

MONTHLY REPORT



**BURLINGTON  
HIGH SCHOOL**

  
**April 2024**

**DORE + WHITTIER**



## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the month of April, the Tappé and Dore + Whittier (D+W) teams were focused on commencing with the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) for the Burlington High School building project.

Geotech commenced marking locations for borings on-site, while traffic engineers observed traffic patterns. Surveyors began their work. Point Cloud scanning was underway, aiming to capture precise measurements of various building elements such as walls, windows, and doors to facilitate the creation of a detailed digital model. Additionally, engineers inspected systems and technology within the building, taking advantage of the students' vacation period.

The BHS SBC approved the statement of Interest enrollment projection of 1,100 students to use in the Preliminary Design Program. Working groups were also established along with discussing alternative site options.

The Tappé team working in conjunction with D+W, has refined the overall schedule of work to account for various PDP activities including:

- Existing Conditions Review
- Educational Program Development
- Programming Non-Educational and High School

## II. PROJECT SCHEDULE OVERVIEW

A Project Schedule is attached to this report. Key milestone dates include:

Completion of the PDP – July 2024

Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) – November 2024

Schematic Design Completion – August 2025

The schedule supports completion of the feasibility study and schematic design to be in a position to include a warrant on the Fall Town Meeting to obtain funding to complete the project. This schedule will be reviewed with the full School Building Committee (SBC) at the next formal meeting on 9 May 2024.

## III. TASKS COMPLETED

- 04.01.24 Internal Monthly Meeting
- 04.02.24 Outreach with Amy Warfield on swearing-in at next SