. All four options are the same in their ability to meet the program. He noted that Option C is slightly less efficient so it's a larger building. Option A is the "Academic Courtyard Scheme" and is two stories in height with a courtyard in the center of the building.

Option B is the "Common Core Welcome" which has all the common areas in the center and is arched toward the back of the site. The gymnasium is at the center of the building with a lower and upper school wing on either side.

Option C is the Addition/Renovation option which preserves the existing 1902 building. It has two wings which are elaborately phased in their construction, and they are located on either side of the existing building.

Option D is the "Core Cluster" which was prepared after the site walk with the abutters. This curves away from the street to provide greater separation from abutters and the gymnasium is located at the

far corner of the site. The Media Center is clustered with the cafetorium and admin areas. There is also an upper and a lower-class wing on either side of the cluster.

Mr. Tocci thanked Mr. Levi for his time and efforts on all the different designs.

Ms. Murphy stated she wants to clarify that the school department has no intention of selling the Greenlodge property. They intend to repurpose the building and have it continue to serve the community and Dedham Schools. The plan is to have a group or committee come together to discuss an academic or community use for the building. She went on to discuss what 21st century learning looks like in a brand-new school. She stated we will be able to say we are truly an inclusive school environment and can handle physical, emotional, and academic needs of the students. We are excited to have regulated climate control and air quality. We will have increased school security with automatic internal and external locking doors and the ability to communicate. There will be enhanced interactive technology, so students will be working with smart board systems and not just have projected screens. The teachers will also be able to teach from multiple parts of the classroom. There are also speakers so the teachers' voices are amplified and students at the back of the classroom can still hear.

Ms. Murphy continued stating there will be a cafeteria, so students don't have to eat in their classrooms anymore. She also stated there will be a kitchen so students can have hot meals. There will also be allocated professional spaces for teachers to collaborate and learn as well. Students will also have flexible learning spaces and a brand-new STEAM/STEM room for students to engage with technology and create using that technology. The outdoor play spaces will be ADA compliant and accessible and there will be dedicated spaces for art, music, and gym as well as outdoor classrooms. She also stated there will be the ability to have a whole school assembly and allow for all the parents to assemble at the school as well.

Ms. Hermesch stated that many of the things Ms. Murphy touched upon were discussed during the visioning process and through communication with the community. She also noted that even though Ms. McGowan is not attending tonight she has been very involved in this process and providing feedback on the designs. With that in mind they feel that Option D is the model that will realize that vision to the fullest. They like the building curve and the way it allows for individual areas for each grade level. They would like to propose moving the gymnasium to the other end of the building, closer to Cedar Street to keep core spaces together. The building shape also allows for create outdoor spaces for learning as well.

Mr. Donati stated its clear that community feedback was reflected in Option D, but he would like to know why they chose Option D vs. Option B.

Ms. Hermesch stated Option B was a close second, but they chose D particularly if the gym can be relocated to the other side of the building and they don't like the gym location in Option B because you have to cut through the building to get to it.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked Mr. Levi if there is a problem with moving the gym.

Mr. Levi stated that during the next phase they team can review many sub-alternate layouts of this layout. He also noted that the main difference between options B and D is the direction the building curves, away from the street vs. toward the street.

Mr. Donati stated in relation to Option C, the addition/renovation option, the team now realizes that if the building were to remain it would really only be the shell of the building and he believes some of the elements of the 1902 building can be incorporated into the new design. He also noted that Option C has

more construction phases and a longer construction schedule and will cost more. That is a lot to overcome for just saving the façade and the actual building location on the site.

Mr. Tocci stated the charge of the SBRC is to make a decision in the best interest of the children and educators and the extended schedule and added costs for renovating the building is not in the best interest of the kids and educators.

Ms. Murphy stated it would be great if something historic from both buildings could be used and incorporated into the new building.

Mr. Bilafer stated the feedback from the educators is critical for this process. He also noted everyone understands the attachment to the old Oakdale building, however keeping the building becomes more of a historic preservation than a restoration. He believes new construction is the way to go.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the back access from Monroe Street won't be interrupted, correct?

Ms. Hermesch stated it shouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Acosta thanked Ms. Murphy and Ms. Hermesch for their perspectives. And he is excited for the new buildings and the students to get the maximum out of their education. He also stated he supports option D as it is the most cost-effective option.

Mr. Tocci opened up the floor to comments on the four designs.

Ms. Sherry Cross thanked the Board and superintendent Murphy for all their work. She's excited for what the students will be gaining. She stated in terms of parking, does the team believe there is adequate parking? And she stated there is not enough room in the cafetorium for all families to gather and there also is not enough parking for all the parents. Has that been addressed?

Mr. Levi stated the current plans are based on existing parking at both existing schools. The traffic study that will be done in the fall will help determine the right number of parking spaces and the intent is to provide adequate parking. He also noted that per MSBA standards the Cafetorium does not need to accommodate assemblies for the entire school and parents and families. But they can find a way to combine with cafetorium with an adjacent space with operable panels, and the team will explore that in the next phase.

Mr. Donati asked if the community decided to have a larger cafetorium can the Town pay for the added cost for the larger building?

Mr. Lemieux stated there are some items the MSBA will allow for larger spaces, like the gym, but we can reach out to the MSBA and ask. However, if you wanted to make the cafetorium 1.5 sizes larger they will not agree to that. He also stated at one school the gym and cafetorium were adjacent to each other and separated by an operable panel so it would enlarge the space if needed for assemblies. He noted that doing that does cost more, and moveable walls may not be as sturdy as masonry walls. It is something the SBRC will have to review and weigh the options.

Ms. Hermesch stated that currently the schools have gym-atoriums, could that be an option?

Mr. Levi stated he would have to ask the MSBA but believes they would be open to the conversation.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that it also provides great storage for gym equipment under the stage. She also asked about bleachers.

Mr. Levi stated that it takes too much added spaces, but it could be discussed.

Mr. Tocci opened the floor to online comments.

Elizabeth Hayes asks: For the question about Monroe Street access. If the gym is moved to the other side on design D per Kim Hermesch's suggestion this seems to help ensure we that Monroe street

entrance to the school property remains accessible throughout construction and once the school is open.

Patrick Magee asks: Is underground parking below the building possible, much like is done at the new Public Safety building? Not sure if that is encouraged in schools or not. Thanks

Mr. Levi stated underground parking is very, very, very expensive, about \$140,000 per space.

MOTION: to approve Design D as our preferred design and our choice for the Preferred Schematic Report

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

Roll Call Vote: Motion passes 7-0-0

4. To Confirm Votes from Last Week:

Mr. Tocci noted that the previous votes from the 7/31/23 meeting should have been roll call votes because there were SBRC members who were participating via Zoom. He would like the committee to reconfirm the votes.

The first is to reconfirm the vote about establishing a communications and outreach subcommittee.

MOTION: to confirm the July 31st votes to establish a communications and outreach subcommittee by Mr. Donati.

SECOND: by Mr. Acosta

Roll Call Vote Motion Passes 7-0-0

The next is to authorize ex-officio members.

MOTION: to confirm the July 31st vote to authorize the subcommittee to make recommendations to appoint ex-officio members by Mr. Bilafer

SECOND: Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Roll Call Vote Motion Passes 7-0-0

The last vote to confirm is the ex-officio member Asst. superintendent of business and finance as an ex-officio member.

MOTION: to confirm the July 31st vote to authorize the Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance as an ex-officio member of the SBRC made by Mr. Acosta

SECOND: Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Roll Call Vote Motion Passes 7-0-0

5. New Business:

Mr. Tocci asked if there is any new business.

Mr. Acosta stated he would like to discuss how we can be more engaging with Town Meeting at a future meeting and requests that be added to an upcoming agenda or to be referred to the communications subcommittee.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs requested that be added to a September or October agenda.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that listening to the Town Clerk speak about timelines, he requests a visual timeline to reflect the different options and timing between votes and relationship of the various different

bodies (Fincom, Selectboard, etc.) involved in the process. This will help folks understand the sequence and process and how it ties into the MSBA process.

Mr. Lemieux agreed and stated that this group should be presenting a project update at the Fall Town Meeting as well to provide accurate information and also provide information on what happens next.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the week before the 11/13/23 Town Meeting is the Mini Town Meeting which would be a great opportunity for that.

Mr. Donati summarized and stated the SBRC will have a table at Dedham Day, talk to Town Meeting Members, attend Mini Town Meeting, and attend Town Meeting.

Mr. Tocci confirmed. He also decided to table the discussion on upcoming meetings until the August 21, 2023, meeting.

6. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci stated he is opening the meeting to public comment.

Stephany Roman unmuted and asked of the school board team: they talked about how this school will have better community opportunities. However, is there any concern or how do they plan to create a community environment with such a large school vs our smaller community schools? She also noted that it is shown to be detrimental to students to have to travel further to school. She noted 550 students is larger than both the MA and US average elementary school size. She asked if anyone has shared these concerns and how do you create a community environment in such a large school?

Ms. Murphy stated she was a principal of a pre-k through 4 school with 560 students and it is possible to have a large school feel intimate and small at the same time. She stated the students will continue to be nurtured in the larger setting. She stated keeping the younger students together in a smaller setting, and providing ongoing opportunities for students to meet in large or small settings is important. She stated morning meetings are a great way to do that. Also offering opportunities for families to be engaged in the building after school is another way to create community especially for single grades at one time. She stated there are both advantages and disadvantages to larger schools, however she sees it as a win. There are more professional resources and also resources and diversity for students.

Ms. Hermesch stated she also came from a larger school as a teacher as she along with Ms. McGowan will continue to engage with parents and students to find out what is important and to include and engage everyone within the new community.

Mr. Donati asked if class size plays a role in any of that.

Ms. Hermesch stated that class sizes will remain small in the new school.

Mr. Donati stated that having more options for ways to place students within the grade is better for both teachers and students.

Mr. Levi stated that the district has been very vocal about wanting 6 tracks per grade to keep the small class sizes even though the MSBA prefers 5 tracks.

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

Roll Call Vote to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 9:50 pm.

Attachments:

JLA presentation
Vertex presentation.

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Paul M. Munchbach
Town Clerk

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday August 21, 2023 – 7:00 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Dr. Ian Kelly, Asst. Superintendent (non-voting)
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dedham TV
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee (Attending via Zoom)		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager	A	Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):	A	Dr. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee		Jonathan Levi		Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Philip Gray		
		A	Carol Harris		

Distribution: SBRC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business:

Mr. Tocci opened the August 21, 2023, SBRC meeting at 7:00pm. He asked for old business, there is none. He requested approval of minutes from the June 17, 2023, meeting and the July 31, 2023, meeting.

MOTION: to approve the June 17, 2023, meeting minutes with correction noted made by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

Roll Call Vote and all members vote to approve minutes

Motion passes 7-0-0;

MOTION: to approve the July 31, 2023, meeting minutes with correction noted made by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

Roll Call Vote and all members vote to approve minutes

Motion passes 7-0-0;

2. Approval of Past Minutes:

He requested approval of minutes from the June 17, 2023, meeting and the July 31, 2023, meeting. He noted some members already submitted comments to Ms. Ellis.

MOTION: to approve the June 17, 2023, meeting minutes with corrections made by Mr. Heffernan.

SECOND: by Mr. Acosta

Roll Call Vote and all members vote to approve minutes from June 17, 2023: Motion passes 7-0-0;

MOTION: to approve the July 31, 2023, meeting minutes with correction noted made by Mr. Heffernan

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Roll Call Vote and all members vote to approve minutes from July 31, 2023, minutes.

3. Timeline and Preferred Schematic Report Update.

Mr. Theran ran through the timeline slide and noted the PSR report is due Thursday August 31, 2023, and the remainder of the timeline is unchanged. The team will fill in the dates for the votes in the spring once a decision has been made.

Mr. Gray stated tonight is an important night because it is a milestone and the site, enrollment, and building design decisions have all been made. All the decisions and work done to date has been compiled into the PSR report. He noted all the minutes from all the meetings are documentation of all the decisions made to date. Once the report has been submitted the team will go to the MSBA office to review and talk about the report. And then we are fully in Schematic Design which becomes the basis of the Scope and Budget and Agreement with the MSBA. That is when they decide what their grant is going to be.

Mr. Tocci noted the PDP was approved and submitted to the MSBA at the end of March.

Mr. Gray stated that is correct and we received one set of formal comments and the team responded to those within the allotted two-week time period.

Mr. Tocci asked if any SBRC members have any questions. There are none.

Mr. Tocci asked if any members of the public have any questions or clarifications on the PSR report.

Mr. Driscoll stated he does not have a copy of the D option for the project, and he wants to know where he can find a copy.

Ms. Ellis pulled up the website and navigated where to find it on the website. It is located under the "Current Meeting Materials" tab on the left of the website and the option is included the presentation from the July 31, 2023, meeting folder.

Mr. Bilafer asked if it is clear to the MSBA in the PSR submission that we want a 6-track school at the Dedham enrollments and not a 5-track school at the requested MSBA enrollments.

Mr. Gray confirmed.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the principals have asked for modifications to the designs shown on the website.

Mr. Gray confirmed, these are concepts and will and can change going forward.

Mr. Tocci stated the principals had asked about moving the gymnasium closer to Cedar Street and the JLA team will look at that.

Mr. Matt Melia, via zoom, asked if there are any neighborhood meetings upcoming so the neighbors can know what is happening and he would appreciate a site walk through.

Mr. Tocci stated we had one meeting, with notices sent to the abutters, it was held on July 13. He noted the team will certainly do that again in the future.

Mr. David Silver, via zoom, stated he is concerned with closing the Greenlodge School and what will happen with that building.

Ms. Murphy stated the school committee does not intend to sell the Greenlodge property and it will be repurposed to serve the community. That is the consensus at this time, to have it continue to serve students.

Mr. Silver stated he does not want to see apartments built on the property.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that has never been the intention of the School Committee.

Mr. Acosta stated he requested the school committee create a "facilities sub committee" to address the reuse of the building as well as maintaining the existing buildings and keeping them as up to date as possible.

Ms. Ellis read a comment from Mr. Czastry: My question: do board members have any statements to make on the site/planning concerns raised by Planning Board Member Jim McGrail and Zoning Board of Appeals Member Tom Ryan?

Mr. Tocci stated he has not seen all of the comments, but he stated Mr. McGrail raised some concerns at the meeting. Mr. Tocci stated he addressed the comments at the meeting and will not address them further here. He stated one question Mr. McGrail asked was about the Greenlodge School and that has already been addressed this evening.

Ms. Ellis read a comment from Ms. Denise McCarthy Why repurpose it for students if it's not "safe" enough for the students that attend now? Greenlodge is a close community and why are you closing the center of our little community?

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated no one has stated at any time during this process that the Greenlodge school is unsafe. She may be thinking about the Capen School, and it was more about it being unfit. The Greenlodge and Oakdale combined due to proximity.

MOTION: Motion to approve the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA, detailing a 550-student enrollment at the Oakdale site, utilizing design Option D, including any minor edits proposed by the SBRC, through its Chair, the School Committee, through its Chair or other project team members made by Mr. Bilafer

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Roll Call Vote: Motion passes 7-0-0

Mr. Silver via zoom stated the meeting minutes are missing from the SBRC website.

Mr. Tocci stated that once they are approved, they are posted to the Town Website on the SBRC page.

Ms. Ellis stated she can add the meeting minutes to the project website.

4. Consideration of Project Name.:

Mr. Tocci stated the project name change is the purview of the School Committee but he did want the SBRC to have the chance to share their thoughts. He also noted this is not a name change with the MSBA but for the Dedham Community.

Mr. Donati stated he suggests the team move on this as quickly as possible and make it clear that it encompasses the Greenlodge and Oakdale schools.

Ms. McGowan stated she would love to see the Greenlodge name included in the project name, so it is understood that school is included.

Ms. Hermesch stated no one has the desire to continue calling the project just the Oakdale School. She also stated it will include many students and should include all the local communities.

Ms. Murphy stated the School Committee is looking to give the public a more comprehensive view of what we are talking about, which is bringing two school communities together into one building.

Mr. Heffernan agrees, it is a good time to change the name.

Ms. Murphy clarified and stated this is a reference to the project name, it will not be the name of the new school.

Zoom comments as read by Ms. Ellis:

Mr. Czazasty stated he likes calling the project "Dedham Elementary School Project". Keep it simple. Greenlodge-Oakdale Elementary School Project" is a mouthful and doesn't account for the fact that redistricting will impact all school districts.

Ms. Alicia O'Brien asks Is SBRC considering including Avery as well? In an effort not to repeat previous mistakes, it should be clear that this project affects other schools as well - not just Oakdale and Greenlodge given the redistricting conversation.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC has been clear from day one that this affects all students in the entire town. He defers to the School Committee on what to call the project going forward.

5. Report on Planning Board Meeting:

Mr. Tocci stated he, Mr. Levi, and Mr. Theran attended the Planning Board Meeting last week, he noted this is the earliest a project has been presented to the Planning Board. He noted there was a lot of appreciation for the early engagement, and the team asked for comments. He noted some of the members had some great suggestions and insights, particularly about traffic, and lighting.

Mr. Heffernan stated he also attended the meeting, and he was disappointed with how the meeting went. He stated he has never seen an applicant unable to finish their presentation because they were cut off. He stated it was very frustrating and he hopes that going forward we have a better discussion and dialog. He stated one of the planning board members stated they should have a seat on the SBRC, and he said there is a way to do that, by submitting a warrant article to change the by law. He stated that is something that should be moved through because it would make sense.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she attended the meeting as well and also found it very frustrating. She stated the SBRC made such great strides with the Planning Board when they did the ECEC project, creating better drop off and pick up, traffic, and parking. She continued and stated the planning board can really help with traffic, egress, lighting, snow removal, landscaping, walking and bike routes, and architecture. She stated we need to focus on the good stuff.

Mr. Tocci thanked Mr. Podolski for recognizing what was happening and trying to redirect things. Mr. Levi was able to complete his presentation and they received some great input.

6. School Committee Report:

Mr. Acosta stated they are working on creating the facilities subcommittee, and they will discuss the school building name as well.

Ms. Ellis read Zoom comments:

Bernadette O Connor asked just wondering if the Greenlodge does close, how much extra tax will Dedham residents have to pay to rehab for other school programs to be held there.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she thinks she's asking what the cost will be for the Town to open another program, and they are in the process of looking at a few different options.

Siobhan Ross asks What is the Town going to do with Greenlodge property? Also, is there talk, or a plan, to redistrict?

Ms. Ellis noted the Greenlodge school was already discussed.

Mr. Tocci stated the School Committee will review redistricting.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated this was addressed two weeks ago, and it starts typically about a year before the school opens. Vertex hired a redistricting consultant to do a study, but the School Committee is hoping to re-engage with them to develop a plan down the road.

Siobhan Ross asks Also, who will pay for bussing? And is there a representative from Greenlodge on the SRCB board?

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC representatives represent the entire town and the children, and the task is to deliver a school that best serves them in the most cost-effective manner. We don't represent neighborhoods.

Mr. Wells stated there is a fee structure for bussing if you are under 1 mile from the school.

Mr. Tocci stated there are two busses to Greenlodge and one to Oakdale.

Mr. Wells stated there are 11 busses district wide.

Ms. Ellis read one last comment from Ms. Alicia O'Brien who stated One person's opinion, the Planning Board made a lot of sense in their concerns raised. It highlighted how illogical this process has felt, to use their words.

7. Communications and outreach Subcommittee.

Mr. Donati stated there was a letter sent to all the Town Meeting officers to share with the Town Meeting Members for each precinct. The letter focused mainly on the 21st century school and conditions of the current school as well as costs for the new building.

Mr. Tocci asked if the letter has been distributed to all town meeting members.

Mr. Donati stated it's not a very efficient method because some emails go to spam folders, he stated there is no way to know if everyone received a copy.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if there has been any reaction or responses.

Mr. Tocci stated he has seen it posted on social media but can't say he has seen anything noteworthy.

Mr. Acosta stated he sent the vacancy posting to the SBRC members to review prior to the meeting. For the number of vacancies, the subcommittee chose not to put a firm number of requested members to allow for flexibility while reviewing applications. He noted the responsibilities came directly from the Town Charter and noted the current schedule of meeting every other Monday. He noted that the subcommittee requests a broad set of experience and noted they are looking for preferences for school building construction experience, parents of students, and educators from Oakdale and Greenlodge.

Ms. Murphy stated having two educators who can present the positivity to the community will be great for getting information out and building positivity.

Mr. Bilafer stated once the subcommittee has a panel of proposed members, is the approval just a vote of the SBRC?

Mr. Tocci stated that appears to be correct.

Mr. Tocci then asked where this will be posted?

Mr. Acosta stated it will be posted on the Town website and also in the Dedham Times.
Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked what the timeframe is for applications? She noted that for School Committee there was a 30-day posting requirement.
Mr. Acosta stated it can be on a rolling basis or a hard deadline.
Mr. Tocci stated he believes it needs to be posted for 10 days and he can work with the Town on getting it advertised this week.
Mr. Acosta stated he would like to keep it open longer.
Mr. Gonzalez asked how this affects the teachers since this is being posted two weeks before school is starting and they are one of the target audiences.
Ms. Hermesch stated it shouldn't be a problem and she can include something in her emails to the teachers as well.
Mr. Acosta stated he can keep it open for 21 days and reassess if needed.

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to post the proposed SBRC vacancy announcement for ex-officio members.

MOTION: to post the proposed SBRC vacancy announcement for ex-officio members made by Mr. Gonzalez.

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer.

ROLL CALL VOTE: unanimously passed 7-0-0

8. Dates and Times for September Meetings:

Mr. Tocci stated he wants to keep every two week schedule for now.

** SBRC Discussion on meeting dates, and has the following schedule:

Monday 9/11/23 SBRC Meeting

Sunday 9/24/23 Dedham Day

Tuesday 9/26/23 SBRC Meeting

10/17/23 is the Select Board Summit

The SBRC will hold off on deciding on the October Meeting Schedule

9. New Business:

Mr. Lemieux stated that one of the decisions that will need to be made as a group is what project delivery method they want for this project. The two options are Design Bid Build chapter 149 or CM at Risk chapter 149a. He noted that the most recent Design Bid Build projects were the ECEC and Town Hall, and the most recent CM At Risk Projects were the Public Safety and Avery projects. He noted the biggest difference between the two is when you go CM at Risk you are hiring a professional to help complete the design, with Design Bid Build (DBB) you are purchasing a building from a builder you will meet on Bid Day. CM At Risk has become more popular because you get the benefit of their estimator. Mr. Lemieux noted that throughout the process the Designer will do 3 estimates throughout Design Development and the OPM will hire an independent estimator to do the same and those estimates get compared. With CM at Risk you get the estimator from the contractor who will be doing the work. They also have input as the design moves along. Another big benefit of CM at Risk is that the project can start before the final design is complete which is great because the schedules are very tight for getting new schools complete. They do this by issuing early release packages for site work, concrete, and steel so those trades can get started and help the schedule. In DBB the design has to be 100% complete before you put it out on the street for pricing.

CM at Risk does tend to be more expensive, at least up front, because they hold more contingencies. If those contingencies don't get used, the money goes back to the owner. CM at Risk is also open book accounting which is beneficial. In DBB if the GC has any cost savings, they keep it and the owner doesn't ever see the difference in cost. He stated the CM Bids the project prior the documents being complete by providing a price per month for general conditions and a stated fee, example 2% on the entire project. Once all the sub trades are bid, they add all those numbers up, add their overhead and fee costs and that becomes the GMP, Guaranteed Maximum Price.

Mr. Lemieux noted the biggest difference is the CM becomes part of the team, the DBB General Contractor you meet on bid day. He also noted we have to apply to the Inspector General for permission to use a CM at Risk.

Mr. Lemieux noted that the cost of bringing a CM on early is just the cost of the estimate if you brought them on now, but you can bring them on after a vote as well. It's up the committee. He noted that with an occupied site and the logistics required it makes sense to have a CM, but that is up to the committee.

Mr. Tocci asked what is required of the SBRC if they decide to do CM at Risk, when does the SBRC have to authorize the decision, or is it the school department.

Mr. Lemieux stated it's a Town decision and each Town is different with what authority makes the decision.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the SBRC has voted on it in the past.

Mr. Bilafer stated the Town has to sign off on it, but it was the SBRC who voted.

Mr. Lemieux stated he would expect the IG to approve Dedham to move forward with CM because the Town has done it before, SBRC members have done it before, and the team has experience. He noted that the IG requires 60 days for approval so if we wanted to use a CM for the SD estimate we should do the application now. But if we wanted to use them for the Design Development phase we have time. If we haven't decided yet we can still include the cost for a CM in the SD estimate.

Mr. Bilafer requested confirmation that there are no added budgetary costs to bring them on now correct?

Mr. Lemieux confirmed. He stated if that's how they would like to proceed Vertex will do all the work and we should do that now.

Mr. Bilafer asked if Vertex will make a recommendation on which way to go.

Mr. Gray stated the current estimates include CM at Risk and they recommend using that delivery on a project of this size and on an occupied site.

Mr. Lemieux stated he agrees with Philip, largely due to the proximity to the neighbors. And there are enough characteristics aside from cost so we would recommend going CM. He stated we can start the process pre vote and have a CM on board and ready, or we can wait until after, but we should not wait on the application.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked if someone from Vertex is going to be on site the entire time, correct?

Mr. Lemieux confirmed.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the last project was on time and on budget because they went Design Bid Build, and the conversation is great and should be ongoing.

Mr. Lemieux stated the next big decision will be the delivery method, he thinks it's a little tight to make a decision for SD and he doesn't want to rush the process because interviews would have to be in November and that is a busy time of year. He also stated we shouldn't do the application just to do it, only if we are actually thinking about going that way.

Mr. Gonzalez asks what it does to the ability to be ready for the DBB if we start down the CM at Risk track?

Mr. Lemieux stated the only risk we have is the schedule, it takes a little longer to design and maybe you don't get as much interest in the bids. Those things could affect the schedule and then it could become a Winter move in for the faculty and staff. The CM gives more flexibility because you can start sooner.

Mr. Heffernan stated he has experience with both DBB for smaller projects and CM at Risk for larger projects. He considers this as a larger project. He stated with CM you get to interview the applicants and you can choose which ones you want, and you have a say in the key subs for the project.

Mr. Lemieux clarified and stated that with public CMR you don't have a say on the trade bid pieces because they are bid out like filed sub bids, however you do have representation for buy outs with the CM and you can see the actual bids from each of the subs. He also noted that all the contractors get prequalified, so there is a process to vet some of the contractors.

Mr. Gray stated that CM at Risk can allow the designers to meet with the subs and get their input on ways to do things in a more cost-effective manner.

Mr. Lemieux stated that with a project this size we are looking at about CM's that do work of this size and maybe a handful of GC's that do work this size. So, you have fewer players to choose from.

Mr. Wells stated he has experience with both DBB and CM at Risk and has good experiences with both.

Mr. Tocci stated the SBRC will consider this at the September 11, 2023, meeting.

Mr. Lemieux stated based on this conversation this is not something we need for the SD, and we can talk more through September and October. He stated we have to let the MSBA as part of the SD, but we don't have to start the selection process yet.

Mr. Tocci stated we can discuss this further at the September 11 meeting, but not have to take a vote at that meeting.

Mr. Tocci stated he will be attending on the next Active Transportation Working Group meeting in early September.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated there should be school committee representation at that meeting.

Mr. Donati stated it may make sense to have a representative from the Active Transportation Working Group to attend an SBRC Meeting as well.

Mr. Acosta stated most of their meetings have been at 4pm, so it shouldn't conflict with any School Committee meetings.

Mr. Tocci then asked the Board if they would like to adjust the times of the SBRC meetings to start at 6:30pm instead.

Ms. McGowan stated that would be great.

The SBRC members, Vertex, and JLA agreed.

Mr. Tocci stated the next September meetings will start at 6:30pm.

10. Public Comment:

Ms. Ellis read some Zoom Comments:

Siobhan Ross asked Is Greenlodge going to the only grammar school students that will be bussed? All the others can walk.

Denise McCarthy stated That is not fair statement that you serve the town. No one from Greenlodge is on the board/committee. We deserve representation!

Andrew Czazasty asked Do the Greenlodge/Oakdale principal have a general estimate of what percentage of students walk to school?

Mr. Tocci stated approximately 20% and asked the principals to confirm.

Ms. McGowan stated it does not tend to be a lot consistently, but she can get more information in the next month.

Mr. Donati stated the Safe Routes to School committee could provide some mor information.

Ms. Hermesch stated 1/5 of her population takes the bus currently.

Ms. McGowan stated she has two busses so well over 30% are bussed currently.

Katie Guiney Where can town members access this letter?

Mr. Tocci stated it is posted on the Friends of the Greenlodge Oakdale School website.

Andrew Czazasty stated Regarding Josh's "more efficient system": town meeting voted so that all town meeting members must submit their email address or phone number to the town clerk. The SBRC should use that list to communicate directly to town meeting representatives

Mr. Tocci stated it was voted that the Town Meeting Member submit their emails to the Town Clerk, he has talked to Mr. Munchbach about this multiple times.

Mr. Bilafer stated he can request that all Town Meeting members subscribe to information for this project, and he refers that to the Communications subcommittee.

Siobhan Ross stated So, I'm clear, no representation from Greenlodge, is on the committee I mentioned? I think a representative from the impacted neighborhood is a must. Can I join? Process?

Ms. Ellis noted we spoke about the process earlier to become an ex-officio member.

Mr. Tocci stated he disagrees with the statement that there is no representation for Greenlodge. That the people who serve on this committee serve the entire Town and the best interest of the Town and the Students.

Bernadette O'Connor asked Has a staff plan being started, from the administration, will the proposed school have 2 principles, 2 nurses ext.

Mr. Tocci stated it's a little early to say at this point.

11. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci stated he is opening the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Bilafer

SECOND: by Mr. Acosta

Roll Call Vote to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 9:52 pm.

Attachments:

JLA presentation


Vertex presentation.

Dedham
Elementary School
Dedham Public Schools

SBRC Meeting
August 21, 2023



MSBA FEASIBILITY / SCHEMATIC PROCESS & BEYOND



PDP: Preliminary Design Plan | PSR: Preferred Schematic Report | SD: Schematic Design Report
 • Aligned with MSBA Board Meetings and Town Ballot | Dates shown are approximate



PSR Update – Due Thursday August 31, 2023 VERTEX

The purpose of the Preferred Schematic Report is to summarize the process and conclusions of the Preliminary and Final Evaluation of Alternatives and substantiate and document the District's selection and recommendation of a preferred solution.

The Report should address all concerns and questions raised by the MSBA during its review of the Preliminary Design Program.

The PSR will include all presentations and minutes of this process and the district's formally voted conclusions including:

- The selected (550 student) enrollment option by the school committee.
- Selected site (Oakdale), and selected design approach (Option D).
- It will also include the comment responses requested in their PDP review.



Q&A / Contact Information

VERTEX

Questions or comments?

To submit a question or comment at a later date, please use the dedicated project email address:

oakdaleproject@dedham.k12.ma.us


Frequently Asked Questions (**FAQs**) will be compiled and posted to the project's website:

<https://www.dedham.k12.ma.us/Page/2802>


Town Clerk

Paul M. MacLachlan

At the City Annex



**DEDHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Committee Meeting
August 22, 2023**



MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert
Stephen Acosta (remote participation)
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant (remote participation)
Cailen McCormick (absent)
Christopher Polito
Laurie Twomey

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Nan Murphy, Superintendent
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Matthew Wells, Assistant Superintendent of Business and Finance
Dr. Ian Kelly, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (absent)
Dr. Heather Smith, Interim Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum (absent)

Meeting Location:

O'Brien Meeting Room

School Committee Meeting commenced at 7:00 pm.

Open Meeting

Mr. Victor Hebert, Chair, called the meeting to order

Pledge of Allegiance

PUBLIC COMMENT

Andrew Czazatsy, 118 Sprague St., believes that building the new school at the site of the old Oakdale School will create inequities in the Manor area of Dedham. People with families will not want to move to the Manor area and this will cause the demise of that area.

Nicole Homire, Greenlodge St. registered complaints about the size of school. She said even though the building will hold more students, at the same time it seems it will not be big enough for projected enrollment.

Jim Maher, 22 Sherman Road, president of the Manor due to the lack of feedback from the Greenlodge community. He said that there are so many people on vacation that this is not a good time for a vote. He feels that due to the name of the project, Greenlodge/Manor families had no idea about the

Greenlodge closing. He thanked Supt. Murphy for her attempts to change the name of the project to be more inclusive of the Greenlodge/Manor community.

Peter Zahka, 216 Greenlodge St. feels that the SBRC recommendation is the wrong decision. He feels that the School Committee needs to be informed that a significant number of Town Meeting members will not vote for the project. He would like to see all the elementary schools retained. He thinks more people would support a stand alone school at Oakdale.

Josh Langmead, 12 Border St. PTO President of Oakdale School thanked John Tocci and the other SBRC members for all the work they have put into this project. He said he doesn't necessarily agree with the decision, but he does not want to go backwards at this late date. He agrees that neighborhood schools are the fabric of Dedham, but our buildings are failing our teachers and students. Change is difficult, but our priority should be the progress of our students.

Lindsey Galvaz has lived in Dedham since she was 10 years old. She felt welcomed into the community as a fifth grader and now her kids attend the Greenlodge School. She would like to see the Town fix the schools that exist, rather than building bigger schools.

Elizabeth Doris Gustin, 8 Walker Lane lives in the Riverdale district. She said the Riverdale School is 100 years old and she feels that the faster Oakdale/Greenlodge School is built, the quicker that Riverdale can be upgraded. She is amazed that Dedham has erected three schools in such a short period. She noted the importance of having new schools to enhance security and safety.

Superintendent's Update

Highlights from Superintendent Murphy's update include:

- Dedham Public Schools are now on Social Media: Facebook, Instagram, X (Twitter) and LinkedIn. The Superintendent thanked Sara Errickson for her role in launching this program. This will allow more people to know what is happening in the district and allow better communication within the school staff and faculty.
- New migrant families are coming into Dedham. The state and Dedham have a contract to add 200 families. 30 new students will be registered in the district. Dedham will be getting state funding for each student by the number of days spent in the district.
- Diversity Equity and Inclusion Coordinator is still posted. The job has been open since May. Extended the posting in order to look further to find a candidate with experience working with students.
- 3-day Leadership Retreat was held at Curry College. The Retreat was called Aligning Systems, Structures and Instruction.
- Upgrades to the Turf Field have not been completed due to the inclement weather. All the games have been scheduled to be away until later fall.

Ms. Briggs asked about the turf situation at DHS. Mr. Wells said the track had some water problems draining from the Concession Stand, but drainage was added to pull water away from the field.

Mr. Polito asked if we could have a hard deadline on the turf/field so we can still use the field in fall. Mr. Wells said the topcoat needs to cure for three days and then the paint needs to cure and all the rain has affected that project. Mr. Wells said he is still confident that the project can be completed by the fall.

Mr. Polito asked how we are doing on staffing. Murphy said there are Paraprofessionals positions like crossing guard and music positions but classrooms are 95% staffed.

Reports/Updates/Requests

- Presentation by Vertex – Building Project Manager

Steve Theran, Vertex Project Manager, showed the scheduled timeline.

He reviewed the process to date. He said the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) deadline to MSBA is August 31, 2023. The final preferred solution and cost will need to be submitted to MSBA by the end of December in order to get approval in time for the Spring Town Meeting. Then the Design Process takes a year. He is hoping to have a project bid by Spring 2025 and building completion in September 2026 at the earliest.

- Discussion & Vote on the PSR Submission to MSBA

Mr. Hebert said Mr. Theran and Tocci will discuss the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) process.

Mr. Polito said he has to recuse himself because this vote affects the site selection and he lives within 300 ft. of the Oakdale site.

In response to Mr. Polito's recusal and its effect on the vote, Ms. Briggs read the State's Open Meeting Law. The law states that remote votes are allowed until March 31, 2025. Mr. Polito's recusal will not affect the quorum.

Mr. Theran recounted that the SBRC gave permission to submit Option D to the MSBA for the PSR. He displayed slides that showed the Option D space and design structure. He noted that the gym may be moved to provide better community access. He said that the design allows for each grade to be separate, lower at one end, upper at other end. Second floor view was shown. He reported that the MSBA comments on the Preliminary Design Plan were mainly about process. The PSR that is submitted will include all presentations and minutes.

Mr. Hebert said that School Committee members have received emails with pros and cons of the process and he said members will continue to work to help the community understand the process. The submission of the PSR is a step to get the proposal to Town Meeting so the community's voice can be heard.

SCHOOL COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Acosta apologized for having to participate remotely. He thanked the committee and board members, the administration and the community for their participation in the project. He agrees with Mr. Zahka's comments, but he feels strongly that the new school is in the interest of the students. As a life-long Dedhamite, he and the four generations of his family have seen a myriad of changes in Dedham. He said that 700 o

Four elementary school students are in substandard facilities. He has listened to all comments and read all emails he has received and he is assured that the new school has the potential to improve student academic experiences. School building costs are escalating and we need to take advantage of the support from MSBA because we don't know that we will have that opportunity again. He feels this

decision was not made lightly and many factors were considered. For these reasons, he will vote Yes on the PSR submission.

Dr. Flynn Gallant said she will vote Yes on the PSR so that the process can be moved ahead to Town Meeting for the community to weigh in on the project.

Ms. Briggs reminded people that 550 students is an average sized school in Mass. She said the School Committee pushed back on the SBRC to make sure there were six classes per grade to maintain the small class sizes. She pointed out that the small class size is very important to the School Committee members. Ms. Briggs said the staff and faculty will care for our students as always. The schools will also allow Dedham to fulfill ADA compliance requirements.

Ms. Twomey said the members have received emails and had many conversations with the community. She reminded people that whether they oppose or agree with the consolidation, it's apparent that Dedham schools are highly regarded by the community. There are still some difficult decisions to be made, but they are being made with concern and care for the future. She feels we need to make the decision to submit the PSR with Option D in order to get this project to Town Meeting for further review. She feels we can't run the risk of not voting after all the hard work of the boards, committees and the school administration. She said she will vote YES for the PSR submission and, as such, is putting trust in all the people who worked to get the project to this point.

Motion was made to approve the Owner's Project Manager submission of the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA detailing the 550-student enrollment at the Oakdale site utilizing Design Option D, including any minor edits proposed by the SBRC through its Chair or the School Committee through its Chair or other project team members. Motion was approved by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Ms. McCormick was absent from the vote and Mr. Polito recused himself due to conflict of interest.)

• Discussion and Potential Vote on Building Project Interim Name

Supt: Murphy talked about the community's request for a more inclusive name for the project. Last night, at the SBRC meeting, the group suggested "Greenlodge/Oakdale" for the project name.

Mr. Polito commented that it was late in the process to change the name so he disagrees with the change.

Mr. Hebert said the scope has changed, and it now affects the whole town. Mr. Hebert prefers Greenlodge/Oakdale.

Mr. Acosta and Ms. Briggs said they are in favor of the Greenlodge/Oakdale name.

Motion was made to refer to the new school building project as the Greenlodge/Oakdale project. Motion was approved by a Roll Call vote of 4-1. (Ms. McCormick and Dr. Flynn Gallant were absent and Mr. Polito voted against the motion).

Subcommittee Updates

• Budget

No updates.

- Communications

No updates.

- Curriculum Advisory

No updates.

- Policy

No updates.

- SBRC

Updates provided previously.

- Traffic Circulation

No updates.

- Negotiations

No updates.

- Parks & Recreation

No updates.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the June 21, 2023 meeting minutes by a roll call vote of 4-0. (Ms. McCormick and Dr. Flynn Gallant were absent from vote; Ms. Twomey abstained because she was not a School Committee member at the time of the meeting.)

Motion was made to approve the July 17, 2023 meeting minutes by a roll call vote of 4-0. (Ms. McCormick and Dr. Flynn Gallant were absent from vote; Ms. Twomey abstained because she was not a School Committee member at the time of the meeting.)

Motion was made to approve the August 2, 2023 Retreat meeting minutes by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Ms. McCormick and Dr. Flynn Gallant were absent from the vote.)

Old/New Business*

Mr. Hebert announced that he is working with the Town to secure the O'Brien Room for future meetings. They are trying to get the O'Brien Room either every other Tuesday or Wednesday. When availability is established, then he will announce the 2023-24 meeting dates.

Mr. Acosta requested updates to the Subcommittee memberships. He noted that at the School Committee Retreat it was decided that a Facilities Subcommittee would be added. Mr. Hebert said that will be on the agenda of the next meeting.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

Mr. Acosta thanked the Transportation Working Group for their success in securing a grant for the new mural on Needham St. that was painted to calm the traffic. Ms. Briggs said the mural seems to be slowing drivers down.

Mr. Polito wished good luck to all the sports teams at the beginning of the school year.

Motion was made to adjourn from public session, move to Executive Session and not return to public session. Motion was approved by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Ms. McCormick and Dr. Flynn Gallant were absent from vote).

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **APPROVED**

Monday October 10, 2023 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Other:
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Matt Wells, Assistant Supt. for Business and Finance
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair		Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager		Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Dr. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		Chin Lin, Sr. Project Manager	A	Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee	A	Jonathan Levi		
A	Phillip Gonzalez		Philip Gray		
			Carol Harris		

Distribution: SBRC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business:

Mr. Tocci opened the October 10, 2023, SBRC meeting at 6:34 pm. He noted that there is a quorum present. He asked for old business, there is none.

2. Discussion, Consideration, and Vote on 1902 Building:

Mr. Tocci noted this is a follow up to the discussion started last week. He opened the floor to SBRC Members for comment and noted he favors demolition of the 1902 building.

Mr. Heffernan stated he and Mr. Tocci had a discussion with Peter Smith, a local real estate developer. Mr. Heffernan asked what the Town could get for the sale of the building, and Mr. Smith stated about \$4-5million depending on a lot of variables. Mr. Heffernan noted that the access and boundaries of the property would still need to be discussed and defined.

Mr. Tocci stated that it could be many years before a developer could be brought in to repurpose the building and he is opposed to that option. He believes the additional 2 acres of land is better used as parking, fields, and playground areas for the school.

Mr. Acosta stated that as a school committee member it is important to have full control over the property for student safety. He stated there are too many questions with leaving the building in place and he would love to see some fields put in that area.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that keeping the building in place limits the access and egress points of the school property and is not beneficial to the school.

Mr. Bilafer stated that the job of the SBRC is to make the best recommendation that they can and it would not be beneficial to leave a massive question on what will happen with the existing building and how the two entities will work together. He does not want to kick a financial question down the road for the Town to deal with at some point. He voted for the Oakdale site with the vision that it would be the entire site for the school with new green space and he favors demolition of the existing building.

Mr. Tocci asked for public comment, there is none.

MOTION: Motion to demolish the 1902 building along with the rest of the buildings as part of the project made by Mr. Heffernan.

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez.

Vote: Motion passes 7-0-0

3. Design Update:

Mr. Tocci turned the floor over to Mr. Levi to provide a design update.

Mr. Levi stated his team was waiting for confirmation on the gym placement at the East end of the building.

Mr. Levi noted that his team met with the staff at both the Greenlodge and Oakdale schools and they were all very committed to the project. He stated the entire staff was committed to the STEM and maker space at the center of the school, especially the librarian. He also noted the adjacencies of the Maker Space, and the Library are exactly what they want.

Mr. Levi stated they also received feedback about the gymnasium and they will relocate the stage. They will also be relocating some of the restroom facilities so they can serve the school day and after-hours community use of the gym.

Mr. Levi stated his team has a lot of work to do in terms of distributing the special education spaces throughout the school.

Mr. Levi stated there was some discussion about direct access from the first floor to the outdoor spaces and his team will be looking into that further. There is also a lot of work to do regarding the Mechanical spaces for the building as well. He noted the custodial staff also discussed the receiving area and they do not require a loading dock.

Mr. Levi noted the restrooms will be clustered in multiple stalls for larger restrooms and single use toilets will be located in the same areas. Mr. Levi also noted the music room will be moved to the second level and will be increased. What is shown as practice rooms will become storage per discussions with the Music teachers. He also noted the double height music room is better for acoustics and safety of the students hearing.

Mr. Levi stated they will also have two monumental stairs for access from the lower and upper schools in the center of the building. This will help the school feel like two smaller schools, which has been the goal all along. He stated his team will have more detailed and updated floor plans to share at the next meeting on October 23, 2023.

Mr. Heffernan asked if the team needs to vote on the gym location.

Mr. Tocci stated it is desired for the SBRC to vote on the preferred location as a formality.

Mr. Heffernan stated we should include the gymnasium in that vote as well.

Mr. Gonzalez asked for clarification on what a monumental staircase is?

Mr. Levi stated it is a term they use, but it really just means it is not an egress stair. It is a staircase that just brings the students from the first floor to the second floor.

Mr. Gonzalez asked for confirmation that it is an interior staircase that brings people from one level to another that is open.

Mr. Levi confirmed, he stated most other stairs are in a tower and go to the exterior. A monumental staircase is also non-utility.

Mr. Donati asked Ms. McGowan for her perspective on the faculty and staff meeting.

Ms. McGowan stated the meetings were full days in both buildings with grade level teams. She stated she was only part of some of those meetings. She stated that one of the longer conversations was with special education and the difference between the full-size classrooms and half size classrooms as well the STAR program and their needs. She stated that her staff was trying to understand the new configuration and what comes with a new building. She stated there were a lot of questions around storage and she stated that teachers really asked a lot of questions around the flow of the building and the gymnasium vs. a cafeteria. She stated the nurse also spent a significant amount of time talking about the main office area and the nurse suite around that admin area. She stated that overall, it was successful and everyone participated.

Mr. Tocci asked Ms. McGowan to describe the vision for what the school wants to see in the gymnasium in the new school.

Ms. McGowan stated they are looking for a large space that is easily accessible for the community. They also look forward to a space for full school assemblies, evening activities, after school programs, so it should be an all-purpose space easily accessible by the community that is separate from the cafeteria.

Mr. Tocci asked about if the team spoke about cascading bleachers in the gymnasium.

Ms. Ellis stated that was discussed with the gym teachers and they did not want the cascading bleachers, they preferred to have more space between the basketball court lines and the walls.

Ms. Murphy stated she hopes it will be a true gathering space with a stage incorporated into the layout. She stated at her previous district they would put out folding chairs if needed.

Ms. Murphy asked about sound within the gym and how that will be handled. She stated that in her previous district there were sound barriers within the gym so acoustically the gym teachers had easier times communicating with students in a small space without any sound echo. She asked if that has been a consideration?

Mr. Levi stated the team is not quite there yet, but there is an acoustician who will be working with the JLA team and that will be discussed. He also noted that gyms are generally not designed to acoustically absorbent so it will be an interesting conversation.

Ms. Murphy stated the material is astonishing how it absorbs sound in the gym.

Mr. Levi stated there are acoustic sound characteristics required to make a band or chorus sound great so it will be a good conversation.

Mr. Tocci asked for a two-part vote to approve the gym located on the east side of the building and also to approve a gymnasium instead of a cafeteria.

Mr. Donati stated one motion can be made encompassing both those options.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs agrees.

MOTION: Motion to approve design option D.2 with the gym located on the east side of the building and incorporating a gymnasium made by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Acosta
Vote: Motion passes 7-0-0

4. Communications and Outreach Subcommittee Report Update:

Mr. Acosta stated the SBRC agreed to add some ex-officio members to the committee to join the committee to provide additional expertise to the SBRC in areas they may be lacking. He noted that the subcommittee held a meeting last Friday to discuss the applicants and they decided to bring five ex-officio members on board. He stated the prioritized the expertise of applicants as well as their geographical location within the town. He stated that the background of the some of the people being recommended include an architect with MSBA experience, a municipal OPM, a local teacher, and a communications expert. Mr. Acosta stated the subcommittee has chosen to nominate 5 community members and one Greenlodge resident.

Mr. Donati stated they were blown away by the quality of applicants and he appreciates everyone who submitted an application. He also believes the representation of the new members will help with the entire process.

Mr. Tocci stated that everyone who applied for an ex-officio position submitted a resume and a statement of interest and everyone in the SBRC received and reviewed those statements and resumes. Mr. Donati also stated that the subcommittee did hold a public meeting to review the applicants, however it was interrupted and they were unable to finish on the zoom call.

MOTION: by Mr. Acosta to add the following individuals as ex-officio members to the School Building and Rehabilitation Committee: Kailyn DeStefano, Kathrine Duceman, Steve Popper, Anthony Rodriguez, and Sara Rosenthal.

SECOND: Mr. Donati

AMENDMENT: Mr. Acosta amended to motion to also include Greenlodge educator Kerrie Bryant.

Mr. Tocci noted there is also room to add another educator.

SECOND: Mr. Donati seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Tocci asked for additional discussion.

Mr. Donati stated that some of the nominated members are at the meeting today, and he recognizes their dedication to the project.

VOTE: 7-0-0

5. School Committee Report:

Mr. Acosta stated the school committee met last week and they are having the first facilities subcommittee meeting next week. He noted it is very preliminary and that it is a posted meeting.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she requested a change to one of the meetings that is scheduled to happen during a school committee meeting.

Mr. Tocci stated there are a lot of meetings happening over the next few weeks and it's becoming hard to schedule them. He then ran through a list of upcoming meeting:

School Committee Meeting: October 18, 6:30;
Madison Abutters Meeting with JLA (via Zoom): October 18, 6:30;
Greenlodge PTO (in Person): October 24, 5:30;
Dedham Junior Women's Club (In Person): October 24, 7:00;
Middle School PTO (Via Zoom): October 26, 7:00;

School Committee: November 1;
Riverdale PTO (via Zoom): November 2, 7:00;
Oakdale PTO: November 6, time TBD, prefer in person meeting.
Avery PTO (via Zoom): November 14, 7:00;
School Committee: November 15;
ECEC PTO: December 5, time and method is TBD.

Mr. Tocci noted he wants to thank Ms. Murphy, Ms. Hicks, and the principals for helping to schedule all the PTO meetings in the coming weeks.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that as many SBRC members that can be at these meetings the better.

Mr. Tocci noted that the PTO meetings are not all posted meetings.

Mr. Donati stated there was a public comment around proposing a field proposal, is that something that will be discussed at the Thursday facilities subcommittee meeting?

Mr. Acosta stated they do have a discussion of grounds, so it would be discussed then, but again very preliminary.

Mr. Donati stated that if there is a movement in that direction, he would like the SBRC to support that if possible.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated they have received many questions at the school committee meetings around redistricting. She stated the school committee has reengaged with Cropper GIS and she wants to restate that at no point during the preliminary redistricting reports was it stated that any of the students currently attending Greenlodge would not be attending the new building. She stated they will not have a definitive plan prior to the votes because we are talking about something that will happen three years from now.

Mr. Tocci agreed and he said they need to continue to state that any redistricting plans done now are very preliminary.

Ms. Murphy stated the intention behind engaging Cropper now is to look at the Oakdale families and see if there is a way that we can bring along students that are already attending Oakdale to finish their Elementary education at the new Oakdale school. They are also looking at how to bring equity to the population as well.

Mr. Donati stated the original Cropper report provided six different plans based on the different options. Is it right to expect that in reengaging Cropper they will provide something similar but for the Oakdale site?

Ms. Murphy confirmed, it will be around this specific scenario.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs added that will include grandfathering in current students.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about the timing between the traffic study and engagement of Cropper GIS. Are the interdependent?

Ms. Murphy stated they are already well along with the reengagement with Cropper and the school department has already shared their ideas and what they would like to see as an outcome. She stated the two are not interdependent.

Mr. Tocci stated the traffic study happening now is taking into account some intersections coming from East Dedham.

Mr. Bilafer stated that either way the traffic study is taking in account people coming to this site from all different directions. So there isn't anything that would come out of redistricting that would not be caught by the current traffic study.

Mr. Donati stated the study also included 8 intersections instead of the original 2.

Mr. Tocci confirmed and stated those intersections came out of conversations with the DPW.

Mr. Tocci noted the next three SBRC meeting dates:

SBRC Meeting: October 23, 6:30;

SBRC Meeting: November 7, 6:30;

SBRC Meeting: November 20, 6:30;

6. Report on meeting with FinCom:

Mr. Tocci noted he and Mr. Heffernan met with FinCom last week and made a presentation on the project history and timeline. He stated they provided financial charts showing the cost to the Town for this project and a subsequent Riverdale in 5 years which is an estimated \$173 million to get all students into new elementary schools. Compared to doing three separated stand alone schools for \$251 million. This is about a \$78 million additional to the tax payers for three schools.

Mr. Tocci stated the members had a lot of great questions, one was in regards to class sizes, another about if they considered replacing all three schools with one large school, and if there was any modeling done to increase class sizes.

Mr. Heffernan stated FinCom made it clear it was not hearing on the school project even though they were there for almost an hour. He also stated he will follow up with the committee to answer some of the committee's question they were unable to answer at the meeting.

Mr. Tocci stated FinCom asked how many students who are currently placed out of district due to the current facilities, will be brought back in district with the new school?

Mr. Heffernan stated he understands that number will change year to year, but they are looking for some idea on how the new school will affect placing students out of district.

Mr. Tocci also wanted to note that FinCom thanked Mr. Heffernan for his 15 years of service and he thanked him for being the SBRC FinCom Representative.

7. New Business:

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business.

Mr. Acosta asked if they can reengage John Arnett from the Town Side on the finances now that they are in a new fiscal year and the SBRC has a clear sense on what the project looks like. He doesn't think it needs to be right away.

Mr. Donati stated they spoke with some of the members in the Town Administrators office to request they provide an idea on the cost to the average taxpayer, they hope to have that information in the next few weeks. He thinks they can talk specific numbers sooner than later.

Mr. Heffernan stated the person we need to add to the conversation is Kevin Doyle from the assessor's office.

Mr. Tocci asked if they want to invite them to a meeting, maybe the next meeting?

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated Matt Wells should be invited as well.

Mr. Tocci stated he wants to also invite Paul Munchbach and Dan Driscoll to the November 20 meeting as well to discuss the Town Meeting and election votes again.

8. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci opened the floor to public comment. There is none.

9. Adjournment:

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

VOTE: to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 7:40 pm.

Attachments:

none

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **Approved**

Monday December 11, 2023 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):	A	Anthony Rodriguez, Ex Officio
A	John Tocci, Chair	A	Jonathan Levi	A	Kaitlyn DeStefano, Ex Officio
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Philip Gray		Shannan Kavanagh, Ex Officio
A	Josh Donati, Selectman		Carol Harris		Kerri Bryant, Ex Officio
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		Other:		
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee	A	Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities		
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee		Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Dr. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)		
	VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)		Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal		
A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Katherine Duceman		
A	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Steven Popper, Ex Officio		
A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Sara Rosenthal, Ex Officio (VIA ZOOM)		

Distribution: SBRC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business/Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Tocci opened the December 11, 2023, SBRC meeting at 6:33 pm.

Mr. Tocci asked for any old business. There is none.

Mr. Tocci stated there are no minutes to approve at this time.

2. Design Update:

Mr. Gray stated the JLA team has created some phasing diagrams to discuss how the school will operate when the new building is being constructed and when the new building is complete with all the students and existing building is being taken down. Mr. Gray stated these plans will also be reviewed with the contractor, but this is a preliminary strategy to make sure the phasing can be achieved.

Mr. Gray stated the first phase is when the building is being constructed and there is a fence around the entire new building site to separate it from the existing building. He noted the fencing will have a scrim so it is not see through. He noted there is contractor parking located where the new queueing turn around will be which is inside the construction fencing. The pick-up and drop off for the existing school will not change from what it is currently.

Phase 2 is when the students move into the new building and the fence moves to surround the existing building.

Mr. Tocci stated we talked about clearing space close to the Lincoln Street side of the building to give more space for student outdoor play, so why is the construction fence so far toward Cedar Street? He

asked if we could create more green space where there is currently hardscape for the students to play during recess?

Mr. Gray stated we can discuss those things and adjust the plan. He stated this is preliminary plan for discussion purposes. He noted these were sent to the cost estimators so they could build this scope into their estimates.

Mr. Donati asked how much space we anticipate between the fence and the school windows?

Mr. Gray stated about 15-20 feet.

Mr. Donati asked about the green space at the front of the school and what the plan was for that area?

Mr. Gray stated that when the students are out for the summer, we will build the new parking area for the new school in front of the existing school as shown on the diagram. He noted that parking is actually part of the final design and will be built now and can be utilized by the existing school.

Mr. Gray continued on to Phase 3 which is when the students move into the new building and the fence goes around the existing building. The first three months of this phase will be abatement of the hazardous materials. The temporary contractor parking is located as shown, in the middle of the existing building. The parent drop off/pick up will utilize the emergency drive that goes around the entire site as shown and the older students can be dropped at the Media Center and the younger students can be dropped off in front of the lower school wing as shown on the plan. The Handicap parking and drop off/pick up is located in the front of the building where the round about for the permanent queue is located. The bus drop off is as designed on Madison Street. Mr. Gray noted all the sidewalks will be installed at this point for access for walkers.

Mr. Gray noted the final phase is building of the new playfields and associated green spaces and parking as shown on the final plan.

Mr. Heffernan stated the queueing for the drop off/pick going around the entire site as shown looks like it would be difficult for the younger students.

Ms. Hermes stated the cars drive around the entire building and the students are dropped off right in front of their wing. She stated this should be enough space.

Mr. Gray stated there would be two lanes, one passing and one for stopping to drop off.

Mr. Gonzalez stated it is a 5-month demolition phase we will be putting traffic onto Madison Street for that amount of time.

Mr. Gray confirmed, he stated it will be a good test case to see if we want to add an exit onto Madison Street permanently.

Mr. Gonzalez stated in the next phase there isn't any vehicle access from Cedar onto the site and all traffic will go onto Madison Street while the fields are being built.

Mr. Gray stated his expectation is that the queueing and parking will be built and usable during the final phase to keep traffic off Madison. The demo can be phased so the portion of the building closest to Madison is completed first it will allow for the parking to be completed.

Mr. Gonzalez asked when this will be happening? Per the schedule it seems like it will happen at the end of 2026?

Mr. Gray confirmed and stated the demo would be done over the Holiday break.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if we are able to do the paving in the winter?

Mr. Theran stated we cannot pave in the winter, but we will review the plan and adjust. He stated the lower portion of the school will come down first so it will be tight to try and get the paving done prior to the plants closing.

Mr. Gray stated this plan was created for a scope and budget for cost estimating and will be refined as we move forward.

Mr. Tocci stated the abatement and demo will commence in June 2026 when the students are out of school.

Mr. Gray confirmed, abatement will start in June 2026 so we can probably start the demo earlier and be done more quickly.

Mr. Tocci asked what is the abatement vs. the demo?

Mr. Gray stated the abatement is the removal of all hazardous materials from the building when it is unoccupied, sealed, and under negative pressure. The process is overseen by professional hygienists to make sure it is all done and disposed of properly. Only after this process is complete and authorization received will the demolition commence. He also noted the abatement and demo can be done in phases as well.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if when the one-story part close to Madison Street is removed first, then the parking will be built correct?

Mr. Gray confirmed.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked if as part of the updated phasing plan for Phase 4 they will pull the construction fence closer to the building and away from the parking.

Mr. Gray confirmed.

Mr. Acosta asked what material is used for the parent queueing in phase 3?

Mr. Gray stated it is all part of the permanent design and he expects it to be asphalt.

Mr. Donati asked if the permanent sidewalks in phase 3, shown in Beige on the plan, are they all permanent.

Mr. Gray stated most, he noted the one that is temporary.

3. HVAC/Geothermal Discussion:

Mr. Levi introduced Dominick Puniello from GGD, the mechanical engineers on the project. He is attending via zoom.

Mr. Puniello stated his team provided a life cycle analysis for 3 different HVAC systems and a Code Baseline system which is the MSBA required "Opt-In" code system. He noted they are all electrified HVAC system.

Option #1 is a geothermal displacement ventilation system. It uses the ground for heat projection and absorption with centralized heat pumps that distribute the air handling and heating/cooling equipment.

Option #2 is an air source Hydronic heat pump system which uses a chiller that generates chilled and hot water that is distributed to air handling units.

Option #3 is an air source VRF (Variable Refrigerant Flow) system and it's a mixed air system. Options 1 and 2 are displacement ventilation systems which provide high quality air, Option 3 is an air source heat pump that has dedicated outdoor air units for outdoor air and fan coil units for the additional heating and cooling requirements. This is refrigerant piping unlike the other systems that use water.

Mr. Puniello stated the costs for the systems came directly from the cost estimators and are shown in the attached slide. He also noted the chart shows initial cost, annual energy and maintenance costs and energy efficiency. The geothermal is the most energy efficient and the least is the baseline system. He also noted the geothermal system is based on a 50-year lifecycle and what outdoor equipment needs to be replaced in that time, it came out to have the lowest replacement cost over that time period with the baseline being the most expensive.

Mr. Puniello continued and noted his team looked at the Mass Saves rebates available for each system, the geothermal has the most lucrative rebate and the baseline has the lowest rebates. He noted the rebates are payable upon completion of construction. He stated they looked at the savings over the 50-year life cycle of the system and include the rebates and savings as part of that calculation.

Mr. Puniello stated the 2022 federal inflation reduction act was a game changer in regard to geothermal projects, he noted there is a 30% tax credit that covers the entire cost from well field to diffusers. He stated the geothermal is the only system that would qualify for the federal rebate and would have \$4.2 million rebate payable upon construction completion. So, when you look at the overall cost including all rebates the Geothermal has the greatest cost savings at \$6.6 million, the VRF has a savings on \$3 million, and the Displacement Ventilation system is a \$1.6 million savings.

Mr. Puniello noted that while these are apples to apples economic prices here, the geothermal is much quieter and the maintenance would largely be done in the basement rather than on the roof. He also noted that due to the noise for the air source systems they will likely require shielding of the roof equipment and those costs are not factored into this matrix.

Mr. Haffner stated he likes the geothermal wells because it's a better return on investment and he likes keeping things off the roof because it eliminates the noise. The geothermal is also greener. Mr. Haffner also noted the electricity costs are always going up so long term geothermal would be a savings. He also noted the less traffic on the roof the better and not having roof units allows for more space for solar. He also noted that not having to service units on the roof is much safer for his staff because we aren't dealing with slippery or hot surfaces. He also stated he does not like the VRF system even though it's less expensive. He stated when there is a leak it is very hard to find and troubleshoot, it's much easier to find water leaks than refrigerant leaks. He stated the VRF system probably has the largest maintenance costs.

Mr. Tocci asked Mr. Haffer to clarify his uncertainty about the rebate program.

Mr. Haffner stated we have to pay up front and then get everything returned to us on the back and these are estimates so theoretically the mass saves should be locked in, but the federal is not yet. He also stated a 20-year warranty on the well fields is great.

Mr. Lemieux asked Mr. Puniello which of the 4 systems would fall into compliance with the Opt-In energy code with the MSBA.

Mr. Puniello stated they all should, the baseline was run on the specialized Opt-In code and all other options comply as well.

Mr. Lemieux Asked if they do not go with geothermal do we have to proceed with solar to comply with the code?

Mr. Puniello stated they do not require solar.

Mr. Lemieux stated all four of these options get the 4 additional MSBA reimbursement points.

Mr. Puniello stated the VRF system can be designed so it is non-proprietary, however once it is installed it becomes proprietary and any replacement equipment needs to come from the manufacturer who supplied the equipment originally because it's sold as system. He noted options 1 and 2 are not proprietary in any way.

Mr. Haffner stated the gold standard in industry was Mitsubishi for years, however he stated that has changed because supply chain issues caused other companies to become more prevalent.

Mr. Heffernan asked who the top players are now?

Mr. Haffner stated Daikin and LG. He stated they all have similar performance specs but it's like buying a Hyundai vs. a Toyota. Some are built better and will last longer.

Ms. Rosenthal asked if the Mass Save is Path 1 or 2 do you know from the incentive calculation? I think Pat 1 usually lends more rebates?

Mr. Puniello answered MassSave Path 1 w/ Heat Pump Kicker for Option 1 & 2 as EUI less than 25, Path 2 w/ Heat Pump Kicker for Baseline & Option 3 as EUI greater than 25.

Mr. Donati asked if all goes to plan the \$14.1 estimate would go down to \$7.5? Should we be thinking that the initial cost would go down when the project is down as much as \$6.6 million? The \$1.5 rebate doesn't seem to be tied into the \$6.6 million.

Mr. Gray stated if it all goes to plan it would be \$8.4 million total for the geothermal because we would receive a \$1.5 million rebate from Massachusetts and \$4.2 million Federal grant. He stated the savings on the right also takes into account the change in equipment costs and maintenance costs. There are annual energy and maintenance costs that need to be factored in as well.

Mr. Haffner stated when the budget is set you are using the larger number which is scary, but it should be smaller because of the rebates.

Mr. Tocci asked if the reimbursement is on the full \$14 million.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed but clarified that it is only on the eligible portion of those costs.

Mr. Bilafer asked if there will be anything on the roof if we go with the geothermal?

Mr. Puniello stated you could have units on the roof unless you had an additional space for an indoor unit in the basement.

Mr. Levi stated it is a cost question, we currently plan on having air handlers on the roof and we have included costs for the acoustic screens in the budget. Putting them in the basement is very expensive.

Mr. Haffner stated we are not having compressors running though.

Mr. Puniello confirmed.

Mr. Haffner we will still have exhaust for bathrooms and kitchens, but those are typically quiet.

Mr. Heffernan asked what is done in the annual maintenance each year for geothermal?

Mr. Haffner stated they will have to clean/maintain the coils, louvers, replace filters. Reviewing the controls and it will be about 2-3 days per unit per year. Plus, seasonal change overs. The compressors and AC units take more time for maintenance.

Mr. Tocci asked what is the presumption for geothermal? What is the number of wells we anticipate and how long will it take to drill?

Mr. Theran stated we had 60 wells in the estimate.

Mr. Tocci asked if there is anything we think would be problematic based on the geothermal report?

Mr. Lemieux stated they prefer rock, the only issue is that drilling is noisy. He also stated that we won't know for sure how many wells we need until we do the test well, which won't happen until we start construction. But that test well becomes one of the wells for the system.

Mr. Tocci asked how long it will take to drill 6 wells.

Mr. Theran stated he estimates 2-4 months.

Mr. Donati asked where it will be done?

Mr. Theran stated somewhere where the new and old buildings are not.

Mr. Gray stated they have also seen it done where the wells go under where the existing was once it has been removed.

Mr. Donati asked if we have a backup boiler?

Mr. Gray stated we do have a temporary field so we can place the new field under the old building once it is demolished. He stated if we move forward with geothermal, we will have more professionals on the team and we can make the decision on where to locate the wells.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked if the geothermal helps the town achieve their goal of green building?

Mr. Haffner stated it should help.

Mr. Bilafer asked if the nonstructural soils have any bearing on the wells?

Mr. Levi stated the geothermal wells are 500 ft. below the ground, the soils do not impact this.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked when the wells would be installed because it's noisy work?

Mr. Lemieux stated that is something we can talk through if we have a CM on board. It's part of the project phasing.

Mr. Gonzalez asked there will be a redundant system for the school in place? Does there need to be a backup system if we go with geothermal?

Mr. Puniello stated they do have some redundancy. Both the geothermal and air pumps are designed to be modular in nature so if one module fails you can still run the system. They can also install electric heat as a backup for heating only. The air source VRF system back up is a similar design approach with modular units, so more units so if one fails you don't lose the entire thing. They can also provide supplemental electric for heating only.

Mr. Tocci opened the meeting up to public comment.

Mr. Czazasty stated he fully supports a geothermal system and he hopes we can take advantage of the green energy now and reduce our carbon footprint. He stated he hopes the committee considers green energy with any new school now and down the line. He stated there are other districts that are going with green energy and taking advantage of the rebates, he thinks Dedham will fully support geothermal for the school.

Mr. Donati stated he is happy to be in a position to be choosing from options that all reach the specialized Opt-In code, especially when considering the town has set benchmarks to reach certain green energy standards by 2030 and 2050.

Mr. Heffernan added that when given a few different options he starts by narrowing things down by removing options, for him it comes down to Options 1 and 2. He stated he leans towards geothermal, Option 1. He stated Option 3 is off the table in his opinion.

Mr. Lemieux stated these are not Net-0 buildings, they could move toward that if solar is added in the future. The building will be solar ready but the panels are not included in the project at this time. He stated this is something we can look at during design and the Town can provide them or lease them through at 3rd party vendor.

Mr. Haffner stated he would like to run conduit for future parking canopies now because it's less expensive to do now than in the future.

Mr. Gray stated they also anticipate having charging stations and they can add conduit for future stations as well.

Mr. Bilafer asked if geothermal gives a great opportunity for roof solar?

Mr. Gray confirmed, there is more open roof space.

Mr. Levi stated Net-0 is different than all electric fossil fuel free. This building is all electric fossil fuel free.

MOTION: by Heffernan to move forward with Option 1 Geothermal.

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

VOTE: Unanimous. Motion passes.

4. **CM at Risk vs. Design Bid Build:**

Mr. Lemieux stated Dedham has experience with CM at Risk and Design Bid Build (DBB). He stated that CM at Risk started in the 70's as a more team-oriented approach to building a project. Design Bid Build is really buying a building for the cheapest option out there. For CM at Risk you are hiring a professional services firm to build your build as opposed to purchasing a building in accordance with plans and specifications.

He continued and stated DBB is lower cost, competitively bid, less paperwork, more appropriate for smaller projects, smaller pool of General Contractors, there are no design phase services. He noted that we do pre-qualify filed sub bidders and GC's. There is no GMP contingency within the bid, all change orders come to the owner directly.

Mr. Lemieux stated the CM at Risk is qualifications based with a negotiated fee based on a schedule set in the RFP and the estimated value of the project. The CM Firms then provide a proposed fee, and they tell us what they will charge per month for general conditions and tell us what they carry for a CM Contingency. He stated any unused contingency comes back to owner.

The CM also provides design phase services including planning, constructability reviews, and estimating. It is also open book accounting for all trades, not just the filed subcontractors, which are called trade contractors in CMR. With CMR we can also do early bid packages, and for this specific project we will need to do that if we want to meet a fall opening date. The CM also provides holds and allowances and we get to see what those are and the unused money comes back to the owner. However, on the flip side if they go over the allowance, we have to compensate them. Because of all the allowances and holds, there is a 4%-6% price premium up front, however they also turn money back over to the owner so it does end up being less than that.

Mr. Lemieux continued and noted that in DBB we see the price for the Filed Sub Bids, in CMR we see the preconstruction costs, general conditions, insurance/bonds, fee, trade bidders, non-trade bidders, allowances and holds, and the contingency. All these costs then make up the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP). He noted the first contract with the CM is just for preconstruction services, and then we can authorize them to move to the next phase with an amendment.

Mr. Lemieux stated simple projects are better set up for DBB and more complicated projects are better suited for CMR. He stated this project may be better suited for CMR because it's a tight site, there are a lot of logistics to think through, and it's also great to have an estimate from the contractor that will be building the project getting real time pricing from their subs who do this every day. The CM's also have a good handle on the current market for pricing and material lead times. He also stated the CM can purchase materials with long lead times by issuing early packages.

Mr. Lemieux stated we also have to ask the State if we can proceed with the CMR delivery method, he asked if the SBRC can make the decision on the delivery method or if the select board needs to get involved. Once that decision has been made, we do an application and include the certified minutes from the meeting with the vote. He noted Vertex, Dedham, and JLA have all done CMR previously and he anticipates the commonwealth providing an approval.

Mr. Gray stated JLA supports what Mr. Lemieux said and they support the CMR for this project because it's a tight site and they want to do early bid packages for ground improvements. He also noted it is good to have a CM for a project of this size as well.

Mr. Lemieux stated the only thing you cannot negotiate with the CM is the fee, but you can negotiate the general conditions and the staffing. He also noted you get to meet the team prior to making a decision.

Mr. Levi wants to emphasize that the CMR gives you access to their subcontractors during the design phase and the access to the pool of non-trade contracts is critical to the value management of the project. Those contractors can provide feedback and suggestions on better, simpler, less expensive ways to complete the work and that is a huge advantage you don't have with DBB. He also stressed that change orders are different with a CM and he believes they will be reduced with a CM because they are part of the design process.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated they did the ECEC with DBB but that was pre-covid and it doesn't have any neighbors and it was very successful and under budget. She stated the next DBB project in the town was not as successful as the ECEC. She stated this is a complicated site and she thinks it's better suited to a CMR.

Mr. Bilafer seconds everything Ms. MacDonald Briggs said and he emphasized that the site was already prepared when the contractor got there and there were almost no neighbors. He stated the ability for us to interview and develop a relationship with the contractor will be critical in dealing with all of the day to day issues that come up on an occupied site. He also noted there are a lot of abutters to think of as well and the volatility of the market. He thinks being able to set up a GMP will be important to the taxpayers.

Mr. Donati stated his colleagues who have already been through recommend CMR and he takes that to heart. He asked if it is entirely our decision on who we use for CMR?

Mr. Lemieux stated it is your decision and you don't have to use the lowest number if they aren't the best fit. Again, the fee can't be negotiated but there is movement on other prices.

Mr. Levi and Mr. Lemieux stated there is a CMR Selection process we have to follow.

Mr. Donati asked if any other board has a say in the decision.

Mr. Lemieux stated no, the select board may need to sign off, but it's the SBRC decision.

Mr. Gonzalez stated we have all these ex-officio members for their expertise and he wants to confirm they can continue through the process.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed and he stated with the CMR you get a list of "qualifications and assumptions" and that is where all the expertise comes in handy.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he thinks CMR is the best way to proceed especially based on the selected site.

Mr. Heffernan noted he has experience with both delivery types and he stated this project has a lot of complexity and is not comfortable with DBB based on size, proximity to school. The CM is on the team and they will spend a lot of time on change orders to make sure they are fair. He recommends CMR.

Mr. Rodriguez stated he has had great experience with CMR and give the size and complexity of the site he thinks this is a perfect project for CMR. He stated the early packages are great as well, especially for mechanical and electrical equipment. He also stated CMR is a collaborative experience.

Ms. Rosenthal stated she agrees with a lot of the previous statements about the benefits of CMR. She has had great experience with CM's and they have always been very thoughtful and they go above and beyond to make sure the building product is the best. She also noted that in her current project the

mechanical equipment has long lead times so the early bid packages are very beneficial for that as well as phasing diagrams.

Mr. Levi noted the current estimates include the CMR premium.

Mr. Tocci stated a vote is not on the agenda for tonight because he wants folks to think about it over the week.

Mr. Lemieux stated next week are voting on the "the number" for SD and CMR. He stated we went through the first pass of the 3011 estimate, but since then we have clarified the kitchen equipment number, we had an add back in for geothermal, now we have an HVAC decision, and we have some VE to think about. He stated next week he can bring two estimates, one with CMR and one with DBB. He also noted that we still have to finalize the reconciled construction estimates into a final version.

Mr. Popper stated the schedule is also dependent on CMR, if we don't go with CMR we push the schedule out.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed.

Mr. Tocci stated we will do the formal vote next week on CMR vs. DBB.

5. Value Management:

Mr. Lemieux stated we reviewed some options last week and we had both cost estimators look at a series of those value management items including the following:

- reducing the play area
- delete the irrigation system
- Eliminate the saw tooth gym roof
- Switch the rear of the building to flat faced block
- Remove south facing sun shades
- Interior plastic laminate bumper rail changed to MDF
- Gym roof structure change load bearing block with long span bar joists

These items totaled between \$1.2 and \$1.4 million. Another option that was priced is to go with DBB instead of CMR.

Mr. Tocci stated he is concerned about reducing the play surface and what that means for the students.

Mr. Lemieux stated none of these changes have been incorporated into the estimate yet.

Mr. Tocci is also concerned about removing the irrigation system. He stated the parks and rec department prefer turf, but if we don't go with turf we will need the irrigation system. He requested an estimate of what it will cost to have turf field over time.

Mr. Gray stated the turf field is approximately \$550,000, that includes any credits for irrigation and grass.

Mr. Lemieux stated there is already site work that has to take place, and the turf is just a different series of drainage for the turf.

Mr. Gray stated the current project includes natural turf and to change that to artificial turf would add \$550,000.

Mr. Lemieux stated the cost for artificial is probably more, but the net change for credits and adds is \$550,000.

Ms. Hermesch stated either way is an upgrade for the school. She thinks about maintenance and safety and community benefit and all of those things seem to be supported with artificial turf. She also noted

going back to geothermal she sees that as a huge learning benefit for students and she feels the same way about the artificial turf vs. grass and there are exciting ways to engage students on learning the difference between the two. Also, the thought of having a garden, and composting, and reusing rainwater and thinking green is great for the students.

Mr. Lemieux stated the turf is a site work item and we are already over so it won't be reimbursed. And if you add it later it will be come out of contingency.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated we would save around \$100,000 if we remove irrigation, so if we put in a turf field it will only cost \$400,000.

Mr. Gray stated no, the \$550,000 is net, they already assumed removal of the irrigation.

Mr. Donati asked if there is any way the parks department can speak to the maintenance of the turf fields and what the savings would be over a 10-year period.

Mr. Lemieux clarified and stated it is a turf ball field and soccer field as shown on the plan.

Mr. Briggs from parks and rec stated they would speak to maintenance at a future meeting, and for them a turf field would be great because they get more use out of synthetic turf. What would also be fantastic is a field with irrigation. without irrigation the field will not be as nice because it's hard to maintain grass without irrigation. If it can't be synthetic, they would like irrigation so the use isn't greatly diminished.

Mr. Bilafer stated the middle school was originally designed with a gray water tank for irrigating the field and it has worked to varying degrees.

Mr. Levi stated those systems are very expensive and cost prohibitive.

Mr. Gray took a step back and stated we are providing these as options and we are not suggesting that we should or should not proceed with some, but we need SBRC authorization before we make any VE changes.

Mr. Lemieux stated if all these items remain in the project that's fine, and going forward if we are in a position where we are over budget during Design Development (DD) we will revisit this list again. He also noted that if we are in the opposite position where the estimates come in less than the budget, we can also add things back in. He also noted there are some things that can't be changed later, like the saw tooth roof.

Mr. Bilafer asked if we can see a diagram on what the reduced play space looks like vs. the original.

Mr. Levi confirmed they will provide more information.

Mr. Tocci stated they will add a vote on some of these items to next week's meeting. He stated the three envelope issues are big ticket items that he thinks we can proceed with for savings.

Mr. Levi stated the saw tooth roof is there to illuminate the gym evenly with North light. Without it you will have light coming in from the North but the southern portion will rely on artificial light. The south facing sunshades are provided to cut off the heat of the sun so you don't need to operate interior shades throughout the day. So, without them the teachers will be adjusting interior shades more. He noted this building has a true rear, seen by very few people, so it saves money to use the alternate block instead of brick.

Mr. Acosta asked if there is a way to use the scored CMU around the entire building as a cost savings.

Mr. Levi stated there is a tradition to have brick public buildings in Dedham, and it isn't something you want to scrimp on.

Mr. Rodriguez asked if we don't do a saw tooth roof can we add skylights instead?

Mr. Levi stated they did add 650SF of clear height glazing at the north wall to allow for light to come in to the gym. We could also look at Skylights, but then you can't have PV there.

Mr. Rodriguez stated he does not prefer painted MDF for the bumper rail.

Mr. Levi stated they have done it field painted and the MDF is better than gyp. Board for maintenance. He noted the painted MDF does need to be touched up yearly.

6. Responses and Queries to the MSBA:

Mr. Tocci stated the MSBA has received a number of queries from the public and the SBRC Sent one of their own and on 12/1/23 we received three responses to our queries. He stated on 11/22/23 the SBRC asked the following question:

If Dedham wanted to build a bigger standalone Oakdale – for example, a 20-classroom school for at least 360 students -- would the MSBA fund their portion of a 235 enrollment and allow the District to pay the financial difference for the additional enrollment? Said another way, if the cost of a 235-student school was \$70 Million and the cost of a 20 classroom, 360 student school was \$90 Million; and the town fully paid for the differential between the two (\$20 Million), would the MSBA still reimburse the town the approved costs of the \$70 Million, 235 student school?

Mr. Tocci stated the short answer to the above question is No.

Questions 2 and 3 sent to the MSBA are as follows:

2. If either the Dedham Town Meeting vote or townwide debt exclusion vote were to fail in the spring of 2024 (after presumed approval by the MSBA of Schematic Design), would Dedham be able to get an extension for the purpose of considering and changing the construction location (thereby necessitating new design) without falling out of the MSBA process?

3. If either the Dedham Town Meeting vote or townwide debt exclusion vote were to fail in the spring of 2024 (after presumed approval by the MSBA of Schematic Design), would Dedham be able to ask for a different enrollment option, either reverting to the 235 standalone school previously approved by the MSBA (but not chosen by the District) or a larger standalone Oakdale – for example a 20 classroom school -- without falling out of the MSBA process?

Mr. Tocci stated again the short answer to this question is No. the MSBA stated:

No. Once the District submits its Schematic Design and the MSBA votes to approve the Schematic Design Submission, the District has 120 days to seek local approval for the approved project.

Mr. Tocci stated this is consistent with what the SBRC has been saying since the start. He stated the SBRC then reached out to the MSBA about narrative that the enrollment projections are higher than projected. We provided the NESDC 2023/2024 report and asked the MSBA to compare it to the 2020 report projected populations and asked if the MSBA if the new enrollment projection numbers are materially different from the projected enrollment numbers considered by the MSBA in 2021 in determining the 225, 450 and 550 enrollment options? The MSB response received on 12/7/23 stated "The MSBA staff have had an opportunity to review the enrollment-related information provided for Dedham and have determined, based upon an initial review, that there is sufficient evidence pointing toward a further increase in district student enrollment."

Then the MSBA asked how the district wants to proceed and if they would like a review of all enrollments and r Would the District request the MSBA to provide a full reconsideration of the enrollment or if the district would like to proceed with the PSR and submit the schematic design submittal based on the original enrollment for the 550-student combined enrollment?

The SBRC then had a call with the MSBA to ask about enrollments. Mr. Tocci noted the NESDC projections show an increase for the next few years and then a decrease in 2026. We requested the MSBA to provide a range for the options based on this information and various other reports the district provided to the MSBA. We are not sure if we will receive an answer or a range as requested. We were told the MSBA doesn't like doing that because we are in the process and well underway.

Mr. Donati stated the MSBA asked if we would want a full review of the enrollment and put the project back into the eligibility phase. He would like Vertex to provide some context on what that means and what the cost would be.

Mr. Lemieux stated if you are going to back into eligibility you aren't necessarily throwing out everything you have done to date, but if the Town decides to go back to the MSBA and the new enrollments offered are increased, then the question becomes would that change your mind? And if you are going to end up with the same PSR, same combined school and location but for more students, then you need to find out how many sections they offer and if it will be different from what we have now. Also, any decisions need to align with the MSBA board meetings so it will be a delay. He also noted he has never seen the MSBA do this before. So, if you want the MSBA to answer this enrollment questions we will not be submitting SD in a week and we will need to reaffirm the PSR at some point which means we miss the spring votes. We are looking at a 6month delay, maybe more depending on how we decide to proceed from and then what the new enrollments offered are. If the change in enrollments make the school committee want to reconsider votes and go with a different enrollment or single school instead of combined, that would require a bigger undoing and redoing and all the costs to date are sunk costs because you have to redo the work already done to get to where we are today.

So, what is the impact of that? It's certainly time and money, if you delay a year and end up at the same place you just put 4%-5% on the project cost that is already in the \$120 million range. If you wanted to do something different, there are the up front costs for the project team to keep doing work to get to appoint where an option that hasn't been fully studied needs to be studied.

Mr. Tocci asked what the inflation of construction would be?

Mr. Lemieux stated 4%-5%, about \$5-6 million.

Mr. Donati stated that's in addition to redoing work that's already been done.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed stating it would less money to reaffirm what we already did and more money to do another option.

Mr. Bilafer stated that the MSBA has provided a 6-unit school, but with the enrollments projected there will still not be any classes above 20 students. So, because of the MSBA's willingness to work with us and give us a 6 unit, 30 classroom school, the flexibility is already built in for the larger enrollments spoken about earlier by Ms. Murphy.

Mr. Donati stated there is a difference between the approved enrollment and the capacity. As we have said 595 students still gets an average class of below 20 students and he hopes it becomes clear that we are not talking about a capacity issue.

Mr. Lemieux asked if an additional 40 students get you larger gym, media center, and cafeteria. He stated it would get more technology and FFE for the building but he's not sure if it impacts the other spaces.

Mr. Gray said it does affect them marginally. Even if we are talking about 60 students, it would add 300SF which is minimal. He noted the gym size would not change.

Ms. Ellis read an online comment from Kevin Schohl at the very least we can keep the same building and get reimbursed a higher amount for tech and F&EE for a higher enrollment?

Mr. Lemieux stated he doesn't know unless we ask for, but if we don't ask for it. He's hoping the MSBA will provide some data without us having to officially ask for it. The MSBA noted we are in schematic design and there are already districts in eligibility right now but to get a full answer you have to ask the full question and step out of the program from a minute.

Mr. Tocci confirmed the options are to keep going as designed, or step back to eligibility.

Mr. Lemieux stated his point was if we keep going as designed but maybe the MSBA will increase the numbers when they review the 3011. We aren't talking about bigger classrooms; the real dollars are in the FFE and the Tech.

Mr. Levi stated that's about \$100,000 increase.

Mr. Bilafer stated the delay costs \$6 million.

7. School Committee Report:

Mr. Acosta stated the facilities subcommittee will be meeting on the 18th.

Mr. Tocci stated the select board, school committee joint meeting is tomorrow night.

Mr. Donati noted the meeting tomorrow is at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Tocci stated the Wednesday planning board meeting is at 6:00 PM.

8. New Business:

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business. There is none.

9. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci asked for any public comment. There is none.

10. Adjournment:

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Acosta

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Roll Call Vote to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 9:06 pm.

Attachments:

JLA Phasing Diagrams

Vertex CM vs. DBB presentation

Value Management Spreadsheet

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes – **Approved**

Monday December 19, 2023 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	Voting Members:		Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):		Anthony Rodriguez, Ex Officio
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jonathan Levi	A	Kaitlyn DeStefano, Ex Officio
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair		Philip Gray		Shannan Kavanagh, Ex Officio
A	Josh Donati, Selectman		Carol Harris	A	Kerri Bryant, Ex Officio
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		Other:		
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee		Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities		
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee		Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Dr. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)		
	VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)	A	Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal		
	Jon Lemieux, Project Director		Katherine Duceman		
	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Steven Popper, Ex Officio		
	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager	A	Sara Rosenthal, Ex Officio		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business/Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Tocci opened the December 19, 2023, SBRC meeting at 6:31 pm.

2. Invoice Approval:

Mr. Tocci stated there are invoices through November 2023 and if he is correct the Town has spent \$802,897 of the \$1 million appropriation.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed.

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to approve the September Invoice

MOTION: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs to approve the September Invoice Package.

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez

VOTE: Unanimous. Motion passes.

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to approve the November Invoice

MOTION: by Acosta to approve the November Invoice Package.

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez

VOTE: Unanimous. Motion passes.

3. CM at Risk (CMR) vs. Design Bid Build (DBB):

Mr. Tocci stated the CMR and DBB process was discussed at length last week.

Mr. Acosta asked if either decision impacts the reimbursement points from the MSBA?

Mr. Lemieux stated it does not.

Mr. Donati asked if this is a decision that would be irreversible?

Mr. Lemieux stated no, however if you vote to move ahead tonight, the cost is baked into the estimate and if that changes, we will need to let the MSBA know and they will adjust their agreement accordingly. The idea of moving forward with CMR is to have the benefit of the CM being part of the team during design development.

Mr. Donati stated if for some reason the complexity of the project changes in the future he wants to make sure we have the flexibility to change our mind.

Mr. Lemieux stated if we end up going backwards tonight, the SBRC will be asked to consider CMR all over again.

Mr. Donati stated he is unclear why we are voting on this in this order.

Mr. Tocci stated it's so we can hit the ground running going forward.

Mr. Gonzalez stated when we talk about complexity, we are really talking about location to the existing school that needs to remain in operation and phased construction, deliveries, and relationship with neighbors. He stated one reason CMR is highly endorsed by folks is for these reasons and he doesn't see those factors changing.

Mr. Acosta asked if the Inspector General application is submitted through the MSBA?

Mr. Lemieux stated that is a separate approval and they suggest a 60-calendar day waiting period to hear back from them. But we can start that process whenever.

MOTION: by Heffernan to move forward with CM at Risk Delivery Method.

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

VOTE: Unanimous. Motion passes.

4. Presentation discussion and vote on synthetic turf field:

Mr. Tocci stated they are going to table the discussion and vote on the turf fields at this time.

5. Budget & Value Management Discussion:

Mr. Lemieux stated the estimators and JLA provided some options for value management to lower the construction cost. The difference in the numbers is really how each of the estimators sees these items.

To refresh everyone's memories we have the following items under review:

- reducing the play area
- delete the irrigation system
- Eliminate the saw tooth gym roof and adding some additional glazing to the North Wall
- Switch the rear of the building to flat faced block
- Remove south facing sun shades
- Interior plastic laminate bumper rail changed to MDF
- Gym roof structure change load bearing block with long span bar joists

Mr. Lemieux stated on average this about \$1.2 million in savings. He noted the roof change is not something we can bring back into the project later because it changes the steel and foundations and as

that design will progress it will become very difficult to change. If these items are removed from the project and then were to be put back into the project in the future, the money to do so would be coming out contingency. If we leave these in the project now, they can also be revisited in the future if needed.

Mr. Levi confirmed, they are all changeable at a later point except the gym roof. He also stated another way to approach these is to make them add alternates later. He also stated he has not yet done a drawing to show the difference between the 15,000 SF play surface area and 10,000 SF area, however he and his consultants are confident we can create an adequate play area for the students with the 10,000 SF area suggested.

Mr. Lemieux stated again that these can be reconsidered when we do one of the other estimate reconciliations during design development.

Mr. Heffernan stated he thinks we should carry these forward at this time, except for the roof.

Mr. Tocci agrees.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs asked if he means take the credit for the roof or leave it in?

Mr. Lemieux stated take the roof credit now and leave the others in the estimate.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he used to coach youth basketball and his teams have played in several with glazing at the top of the gym. He noted that sometimes the gyms are almost unusable b/c of the way the sun sets and the light enters the gym. He stated he is in favor of the roof VM but wants to make sure we are not making this gym unusable at certain times of the day.

Mr. Levi stated we will not be making the gym unusable. He stated the windows will be on the North facing wall and they will not affect the gym with direct lighting, it's all indirect.

MOTION: by Heffernan to put off accepting all items on the Value Management list except for the saw tooth roof.

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

VOTE: Unanimous, motion passes.

6. Responses and Queries to the MSBA:

Mr. Tocci stated that in October every district in Massachusetts submits enrollment information to DESE (the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education) and this year Dedham had a bump in enrollments. The New England School Development Council (NESDEC) takes those enrollments and make projections for the next 10 years. NESDEC projects a larger enrollment in Dedham from 2025-2029 and then it starts to decline. The SBRC decided to ask the MSBA if these changes in enrollment projections would result in a different enrollment offering from the MSBA for this project. Currently, we have been moving forward with the 30-classroom 550 combined Oakdale/Greenlodge enrollment. The MSBA Stated this new information may provide updated enrollments and stated the enrollments could be 300 for a standalone Oakdale, 515 for a combined Oakdale Riverdale, and 615 for a combined Oakdale Greenlodge school. All of this correspondence has been information via email, and the MSBA has stated we have until Thursday to decide how to proceed. We have two options, to move forward with Schematic Design or to submit a formal request to the MSBA to reconsider enrollment options.

Mr. Tocci noted the formal request includes submitting more forms so the MSBA can review and issue a formal recommendation for new enrollment numbers, or maybe the enrollments would stay the same. Then the MSBA will vote on the enrollments at their Board meetings which are held every other month. This path would certainly mean a delay for the project.

Mr. Tocci stated if after this review we decided to stay on the same course, it would likely be a 6-9 month delay.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed, he stated if we receive a response from the MSBA in February and they provide new enrollment numbers we have to decide if the current building will work for a 615-student enrollment. Obviously a 615-student building will have some changes, the big question is if they will add additional sections. If they were to allow 5 more classrooms that changes the square footage significantly which would change the footprint. If the footprint were not to change there are nominal changes because the class size will change from approximately 18 students to 20 students per class. It would provide additional grant money for FF&E and technology but the construction numbers would remain similar.

Mr. Tocci stated they asked the MSBA informally if they would change the section options based on the new enrollments and they stated they stated if you want to find out please proceed through the process. He also stated that if the enrollment given by the MSBA is 615 students and it is still a 30-classroom school the school department can opt to still have between 550 and 600 students in that school.

Mr. Tocci stated that a 6-9 month delay could add anywhere between \$3 million to \$5 million in total project costs.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed and stated the estimators are using between 4%-6% for inflation which is about \$500,000 – \$600,000 per month if you go back with the same decision. Again, this ties to the MSBA board meetings which are every other month and then we also have to figure how this change affects the town votes which will likely be pushed to the Fall Town Meeting. He stated to get back to exactly what we are voting on tonight it would be at least a 6-month delay and about 4%-6% on the budget.

Mr. Tocci stated if we decide to go with a different enrollment option, we go back several steps because the architect would have to create a new design and we would have to ask the town to appropriate more money for a new feasibility study. He stated we would redo the process of vetting a new design, more public meetings and it would be about a year to two years.

Mr. Lemieux stated that is correct because it would likely bring us back to PDP and there is a minimum time required between submitting PDP and PSR. He noted that when we originally did the PDP, we did not bring forward a standalone Oakdale as an option to study.

Mr. Tocci stated that given all the votes required by School Committee, SBRC, MSBA, and Town meeting would be 18 months to 2 years.

Mr. Lemieux stated it would be around year to 18 months, unless you wanted to reconsider sights again, then it's starting from scratch. Whatever can be salvaged from this process helps in the future.

Mr. Tocci asked if there is a motion to move forward with schematic design. There is none. He asked for another motion.

MOTION: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs to go back to the MSBA and request a formal review of the enrollment figures.

SECOND: by Mr. Donati

Mr. Donati stated he has heard from a lot of people over the last week and there seemed to be agreement about some of this finally. It is a very different dynamic from what we were originally evaluating so it's important to do the due diligence and get formal numbers from the MSBA. The current plan is one that everyone on this board feels good about but that doesn't mean we shouldn't see what could happen when we get formal numbers. He stated he wants to start from a place of agreement after

this pause and he believes there is broad consensus that the community wants to address, renovation, replace the remaining three elementary schools. This new enrollment information does help and gives us a slightly better version of what we have been debating. He's hoping that we can start from a place of where we agree. He noted that the community is engaged and aware and that is a good place to be right now.

Mr. Bilafer stated that from the start he has made a point of reminding everyone of the roles and responsibilities of the committees throughout this process and the role of the SBRC is to work with the MSBA and the community through the Town Meeting and Voters. Through this process we have followed the facts and decisions of the school committee to get us to where we are today. Tonight, we are debating whether circumstances have changed and when they do you have to take the new information into consideration and check the facts. It is hard to say if circumstances have changed because the MSBA gave informal enrollment numbers. At this time, we don't have the answers to the questions about new enrollments, how many sections, and the capacity of the school yet. He does believe it is our obligation to get complete answers to those questions to help this board, Town Meeting Members, and the voters make their decisions. We can make the best use of this break and work hard as community to understand the full ramifications of the decisions. In the future we can discuss how best to collect that community input so we can move forward. He stressed that we have to move forward and we cannot go through the decade of the 2020's without opening a new elementary school and we as community need to address this one way or another. Waiting for the price to go down or waiting for the site to improve, or for the MSBA to be there again, aren't viable options. He stated 2024 is the year this town needs to decide what to do with the Oakdale and also to answer what is our plan for all our elementary schools? If we all care about our neighbors as much as we all claim to, we can't leave any of them behind.

Mr. Acosta stated that given where we are and the history of the town there is no perfect plan and we are realizing that makes it difficult to build consensus. And even if we were to change any of our decisions it's still not going to be a perfect plan. He is hoping by taking a pause that we can take more time to build better consensus but to also realize that there will be parts of the project that everyone doesn't agree with 100%. He also said we have heard a lot about compromise and that is challenging because we were given options by the MSBA and those were not negotiable. Now we have the opportunity to request a formal review and we are hopeful the new numbers could lead us to better opportunities. He is hoping going forward we can do a better job engaging the community and making it clear that at the end of the process we hope to get to a proposal and design that will be passed by the community at Town Meeting and the votes. We need to start from the understanding that whatever we move forward with, there will be parts of the final proposal that we don't all 100% agree with but we will continue to move forward to get the 750 students into new buildings.

Mr. Heffernan stated that if new information is provided to us, we should reconsider, and this is substantial new information and should make us pause so we can get formal responses from the MSBA. He stated that in the beginning of this process he doesn't believe the community was engaged or aware of what was happening, but now we have people engaged. He is looking to work with the community to get ourselves aligned so we can move forward together to create a plan that will have full community support. He stated we did not have support from the select board or planning board and he thinks it would have been very difficult for us to move forward, but when we restart, he wants to have those boards and the rest of the community behind us.

Mr. Gonzalez stated what we are discussing complicates an already very complex process. He agrees that there is consensus that we need a pause but is hesitant that some will claim this a victory for one side or another and then people taking their eyes off the process. When we get the clarification from the MSBA we will need to move quickly and he doesn't want people to lose engagement in the process. He stressed that this is a pause to recommit to working together and making the best possible project for the Town, students, and teachers of Dedham and it will move quickly.

Mr. Tocci stated he agrees with the motion to request new numbers from the MSBA. When we have substantial new information, the committee has always been of the mind to consider the new information and act accordingly. He stated we have 761 students who are currently learning in substandard facilities that are over 100 years old. As it stands, the JLA and Vertex teams have produced a phenomenal plan, it takes into account the neighborhood, it is the most educationally appropriate option for this Town and it is certainly supported by the educators, and he thanked them and the committee for all their hard work in getting here. He wants to thank the principals who continue to work with the educators in difficult physical conditions and still deliver phenomenal education day after day. He stated in the end we are committed to delivering the best possible product for the educators and students.

Mr. Tocci opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. David Sliver spoke via Zoom and asked about the 9/23 Preferred Schematic Design that was posted by the MSBA.

Mr. Tocci stated this comment is off topic so he will take this comment later on.

Mr. Kevin Schohl spoke via Zoom and stated that he does trust the people on the committee to make decisions and it is important not to rush this 50-year decision. He thinks a lot of people want this reassessment of the new information and this is a good time to press pause. He also applauds the SBRC for their work on this project. He wants to acknowledge that this pause may cost millions of dollars to get to an option that could possibly cost the Town \$50 million, and those same people who want that higher cost option are the same people who complain when the Town spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on the existing buildings. He asks the committee to keep the momentum and urgency up after the pause and also for the community to evaluate the options and be involved and keep thinking about the long term and the future students.

Mr. Tocci stated we have a motion for the town to formally request the MSBA provide new enrollment options and that motion has been seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous, motion passes.

7. New Business:

Mr. Donati stated that we will be waiting for responses from the MSBA through late February or early March, so what does our work on the committee look like until then? He's hoping to get a better sense of where people stand while we wait for new information. He is curious if there is any ability to add voting members to the committee as we think about refreshing this process. People have expressed a desire to have more members of the committee, he noted it may take a community vote.

Mr. Tocci stated it is Town Meeting that dictates the members of the SBRC. He stated years ago about the School Superintendent, Town Manager, and one more at large member were part of this committee but Town Meeting voted at some point to lower the number of members.

Mr. Heffernan stated it's in the Town Bylaw, so that's what is voted on at Town Meeting.

Mr. Tocci stated that one of the planning board members opined that one of the planning board members should be on the committee.

8. Public Comment:

Mr. Tocci asked for any public comment.

Mr. Reedy stated he supports the combined school proposal and he supports the pause to get more information. More importantly he feels confident that Oakdale will be getting a new school soon out of this process and doesn't want the other neighborhoods to be left behind. If the path forward does change, he worries about a future where circumstances change and Riverdale or Greenlodge don't end up with a new school. He also mentioned that there was a statement on Facebook and he read an abbreviated version: We believe that all Dedham elementary school students belong in new elementary schools by the end of this decade. By 2030, if not sooner, none of the existing schools will be acceptable learning environments as evidenced by state evaluations and the school department. Asking Dedham taxpayers to support a tax increase for three stand alone schools will be a significant budgetary challenge for residents so the combined school is the best path forward. We also support the repurposing of the Greenlodge site and hope the neighborhood will participate in the process. No plan will achieve town wide consensus but this is the best one to maximize benefits to the town.

Ms. Campbell Hegarty stated the Save Dedham Schools is support of new schools for the Town, but we differ on what the looks like. But we all agree we need to do what's best for the kids, she likes neighborhood schools and that is what is in the master plan. She stated they have a petition and within 24 hours they had 590 signatures saying the large 550 student school at Oakdale is not what the Town is looking for, they want neighborhood schools that are the right size for the right location. She stated if the new MSBA enrollment options had been on the table originally, she doesn't think we would be here and we would have moved forward with stand-alone schools. But now that we are here, we need to pause and look at the facts, reevaluate and build schools that will make us proud.

Ms. McElligot thanked the board for taking the steps they took this evening. She stated she is Riverdale parent but she doesn't support this combined option she thinks the neighborhood schools are something special that Dedham has and she hopes we can find some common ground to move forward with the new enrollments.

Mr. Silver commented via Zoom and asked about the study done during the ECEC School and there was survey done at that time and it was decided the Oakdale was not a sufficient site for that school, so what happened between 9/23/15 and today?

Mr. Bilafer stated the proposals for a combined ECEC and elementary school were a very different project from the one we are looking at now of just combining two elementary schools. It was pre-k and K as one part of the building and 1-5 as another part of the building with separate nurses, administrations, play areas, and gyms. So, the idea was to keep those two school populations completely separate because we are talking about our youngest learners. They were very different

proposals even though the enrollment numbers lined up, but it was decided that proposal didn't work at any of the other elementary schools either.

Mr. Silver stated the report stated the report said the school would work at Greenlodge.

Mr. Bilafer stated that was not supported by the School Committee or the neighborhood.

9. Adjournment:

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Acosta

SECOND: by Mr. Bilafer

Roll Call Vote to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 9:06 pm.

Attachments:

JLA Phasing Diagrams

Vertex CM vs. DBB presentation

Value Management Spreadsheet

A True Copy Attest
Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
December 20, 2023

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert
Stephen Acosta
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant
Cailen McCormick
Christopher Polito
Laurie Twomey

Naila Hernandez (Student Representative)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Nan Murphy, Superintendent
Dr. Ian Kelly, Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services

Meeting held at the Avery School at 6:30 pm.

Open Meeting (Public Meeting is recorded and can be accessed via Dedham Television)

Mr. Hebert called the meeting to order.

AGENDA:

Performance by DPS Fine Arts Students led by Fine Arts Department Chair Heather Kirby

The Dedham Marauder Band played a medley of the Grinch Who Stole Christmas arranged by Michael Story. Students from the DHS ACappella and Chorus sang Let It Snow.

School Committee members thanked the students and Ms. Kirby for the presentation. Supt. Murphy asked if the high school students could share their music with the elementary schools. Ms. Kirby replied that this year high school students did share their music and talents with the elementary and middle school.

Public Comment

Andrew Czazasty commented that he feels that town residents will oppose the merged Oakdale/Greenlodge schools. He thinks that if the project doesn't pass Town Meeting, there will be further delays. He feels that a stand alone school is the best option.

Nicole Homeier, Greenlodge St. strongly supports modern facilities, but she supports a stand alone Oakdale School. She requested updated enrollment projections from the MSBA. It would be a mistake to build a new building that is too small. She feels there still has to continue to be the commitment to class size. She would like to see the Dedham class and school size policy follow the same parameters as the Wellesley Public School district.

Student Representative Update

Naila Hernandez provided the student representative update:

DHS update:

- Students in Mrs. Ashley Mansfield's Career Planning class participated in mock interviews last week. Students prepared for interviews by creating a resume and practicing commonly asked questions with peers. They were interviewed by staff in a small group setting to help them prepare for a job interview or a college admissions interview in the future.
- DHS also hosted two great Performing Arts events! The high school's winter concert was on Monday and the Taylor Swift tribute concert was last week. Both events were a great success.
- The food service industry also sponsored a Gingerbread house contest, where each department got to work together to decorate a house. They were all displayed in the cafeteria where students got to vote on the most creative, best use of materials and the one that stands out the most.
- Last Friday, students in Connections and Acting 1 participated in a performance of the short play Little Red Riding Hood. The Connections students worked for months on their starring roles during their Music Connections class, practicing their speaking lines, songs, and dances. Their Acting 1 friends supported their work by filling out the cast as supporters, narrators, dancers, and backstage crew. The three Connections students were thrilled to share the performance with their parents, teachers, and friends from Best Buddies. Everyone grew as performers and came together as a team, and we are so proud of them.

District update:

- Greenlodge first graders learned about holidays that are celebrated around the world!
- ECEC kindergarten classes celebrated the first night of Hanukkah.
- 5th-graders at Avery sang at Legacy Place as a way to spread holiday cheer!
- Avery School focused on kindness. A discussion took place in their community meeting about the importance of kindness and even presented a challenge to the students by rewarding them when they are "caught being kind". They get a certificate of kindness and the act is announced to other students who were caught being kind on the announcements in the morning. This is a great way of encouraging kindness to students in different ways throughout the community.
- Winter Enrichment Program registration opened last Wednesday. More individual information about the enrichment opportunities can be found on the DPS website.

Upcoming News and Events:

- Schools across the district have been celebrating spirit week as a fun way of sending the students off to winter break!
- There are 3 more winter concerts to be hosted.
 - December 21 - Oakdale Winter Concert
 - December 22 - ECEC Holiday Sing Along
 - January 19 - Greenlodge Winter Concert

Special recognitions at the High School:

- Senior, Jack Roberts and Junior, Luca O'Connor have been accepted into UMass Lowell's 3rd Regional Juried High School Exhibition, which showcases some of the best high school art in the region. Their artwork was on display for a week and a closing reception and award ceremony was held on the UMASS Lowell campus to celebrate their accomplishments.
- Mason Piro, earned one of the top scores at the Southeastern Massachusetts Mathematics League Meet.

Naila also followed up on the Chair's question from the last meeting about the way the high school has celebrated Jared Sedlis' figure skating accomplishment. She reported that Principal Forrest recognized his success by highlighting the student in the Marauder Message.

Superintendent Update

- Supt. Murphy announced that DPS has been awarded grants equal to a half million dollars this month. Awards include: 1) \$27K from DESE to support the implementation of the new Mass. Individual Education Plan process; 2) \$350K was received by the Student Services and Health Department from Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital Mental Health and Substance Abuse to continue the mental health initiatives outlined in the District Strategic Plan, and; 3) \$256K was received as a matching grant from the state to support instructional materials (4th highest award in the state).
- Dr. Heather Smith is being recognized nationally by the Modern Language Association Convention. She received an appointment that is only held by seven others nationwide.
- Dr. Sara Stetson presented at the International Dyslexia Association of New England conference. She was invited to participate in an expert panel discussion. Dr. Stetson was interviewed by Boston Globe about her work with dyslexia.
- Supt. Murphy displayed images of all the holiday concerts that were held this month at the elementary, middle and high schools. She thanked the Allied Arts teams for bringing together the students in the large settings. Students supported each other and engaged well on stage.
- She showed images from the Gingerbread House contest. There were 30+ houses that were created for the competition from departments all across the district. Chris Polito asked if the School Committee could participate next year.
- The Central Office team canceled the Professional Development Day for today to allow teachers and staff to spend time with friends and family.

COMMENTS about the Superintendent Update

Mr. Polito asked about the ALT Program. Supt. Murphy said there is a January meeting scheduled to discuss the program.

Mr. Polito commented that having nationally recognized central staff is such an asset to Dedham Schools.

Ms. McCormick commented on the success of the grants.

Education/Business Reports

- Elementary School Building Project Update

This update is included in the SBRC update.

- Discussion & Vote on SBRC Recommendation

Mr. Polito recused himself from this discussion because of conflict of interest.

Ms. Briggs updated the group on the SBRC meeting. She said the SBRC voted to recommend that the School Committee request a formal reevaluation of the enrollment numbers.

Mr. Hebert said the School Committee needs to vote to formally request the reevaluation. He asked if anyone had questions about the process.

Ms. Twomey thinks we need to clarify to the public the meaning of the vote. The issue is that there are higher than anticipated enrollment numbers from NESDEC. Voting on a formal request puts the project on hold. That could increase the costs of the project, but it also gives the Town a chance to look back at the process in light of the new enrollment numbers.

Mr. Acosta said the original projection was enrollment of 550 students for the combined Greenlodge/Oakdale school. The new enrollment numbers show an increase of 65 students.

Ms. Briggs said that every year in October districts have to submit their enrollment numbers. NESDEC is only involved as part of the MSBA requirement.

Dr. Flynn Gallant said that time is important and she thinks it's an opportunity to bring the Town together to make sure the final decision is a sound one.

Motion was made to request that the Superintendent, the Chair and the Town Manager request a formal reevaluation of the enrollment members through the MSBA. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0.

[Mr. Polito rejoined the committee.]

- Continued Discussion of 2024-2025 School Calendar

The discussion and vote on the 2023-25 School Calendar will be tabled to the next School Committee meeting to give central administration the time to make necessary updates.

Subcommittees Updates

- Budget

Mr. Polito said they are working diligently on the FY25 budget and after reviewing the FY24 budget they are projecting a deficit spend based on increased enrollments. He announced that the Budget Subcommittee will be presenting a quantified draft of the budget at the next meeting.

Ms. Briggs asked that the School Committee be provided updates about any meetings related to the budget.

- Communications

No updates.

- Curriculum Advisory

Ms. McCormick said the Curriculum Advisory Subcommittee met last night and reviewed the role of the subcommittee and discussed tangible action items. She said Dr. Smith talked about shifts in curriculum related to the pilot. Ms. Twomey added that they received highlights about the Curriculum Night and they are talking about having more focus groups this year. Dr. Smith will attend a School Committee meeting in February to report about the ongoing pilots.

- Facilities

Mr. Acosta said the Facilities Subcommittee had a well-attended meeting with many community members. He added that the Facilities Subcommittee wasn't created just for repurposing the Greenlodge School building. The subcommittee is also looking to tour other facilities with the goals of improving function. He applauded the skills of Matt Haffner, the new Facilities Director.

- Financial Policy Review

Last meeting was postponed.

- Negotiations

Meeting at the beginning of the year.

- Parks & Recreation

No updates.

- Policy – Third Reading & Vote of changes to Policy IC/ICA – School Year Calendar

Motion was made to approve the IC/ICA policy changes as presented to the school year calendar.

Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Ms. Briggs said there will be an upcoming Policy Subcommittee meeting to discuss the rental policy and review the general subcommittee policy.

Mr. Acosta said the subcommittee chairs may have to submit a description of each subcommittee policy for review. Ms. McCormick said that the subcommittee will also review the flag policy.

- SBRC

Already updated.

Donations

Dr. Langenhorst received a donation of \$5,937.50 from Dedham Institution of Savings Foundation in support of the DPS One-to One Initiative. The money will be used to purchase 250 new Chromebook cases with the new Dedham Savings logo for next year's 6th graders.

Members expressed appreciation for the strong role that the Dedham Institution of Savings has played in supporting students at every level of the district.

Motion was made to accept \$5,937.50 from Dedham Institution of Savings Foundation. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the December 6, 2023 minutes. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Ms. Twomey abstained because she was absent from that meeting).

Old/New Business

Dr. Flynn Gallant asked if the custodial staff could do some extra work to sanitize the schools during the holiday vacation. Supt. Murphy responded that there are plans for doing that work during the break.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

Mr. Polito announced that the Boosters Club produced sweat shirts and swag for the soccer team and subsidized costs so that families only have to pay a nominal amount.

Mr. Hebert urged everyone to stay safe and healthy and have a Happy Holiday.

Motion was made to adjourn and approved by a vote of 7-0.

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul M. Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
Dedham Town Hall – O'Brien Meeting Room
January 31, 2024

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert (absent)
Stephen Acosta
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant
Cailen McCormick
Christopher Polito
Laurie Twomey

Naila Hernandez, student representative (absent)

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Nan Murphy, Superintendent
Dr. Ian Kelly, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services

Meeting held at the Town Hall at 7 pm.

Open Meeting (Public Meeting is recorded and can be accessed via Dedham Television)

Ms. Briggs, Vice Chair of the School Committee, called the meeting to order in Mr. Hebert's absence. She announced that this would be a truncated business meeting due to the frequency of meetings this month.

Pledge of Allegiance

Open Meeting (Public Meeting is recorded and can be accessed via Dedham Television)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Andrew Czsatsky, 188 Sprague St. He expressed sentiment that the merged Oakdale School is no longer viable. He recognized the hard work of everyone who was involved in the process. Need to take decisive action and we need to envision a school that includes shared values.

Holley Redmond talked about the calendar and the discussion about having school on the religious holidays. She feels that removing Rosh Hashanah is not inclusive at a time when Anti Semitism is so high.

Jim Maher, 22 Sherman Road is hoping that the School Committee could prevent much conflict in the Town by making the right decision about the Oakdale School project.

Business Report

• Discussion & Vote on 2024-2025 School Calendar

Supt. Murphy said she sent out a survey poll that solicited feedback from DPS families about the observance of Rosh Hashanah and Good Friday. The feedback she received has guided her to make a recommendation that the calendar stays as originally presented with Rosh Hashanah and Good Friday remaining as observed holidays. She suggested that maybe next year, we can better utilize half days to attain the goal of an earlier release day in June.

Ms. McCormick said the overarching message should be inclusivity and she is in favor of keeping both Rosh Hashanah and Good Friday as observed holidays.

Motion was made to accept the 2024-25 School Calendar as presented. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

• Discussion & Vote on 2024-2025 ECEC Before/After School Fees

Dr. Kelly displayed a slide with a partial and full fee increase. He explained that the goal is to try to align the ECEC Before/After school fees with the LEAP fees. He said the ECEC fees have not been increased for eight years. He recommends a partial increase at this time to increase the fees gradually.

Ms. McCormick said she would be willing to vote on the increase, but she wants to ensure that the Administration communicates the annual percentage increases to families.

Motion was made to approve the 2023-25 Before/After school fees as proposed. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

• Discussion & Vote on Solar Panel Project

Dr. Kelly talked about the solar project and the mandate to move towards renewable energy. The current proposed projects are canopies at the high school at the end zone lot and recreation road, canopy at the Middle School and large canopy at the ECEC. The vote tonight would be to approve the projects and authorize the Town Manager to finalize the contracts.

Mr. Polito asked if the Planning Board has been involved in this project? Dr. Kelly said that the Planning Board has been working with Solect Energy to make sure clearance is permitted.

Motion was made to approve the solar project to move forward with Solect Energy and the Town of Dedham. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

• Discussion & Vote on FY25 Operating Budget

Supt. Murphy said the proposed 8% increase in the School budget does not reflect a level service budget and would include a reduction of 14 FTEs. Since last discussed, the Governor has released her state budget with a \$2.7M increase in Chapter 70 funds for Dedham. The funding is disbursed through the schools and then Town Management has to approve the use. If approved, the 8% increase would only be a 3% increase when offset by the Chapter 70 funding. Supt. Murphy cautioned that this extra funding doesn't change the need to make reductions. The Senate and House have to approve the funding and it will not be approved until early Fall.

Ms. Twomey asked if historically the Town of Dedham approves the Chapter 70 budget? Supt. Murphy said the town leadership is aware and understanding about our funding needs.

Ms. Twomey asked if the funding is allocated, could we increase our budget demands past the 8% increase? Mr. Polito said we could ask for closer to the original budget of 11% increase, but we need to be careful that we strike a balance with the Town and work as a partner.

Supt. Murphy concurred that in the budget subcommittee she made a recommendation to stay at 8% in order to maintain a healthy partnership with the Town.

Dr. Flynn Gallant and Mr. Acosta hope that the Town will do the right thing and appropriate the Chapter 70 funding to the schools.

Motion was made to approve the FY25 operating budget for \$58,826,432. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

- Review updated MSBA Enrollment Options and possible Vote to Certify Enrollment Options

Mr. Polito recused himself from this vote.

Ms. Briggs announced that today they received new numbers from the MSBA. The enrollment numbers are as follows:

- Standalone Oakdale approved for 360 students in grades 1-5.
- Consolidated Oakdale/Riverdale approved for 560 students in grades 1-5.
- Consolidated Oakdale/Greenlodge approved for 665 students in grades 1-5.

The vote tonight would allow Supt. Murphy, Victor Hebert and Leon Goodman to ask that these numbers be certified at the MSBA next board meeting.

Mr. Acosta said that these numbers come with additional classrooms.

Motion was made to authorize Mr. Hebert in his capacity as Chair, Ms. Murphy in her capacity as Superintendent, and Mr. Goodman in his capacity as Town Manager to sign and execute the study enrollment certification from the MSBA provided on January 31, 2024. Motion was approved by a vote of 5-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent and Mr. Polito abstained from the vote).

Subcommittees Updates

- Budget

No further updates.

- Curriculum Advisory

Ms. Twomey said the Curriculum Advisory subcommittee met this month and talked with Dr. Smith about the language pilot currently underway. Dr. Smith will join an upcoming meeting to update us about the language pilot. She said they also reviewed the district and school improvement plan and are planning to hold focus groups in March. The next meeting is February 27th.

- Facilities

Mr. Acosta said that the next stage of their analysis is a tour of the high school. The Finance and Warrant Committee will join them during that tour and the public is also invited.

- Financial Policy Review

Mr. Polito said the Financial Policy Subcommittee will be meeting again this week and hopefully finish the review this week.

- Parks & Recreation

No update.

- Policy

Mr. Acosta reminded the Chairs of the subcommittees to return their edits on the subcommittee descriptions.

- SBRC

Ms. Briggs said that there are no further updates but there will be a meeting this Tuesday, Feb. 6th at Town Hall at 6:30. No action can be taken until Feb. 28th when MSBA votes on the enrollment numbers.

Donations

Dr. Langenhorst is requesting approval of a donation by the Library Innovation Team (DELit) of \$3500 to support the townwide Dedham Reads Together program.

Motion was made to approve the donation from the Library Innovation Team for their donation of \$3500 to Dedham Reads Together program. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the minutes from the January 17, 2024 School Committee as presented.

Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Supt. Murphy announced that the Commissioner of Education noted the merits of Don Langenhorst in his accomplishments in securing data privacy in the Dedham Public Schools.

Dr. Flynn Gallant thanked the Dedham High Performing Arts groups for the sing-a-longs on Saturday morning.

Ms. Twomey attended the "Charting the Course" workshop open to newly elected School Committee members run through the National Association for School Committees. She said it was a great learning experience that covered many topics.

Ms. McCormick offered acknowledgement to Alyssa Freda for her work on getting the summer program registration out in a timely manner and to the teachers who will be running programs.

Executive Session – Exemption 3, to discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining

Motion was made to go into Executive Session and not return to public session. Motion was approved by a vote of 6-0. (Mr. Hebert was absent from the meeting.)

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

A True Copy Attest

Paul Munchbach
Town Clerk

Dedham Public Schools
School Committee Meeting
Avery School
March 20, 2024

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Victor Hebert
Stephen Acosta
Mayanne Briggs
Dr. Leah Flynn Gallant
Cailen McCormick
Christopher Polito
Laurie Twomey

Naila Hernandez, student representative

MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION:

Nan Murphy, Superintendent
Dr. Ian Kelly, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Sara Stetson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services

Meeting held at the Town Hall at 7 pm.

Open Meeting (Public Meeting is recorded and can be accessed via Dedham Television)

Pledge of Allegiance

Open Meeting (Public Meeting is recorded and can be accessed via Dedham Television)

Performance from the cast of Mean Girls from the Dedham High School musical.

- Discussion, Recommendation and Vote on the Enrollment Option for the Elementary Building Project

Motion was made to take the agenda out of order. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

[Chris Polito recused himself due to personal conflict of interest.]

Supt. Murphy showed slides with the school building project survey feedback. Survey was emailed to all DPS families, posted on social pages and in newspapers and flyers, and shared at all public forums held through in-person and Zoom. There were a total of 647 respondents who participated in the survey. Out of the 647 replies, 525 responded in favor of the stand alone Oakdale.

Supt. Murphy said that she and the leadership team are recommending the stand-alone Oakdale with 360 student enrollment and would provide 110 more students than the current enrollment at Oakdale, that would allow expansion.

Mr. Acosta said that this decision makes sense with the new enrollment numbers and he would hope we can all move forward and address the capital improvements to the remaining buildings that need updates.

Ms. Flynn-Gallant said that we need a clear plan to address issues with the remaining facilities as soon as possible.

Ms. Twomey thanked the survey respondents. She applauded the leadership team for supplying so many outlets for feedback. It was important to hear the community voices.

Ms. Briggs said the 360 enrollment option gives us a new opportunity to alleviate overcrowding in the new facility.

Motion was made by Ms. Briggs to accept the 360-student stand alone school for the new Oakdale Building project. Motion was approved by a vote of Vote 6-0. (Mr. Polito recused himself from the discussion and vote).

[Chris Polito rejoined the committee.]

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carlene Campbell-Hegarty, 57 Holmes Rd., feels that the Town made the best choice possible for the Oakdale Project. Mr. Hebert replied that SBRC will look at the site again and then there will be meetings with the MSBA. He said if we move forward smoothly with the process we should only be six months behind the original schedule.

Jim Maher, 22 Sherman Rd. thanked the group for making the right decision.

Andrew Czazasty, 118 Sprague St. thanked the School Committee and hopes the decision will reflect well on the committee.

Matt Brophy, Pleasant St. said this was a lesson learned to apply to the other schools going forward.

John Tocci, 78 Adams St., Chair of the SBRC, thanked the School Committee members for being a great partner. He also thanked the School Committee for listening to the community. He feels that every decision made was for the best interest of the educators and students.

Student Representative Update

Naila Hernandez provided the bi-weekly update at DPS.

High School events:

- The English for EL classes got a special visit last month! They explored the award-winning book *The Only Road*, which is about a young Guatemalan boy's journey to the US. Students participated in a virtual visit with the author, Alexandra Diaz. Students took the lead in a thoughtful discussion about the book. Many thanks to the Dedham Education Foundation for making this event possible!
- The performance of *Mean Girls* was a huge success! After two months of rehearsal, the cast and crew outdid themselves. The audience was blown away and couldn't stop talking about how amazing and fantastic the show was. Much gratitude to Ms. Soson, Ms. Kirby, and everyone involved in the production for the amazing performances.

- On Thursday, March 7, the junior class participated in an important training, sponsored by the Norfolk County District Attorney's Office. This one-hour session, led by local first responders and public health partners, taught students what to do during an emergency. This training was one of the various challenges of Team Rival, a community service and peer leadership-based project that the Student Council participated in.

District Summary:

- At Oakdale, last Wednesday, the third graders attended a field trip to The Commonwealth Museum. They reviewed state history beginning in the 1600's and learned about the Native Americans, the Pilgrims, and Puritans. They explored the American Revolution and continued traveling through time where they ended up learning about the Lowell Mills. They also learned about child labor, the history of children working in the mills, and the right to an education.
- Congratulations to the middle school's 7th and 8th grade students, Celia , Izzy, Sasha, Adlai, Dershana, and Jorge. These students participated in the MMEA Eastern Junior Districts Festival this past weekend. After securing their spots in January, over a day and a half they rehearsed with their respective ensembles which culminated in a performance Saturday afternoon. During rehearsals, students worked with respected conductors based in New England.

UPCOMING NEWS & EVENTS

- Schools across the town are excited to announce that the award-winning author Rajani LaRocca will be visiting the Dedham students on April 12, 29, and 30th. Rajani will be offering presentations to students focused on her author journey and published books.
- Oakdale will be hosting a cultural night on Thursday, April 11 from 6-7:30 pm. It is one of their favorite family events of the year and a great opportunity to showcase family traditions, share favorite recipes, demonstrate a traditional performance or activity, or learn about a place or culture .
- The Smart Smiles Program through Dental Associates of Walpole will be at the ECEC this week teaching all students in PK and Kindergarten about the importance of good oral hygiene.
- ECEC is once again partnering with the Special Olympics to be a Unified Champion School. Since March not only includes Spread the Word Inclusion Day but also is National Disabilities Awareness month, Cerebral Palsy Awareness month, the start of World Autism week and World Down Syndrome Day, the ECEC will host its second Spread the Word Inclusion Week which will take place March 18-22th.
- For seniors not enrolled in a Wellness elective this year, the DHS grade 12 physical education requirement will take place during the underclass MCAS exam on Tuesday, March 26 or Wednesday, March 27. They are required to attend the date which they have been assigned to receive credit for their Grade 12 Physical Education Graduation Requirement.
- DHS will be hosting an On the Spot Admissions Day for seniors tomorrow, Thursday, March 21. During this event, seniors will have the opportunity to meet with admissions counselors to review their applications and receive an admissions decision while in the meeting.

Superintendent Update

- Supt. Murphy gave heartfelt thanks to Principals Hermes and McGowan for their involvement in the building project. She confirmed that school leadership have intentions to continue to improve the Greenlodge School facility. She also thanked Drs. Kelly, Stetson and Smith for their roles in the building project process by providing information to the MSBA in a timely manner.

- March is Women’s History Month and the Supt. showed the events honoring women. STEMInist Conference at Roxbury Community was attended by some of our Middle and High School students. She recognized the female leaders at the district who attended the Women’s Leadership Conference in Framingham.
- DEF Spelling Bee – Riverdale took home the Spelling Bee trophy. She said she was amazed at the spelling skills exhibited by the teams.
- Inspection and monitoring of School Facilities are being undertaken by Dr. Kelly and Mat Haffner. Tours are scheduled to look for safety and capital improvements. The goal is to focus on issues that are under our control.
- Sixteen Middle School Art students have been selected to present their art at the K-12 virtual state Art Exhibit.
- Sample pages were shown from the DPS social media site that is open for families to follow.
- School Transition Plans. Opportunities will be available for students and families to tour and meet teachers in their new schools.

Ms. Twomey thanked the school for linking the High School course enrollment catalog so parents can see what is available.

Ms. McCormick said its important to objectify what students are exposed to every day in our school facilities.

Education Report

- Oakdale School Spirit Color – Principal Kimberly Hermesch

Principal Hermesch talked about the loss of Christine Stec and what she meant to the Town of Dedham. The Oakdale School often honors her with the color purple. She would like to ask that Oakdale school colors be changed to purple and white in Christine’s honor.

The Supt. said they are happy to see the colors transition to purple and white.

Mr. Hebert said even though the School Committee does not have purview over this decision, they would be pleased to vote in favor of the request.

Motion was made to make purple and white the official colors for Oakdale School. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

- Winter Sports Update – Athletic Director Stephen Traister

Mr. Traister reported that 220 student athletes participated in sports at DHS this past winter. He provided an update and highlights of the Middle and High School teams.

He said that the new DHS field has made sports so much more enjoyable for the students. He made a comment that there is a need for more tennis courts in Dedham.

Mr. Traister talked about the plans for introducing the 8th graders to High School sports. He said that scores and game outcomes are posted on X (formerly Twitter) every day.

- Superintendent’s Evaluation

Ms. Twomey requested the superintendent add a little more evidence about her vision for aligning academic achievement activities.

Mr. Hebert announced that Dr. Flynn Gallant has volunteered to organize the evaluation feedback. Forms should be returned by March 26th.

Supt. Murphy and Mr. Hebert will meet to discuss the evaluation before the April 3rd School Committee meeting.

Business Report

- FY25 Budget Planning Update

Dr. Kelly said he is putting together the 3rd qtr. budget for April. He said it has come to his attention that the kilowatt hour projection is higher than budgeted by a substantial amount. He will be confirming the differential and reporting back to the group about that.

Dr. Kelly reported that Supt. Murphy and he met with the Finance and Warrant Committee about the budget on March 12th. They have also met about the budget with the leadership of six out of the seven schools.

A Community Forum about the budget will be held on April 4th and Supt. Murphy and Dr. Kelly will meet with Town leaders this week. If the budget needs to be capped at 8% increase, then we need to get a firm idea of the budget so that we are able to notify employees of layoffs before June 15th.

Dr. Kelly also reported that eight facility visits have been completed. Short and long-term concerns are being identified.

Mr. Polito thanked Dr. Kelly and the superintendent for taking such a vested interest in school facilities.

- Discussion & Vote to Accept and Authorize the School Committee Chair and Superintendent to sign the Town of Dedham Combined Financial Policies document

Mr. Polito said after much dialogue and interface with Town leadership, the financial policies document is ready for review. He clarified that the updated policy does not require changes to any of the existing School Committee policy.

Dr. Flynn Gallant reported the team involved in the financial policies process focused on ensuring that the policy is written in layman terms.

Motion was made to accept and authorize the School Committee Chair and the Superintendent to sign the Town of Dedham combined financial policies document. Motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

Subcommittees Updates

- Budget

No further info.

- Curriculum Advisory

No updates.

- Facilities

Mr. Acosta reported that a tour of the high school will be held this Saturday at 11 am. Other Town committees and the public are welcome to join the tour.

- Negotiations

No updates.

- Policy

Mr. Acosta asked for members to submit any comments about policy description changes as soon as possible. He is planning to reach out to MASC about best practices in policy implementation.

- SBRC

Next meeting will be held on Monday night at 6:30 at Town Hall.

Donations

Dedham Educational Partnership has donated \$1200 to support the purchase of an exercise bike for the high school athletic program.

Motion was made to accept the donation of \$1200 from the Dedham Educational Partnership and approved by a 7-0 vote.

Review and Approval Vote of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion was made to approve the February 28, 2024 meeting minutes and approved by a 7-0 vote.

Motion was made to approve the March 6, 2024 meeting minutes and approved by a 6-0 vote. (Ms. McCormick was absent for that meeting).

Old/New Business

Mr. Polito reminded the group that the Executive Session minutes review needs to be finalized.

Acknowledgements and Announcements

Ms. Briggs reached out to the community to partner with the School Committee to ensure that small neighborhood schools continue to be a focus. Three more school buildings are needed and we need the Town to support our endeavors in this regard. A solid financial building plan needs to be developed.

Dr. Flynn Gallant announced that tomorrow is World Down's Syndrome Day. This is about how everyone is more alike than different and how different modes of learning are necessary.

Motion was made to adjourn the meeting. Motion was approved with a roll call vote of 7-0.

Submitted by

Virginia Quinn

Recording Secretary

Dedham School Building Rehabilitation Committee

Hosted at the Dedham Town Hall and via Zoom

SBRC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday March 25, 2024 – 6:30 PM

Members present:

(A= attended Meeting; P= attended partial meeting)

	<u>Voting Members:</u>		<u>Jonathan Levi Associates (Designer):</u>	A	Anthony Rodriguez, Ex Officio
A	John Tocci, Chair		Jonathan Levi	A	Kaitlyn DeStefano, Ex Officio Via Zoom
A	Steve Bilafer, Vice Chair	A	Philip Gray Via Zoom		Shannan Kavanagh, Ex Officio
A	Josh Donati, Selectman	A	Carol Harris		Kerri Bryant, Ex Officio
A	John Heffernan, Finance Committee		<u>Other:</u>	A	Dr. Ian Kelley, Deputy Superintendent
A	Mayanne MacDonald Briggs, School Committee	A	Matt Haffner, Director of Facilities, Via Zoom		
A	Stephen Acosta, School Committee	A	Kimberly Hermes, Oakdale School Principal		
A	Phillip Gonzalez	A	Ms. Nan Murphy, Superintendent of Schools (non-voting)		
	<u>VERTEX: Owners Project Manager (OPM)</u>		Jennifer McGowan, Greenlodge School Principal		
A	Jon Lemieux, Project Director Via Zoom	A	Katherine Duceman, Ex Officio		
	Stephen Theran, Sr. Project Manager	A	Steven Popper, Ex Officio		
A	Anissa Ellis, Project Manager		Sara Rosenthal, Ex Officio		

Distribution: SRBC Members and other attendees

1. Old Business/Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Tocci opened the March 25, 2024, SBRC meeting at 6:33 pm.

Mr. Tocci asked for any old business. There is none.

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the minutes from the March 5, 2024, meeting.

MOTION: by Mr. Gonzalez to approve the March 5, 2024, minutes.

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Vote: Vote is unanimous. Motion passes 6-0-1; Mr. Heffernan abstains.

Mr. Tocci noted there was one change to the minutes, he requested one update to page 2 it should say 665 instead of 660 for the combined Oakdale Greenlodge enrollment. He then requested a revote.

MOTION: by Mr. Donati to approve the March 5, 2024, minutes with noted changes.

SECOND: by Ms. MacDonald Briggs

Vote: Vote is unanimous. Motion passes 6-0-1; Mr. Heffernan abstains.

2. Approval of Invoices:

Mr. Tocci requested approval of the vendor invoice package for February 2024. Mr. Tocci asked about the invoice for the Cropper GIS work and if that is going to be paid by the project and not the schools. Ms. Ellis confirmed.

MOTION: by Mr. Bilafer to approve the February 2024 Package.

SECOND: by Mr. Heffernan

Vote: Vote is unanimous. Motion passes 7-0-0;

3. Report on Communications with MSBA regarding enrollment options and certification:

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated that last Wednesday the school committee voted 6-0 in favor of a 360 enrollment standalone Oakdale school.

Mr. Tocci requested an update on the possible timelines as we move forward.

Ms. Ellis stated we had talked about providing a PSR in May and Schematic Design Report in August which leads to an MSBA schematic design approval in October.

Mr. Tocci stated in order to get to an MSBA Board meeting we need to submit approximately two months in advance.

Ms. Ellis stated that the report is due at the end of August and the Board meeting is approximately October 25, 2024.

Mr. Tocci stated we do not have to go as far as back as the PDP but we are submitting a new PSR in May.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if we can make these deliverables in a more compressed time frame?

Mr. Tocci confirmed. He stated because we don't have to submit a PDP, it is a compressed timeframe. The PSR needs to be submitted by May 2, 2024, to make it to the MSBA Board meeting at the end of June.

Ms. Harris stated the PSR is the Preferred Schematic Report. Previously at this phase we had already eliminated many of the sites, but we still had the three school sites. So, we will be looking at the three different enrollment configurations on those sites. She stated we will be redoing those studies and looking at the massing for an add/reno and new construction and because there is already a site and enrollment chosen we can also put together a floor plan and site plan for that chosen option.

Mr. Tocci stated it does seem odd that enrollment has been selected but we have to show the MSBA that we considered other options and sites.

Mr. Donati asked why that is?

Ms. Ellis stated it's because the MSBA gave us the three different enrollments and they want to see that all options were considered. This is part of their process.

Mr. Donati stated he's sure that is true, but the last time when we did this, the enrollment vote was already made and we didn't still pursue studying the enrollments that were not chosen. Since we already voted, why do we have to do this.

Mr. Tocci stated when we submitted the PSR last summer we had done the analysis of the different sites and we had done site designs and preliminary cost estimates that went into the PSR. Now we are doing this backward and the MSBA is aware this is a unique situation. But they want to see that there were documents created for all options, that all the options were studied, as part of the report.

Mr. Heffernan stated we have that information in the PSR under the old PSR, so is a lot of that information the same.

Ms. Harris stated in many ways yes, but in other ways there is a lot of work that has to go into it. She noted we have to create new space summaries which she is working on right now. So, it will change the amount of square footage required for each option, we are trying to get it just right so all the documents reflect the enrollments we are dealing with right now.

Mr. Gonzalez stated the program that was in the original PSR was comprehensive, does that have to get significantly revised?

Ms. Harris stated it will be very similar, but the number of rooms will be adjusted to appropriately match the enrollments.

Mr. Donati stated tonight we will be talking about cost and what we need to ask from Town Meeting to continue with the feasibility study and expedite the new school design. So, whatever we are doing to expedite this report and reconsider options that are already off the table, is that taking away from cost and time that we could be focusing on finalizing the actual design? How much money and time is being spent on what is, quite literally, an exercise. Discussing the other enrollment options seems strange.

Mr. Heffernan stated we've heard we need to do that as a requirement of the MSBA, hopefully we can minimize time spent on the other enrollment options. He stated it is important for us to have discussed this because he doesn't want anyone to think we are still considering those options.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that we are only looking at Oakdale and the Capen site because it's a standalone option. We couldn't possibly site something at the Greenlodge or Oakdale.

Mr. Tocci stated we could, but it does not make any sense. Conceivably, we could open it up to other sites.

Mr. Tocci stated the goal is to get the annual fall town meeting, so the latest MSBA approval is the October 30, 2024, meeting and then we worked backwards from there. He noted that it will be a tight timeline, if the MSBA votes on October 30, we have the town election a week later, and then town meeting a couple of weeks after that. The vote isn't on the agenda for tonight, but the goal to have all the votes in the Fall.

Mr. Donati asked if we are able to say there is a target date for opening the new school? This seems like a 6-month delay in the town meeting votes, will this be a February opening?

Ms. Ellis stated that we should have that information by next meeting. Once we have finalized the size of the building, we can finish putting a schedule together.

Mr. Acosta asked if there is any chance we could have Schematic Design approved at the August 28, 2024 meeting?

Ms. Ellis stated we cannot do that because we cannot attend back-to-back MSBA meetings.

Mr. Donati asked if we have asked the MSBA and confirmed we cannot attend back-to-back meetings.

Ms. Ellis confirmed.

Mr. Tocci asked when we have to have our ask ready for Fincom?

Mr. Heffernan stated we have to look to see how much information we can have ready for Fincom April 8, 2024. That is for the discussion on the warrant for additional funds to complete the design. Hopefully tonight we can have a conversation about how much additional money we will need to finish the design work.

Mr. Tocci stated there have been conversations, but we do not have final numbers yet from JLA or Vertex. There is ongoing discussion.

Mr. Heffernan stated we will need those for the April 8, 2024, Fincom meeting. He stated there have been times when the number has been delayed to later hearings, however they are moving fairly quickly so the more information we can give them the easier it is for them to move into deliberations to make a recommendation. He stated he asked the chair to get him any questions ahead of time if possible.

Mr. Tocci noted it is a warrant article submitted by School Committee, he confirmed the next SC meeting is April 3. He asked for confirmation that the new number will be ready for that meeting even if it's not ready for the SBRC ahead of the Fincom meeting.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated the SBRC does not need to vote on the warrant article. It is nicer to say that both committees voted on it and are in agreement, but not necessary.

Mr. Donati stated we can have the conversation at the April 9, 2024 meeting which is before town meeting.

Mr. Lemieux stated we should have the number tomorrow for everyone to review.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated she wants to thank the MSBA for allowing us to move head as quickly as possible.

Ms. Murphy thanked Principal McGowan and her staff at the Greenlodge for their time and efforts in getting us to where we are this time. All their feedback and input will continue to inform the process as we move forward. She stated the school committee will continue to ensure the Riverdale and Greenlodge school have a thoughtful plan on when they can expect to see changes to their schools moving forward.

Mr. Tocci stated JLA met with approximately 50-60 teachers back in the fall and those communications will certainly still be used and inform the design and construction of the school.

Ms. Murphy stated not just teachers but also custodial staff, nurses, and food services.

4. Consideration and possible vote on location of the new school:

Mr. Tocci stated it seems to him to make sense to site this new school at the Oakdale site. He stated he is open to hearing other ideas or thoughts, but the Oakdale site has already been tested and had borings completed. It was approved for Geothermal the first time we voted on this project. He stated we have put a lot of thought into what it would be like to build a school on the occupied site. He stated those are some pros to building at the Oakdale, it would also allow the design to move forward more quickly.

Ms. MacDonald Briggs stated we have put a significant amount of work into studying the Oakdale site already. She has heard people say they want us to look at an add/reno or building where the current building is already sited. She stated it would irresponsible and wasteful to consider other sites since we have already done borings and studies on the Oakdale Site. She stated she is not in favor of doing that. She is also concerned with moving the existing Oakdale to a different neighborhood.

Mr. Heffernan stated as one who voted for Capen, he would not consider it again. It was the best choice for consolidating two schools into one location, but to move the single school out of Oakdale makes no sense. He stated he is prepared to make a vote tonight.

Mr. Donati stated keeping the school at the Oakdale site is the most cost effective and efficient thing to do. He stated we would be ignoring all the public input we received if we moved the schools out of their current neighborhoods. No one has been advocating for the Oakdale to be moved to another site. The only issue at the Oakdale is the bad soil, but if you balance that with costs for doing an entirely new public process and reviewing new sites, it doesn't make a ton of sense. If we had endless resources and

time we could do that, but that's the not the case here. For the purpose of a school, it will be a good site.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he agrees with what has already been said. He stated we also got pretty far through the process previously and discussed the complexity of building on an occupied site. We know it is possible and can be managed. He stated it is important to remember we are not overlooking that fact we are building next to a school that is open and in session. The other reason is the equity consideration, when we looked at the Oakdale site, we agreed the Oakdale site will better help achieve that equity.

Mr. Bilafer stated that things changed when the MSBA gave us new enrollment figures, so it is certainly appropriate to retrace our steps, however we don't have to do it at the same pace as before. Many of the considerations from the original decision still hold true. That includes the site and new construction on that site. Changing the enrollment to a standalone 360 school doesn't make renovating a 100-year-old school any cheaper. He stated the committee is now mindful that ultimately, we will be asking the community for three new elementary schools over the next few years and we need to be mindful of cost. What the MSBA is asking us to do is to give them a PSR that shows all potential options given the new enrollment figures. We have spent a lot of time talking about these things so if we take tonight to refresh our memories that is appropriate but there is nothing that will lead me to believe this school should be anywhere other than the Oakdale site with new construction.

Ms. Hermesch stated she agrees. The first time around we really looked at renovating the existing Oakdale school and what we were really talking about is preserving the shell. Economically it does not make sense and there needs to be a consideration of cost. As a school we are prepared to move forward with the new construction on the site as discussed before, she does not see the revisiting the conversation about renovation being a realistic option.

Mr. Tocci asked Ms. Hermesch if she is ok with building a new school on the current site.

Ms. Hermesch confirmed. She stated that considering efficiency and costs she understands why that needs to be the option.

Mr. Acosta stated he agrees with what Mr. Heffernan said. He voted for the Capen site because it was a good way to merge the Greenlodge and Oakdale neighborhoods into one. However, now that it is a standalone school it does not make sense. Based on what we heard tonight it makes sense to move forward with the Oakdale site.

Mr. Rodriguez stated he agrees with everyone that the Oakdale site makes the most sense. One of the big things to note is that it is the most cost effective option. The smaller enrollment alleviates the site from being overcrowded and reduces the amount of required parking which helps allow for larger play areas and everything fits more comfortably on the site. In the end we all want a successful project that the community can appreciate. As we go through the process again we can be very mindful of the neighborhood context so all the residents can buy into the new project.

Mr. Tocci stated we have already done a traffic study that looked at a new school being built at the Oakdale. He noted there are a lot of stakeholders who have been involved with the design. He stated they have met with the Active Transportation Working Group, the Town Engineer, and the Town DPW Director and they are already thinking about improvements to the area streets and sidewalks. Many

people have provided input and feedback on the site. He stated he also thinks it will be less costly for JLA and Vertex to get us to schematic design if we can tell them tonight the building will be at the Oakdale school and that may make the additional funding ask at town meeting more manageable.

MOTION: by Ms. Macdonald Briggs to move forward with the Oakdale 360 standalone to be constructed at the Oakdale site.

SECOND: by Mr. Heffernan.

Vote: Vote is unanimous. Motion passes 7-0-0;

5. Feasibility Study Cost:

Mr. Tocci stated we do not have the budget for the feasibility study yet, we should have it in a few days and in time for the School Committee will vote next week.

Mr. Donati stated it has been said that as a result of the decision making it will cost extra money and some people have called it "wasted money." However, he wants to revisit how everything played out and review the timeline. He stated the SBRC voted on the enrollment and site last June. We then received new enrollment numbers in November that showed we were looking at a possible 665-student enrollment to combine those two communities. And so, we would have had a choice to make at that point.

He stated Capen was a smaller site but many people supported it because it was between two neighborhoods. There was a question if the Capen site could handle the original 550 student enrollment. And so, whether we had changed our minds in June or July or if we changed course in December, we would still have been faced with higher current enrollment numbers in November which led to us asking the MSBA if they could revisit the enrollments offered. To which they responded yes and hugely increased our enrollment. The point being, we would have been at this point regardless. It is easy to say all this time has gone by and been wasted, but we just mentioned a lot of things that happened over the last 5-6 months that is not wasted. We know we can do geothermal at this site, we know that if a 550 student is going to fit a 360 student will fit. We've also done a traffic study. None of that has been wasted time.

Mr. Donati stated that there would have been a conversation in November about enrollments that would have brought us to this same point. He stated a 235 enrollment was never an option so we are here today because we asked questions about the enrollment, received great enrollments back from the MSBA, and now we have a standalone school with state money which was not really an option before. He hopes that if town meeting members have questions about the money that will be asked for at town meeting, that they should ask them now and we can walk through the last 6 months of decision making. Mr. Bilafer stated the fact that we did a few months of site consideration in 15 minutes should tell you how much work the committee has already done. He stated that all the work that was done before can inform the decision being made with the new enrollments.

Mr. Bilafer asked if the work being done now is still being done under the original appropriation because we have some funds left over.

Mr. Lemieux confirmed, he stated we have approximately \$81,000 which will be applied against any future ask of town meeting.

Mr. Bilafer stated, just to reiterate that, the funds that were given to this committee were used wisely and they were well within the limits to get the job done. Now we will be asking for the funds to make any required alternations to meet the new numbers given y the MSBA.

Mr. Lemieux stated the MSBA is still considering if they would participate in reimbursement for the additional ask. They recognize that we are in a unique position and were within days of submitting the

SD, but they want to know what the number is first, but there is a possibility they will increase their reimbursement. He noted the reimbursement rate is 47%.

Mr. Lemieux stated there are not caps for feasibility so it's straightforward. He noted that if we hadn't spent the remaining \$81,000 they would reimburse 47% of everything spent. The unanswered question is if they will reimburse for anything over the original \$1 million appropriation from the MSBA.

Mr. Donati stated we are going to asking for somewhere in the hundreds of thousand, nowhere close to \$1million. We are looking at getting close to \$20 million overall from the state, so whatever money we are going to ask for at town meeting is well worth it.

Mr. Tocci asked when we will know from the MSBA what portion of this may fund? Or do they have to see the PSR first? It would be helpful to know how much of the new ask the MSBA will be willing to fund.

Mr. Lemieux stated if we can provide the request for added funding, we can let the MSBA know at the same time and ask that they make a decision before the May town meeting.

6. Future Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Tocci suggested they also switch the working group meetings to the opposite weeks.

****Discussion on meeting dates****

Agreed upon upcoming meeting dates:

Wednesday April 3, 2024 – School Committee Meeting

Monday April 8, 2024 – Fincom meeting

Tuesday April 9, 2024 – SBRC Meeting

Tuesday April 16, 2024 – Fincom Deliberations (possibly Thursday April 18, 2024 as well)

Monday April 29, 2024 - SBRC Meeting

Thursday May 2, 2024 – PSR SUBMISSION DUE

Monday May 14, 2024 – SBRC Meeting

Tuesday April 2, 2024 – Working Group

Thursday April 25, 2024– Working Group

Tuesday May 7, 2024 – Working Group

7. New Business & Public comment:

Mr. Tocci asked for any new business. There is none.

Mr. Tocci asked for any public comment.

Mr. Czazasty asked if there can be a debt exclusion vote on the November national ballot and then a town meeting vote soon after?

Mr. Tocci stated we can have a debt exclusion vote on the election ballot, but not an override vote. We will have a more definitive answer when we have a meeting with the Town Clerk. He also noted we will have 120 days to get approval from town meeting and a town wide vote after the MSBA approval. He stated we will talk with the town clerk and moderator about timelines.

Mr. Donati stated he hopes we can all work together as a community because time is money so we hope that the votes can happen as quickly as possible so construction can start as soon as possible.

8. Adjournment:

Mr. Tocci requested a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: to adjourn by Mr. Acosta

SECOND: by Mr. Gonzalez

Vote to Adjourn - Unanimous

Meeting Adjourned at 7:17 pm.

Attachments:

None.

A True Copy Attest

Paul M Munchbach
Town Clerk



May 2, 2024

Jennifer Flynn
Senior Project Coordinator
Massachusetts School Building Authority
40 Broad St | Suite 500 | Boston, MA

Re: Town of Dedham
Oakdale Elementary School Project
Missing Meeting Minutes

Dear Jennifer:

The draft minutes from the April 29, 2024 SBRC meeting when the committee voted to approve the PSR submission, as well as the May 1, 2024 School Committee meeting where the committee voted to approve the PSR submission, will be forthcoming. The drafts have not yet been completed due to the tight turnaround timeline. However, the meetings were both broadcast on Dedham TV and the meetings and votes can be viewed using this link if desired:
www.DedhamTV.com.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Anissa Ellis".

Anissa Ellis
Project Manager, Vertex

6 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee

6.1 Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Presentation

UPDATE - An updated draft Facilities Assessment Subcommittee presentation follows.

OAKDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Preferred Schematic Report Summary REVISED

MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Presentation
May 2024


DRAFT

Agenda

- Introduction
- Process
- Vision and Educational Program
- Preferred Schematic Selection
- Project Costs
- Community Outreach



Location



1. Place You Want to Be

- o Feels Authentic and True to School Values
- o A Place for Everyone

2. Whole Child

- o Balancing Academic Achievement with Personal Well-Being
- o Think Critically and Creatively
- o Age-Appropriate Joy and Fun

3. Whole Community

- o Learning Communities
- o Grade Levels Partnered Together
- o Collaborate, Contribute, and Adapt
- o Teacher Teaming

4. Flexibility and Adaptability

- o Space to Evolve and Adapt as Needed

5. Connections to Nature and Sustainability

- o Sustainability Principles
- o Learning About and Caring for the Environment
- o Partnership with Endicott Greenhouse
- o Outdoor Connections and Learning
- o Natural light

6. School as Community Resource

- o A Benefit to the Community
- o A Tool and Resource for Students and Community
- o Community Learning

7. Safety & Welcome


- o Feels Like an Elementary School
- o Fully Equitable for All Users
- o Warm and Inviting



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024

Programmatic Relationships

- Oakdale Elementary School
- 360 Student Enrollment, Grades 1-5
- 5 Cohorts – 1 Per Grade Level
- 4 Tracks per Grade



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024

Summary of Program Deviations

CORE ACADEMIC (+9,000 SF):
 (4) General Classrooms +3,800 SF
 (1) STE Room and Storage +1,200 SF
 (4) Grades 1 & 2 R Breakout +1,200 SF
 (3) Cohort Commons +2,400 SF
 (2) Academic Storage +400 SF

ART AND MUSIC (+1,350 SF):
 (1) Music Classroom +150 SF
 (-2) Practice Rooms -150 SF
 (1) Music Storage +150 SF
 (1) Maker Space +1,200 SF

ADMIN & GUIDANCE (+460 SF):
 (1) Larger General Office +70 SF
 (1) Teachers' Work Room +270 SF
 (1) Lactation Room +120 SF

SPECIAL EDUCATION (+3,680 SF):
 (1) Medically Fragile CR +1,000 SF
 (3) Teacher Planning +150 SF
 (1) Resource Room +500 SF
 (2) Larger Toilet Rooms +20 SF
 (1) OT / PT Room +950 SF
 (1) IEP Conference Room +250 SF
 (1) Psychiatrist Office +150 SF
 (1) Guidance Office +150 SF
 (1) Eval Team Leader Office +250 SF
 (1) Break-Out Room +150 SF
 (1) Records Room +110 SF

HEALTH AND PHYS ED (+850 SF):
 (1) Larger Gym +750 SF
 (1) Gym Storeroom +100 SF

CUSTODIAL (+200 SF):
 (1) Outdoor Equip Storage +200 SF

DINING & FOOD SERVICE (+1,880 SF):
 (1) Larger Cafeteria +790 SF
 (1) Larger Kitchen +440 SF
 (1) Larger Staff Lunch +50 SF
 (1) Quiet Dining +600 SF

OTHER (+1,600 SF):
 (1) Net Zero Mechanical +1,600 SF

MEDICAL (+90 SF):
 (1) Larger Toilet +40 SF
 (1) Larger Office / Waiting +50 SF



Preferred Schematic Alternatives Considered



Option A: New Construction



Option B: New Construction



Option C: Addition Renovation



Option D:
 New Construction





Oakdale Elementary School
Preferred Schematic Report Summary
MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
May 2024



Oakdale Elementary School
Preferred Schematic Report Summary
MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
May 2024



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024

Preferred Solution – Street View and Interior Concept Sketches



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024

Option	Site	Enrollment	Option	Cost per SF (\$)	Construction Total (\$M)	Soft Costs at 30% (\$M)	Total Project Cost (\$M)	NOTES
O-O-N	Oakdale	360	Oakdale Only - Option D	\$955.97	\$87.1	\$26.1	\$113.2	With New Sustainability Goals



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024

Community Outreach

Public Meetings, City Board Updates and Community Forums

- (47) SBRC Meetings
- (30) School Committee
- (9) Community Meetings
- (6) PTO Informational Meetings
- (2) Neighborhood Meetings
- (1) Public Hearing

Televised Public Meetings and Community Forums

- Transparent process keeping the community informed

Community Resources

Project Website:
<https://www.dedham.k12.ma.us/domain/686>



Oakdale Elementary School
 Preferred Schematic Report Summary
 MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee
 May 2024



266 beacon street
boston ma 02116
tel 617 437 9458
fax 617 437 1965
www.leviarc.com

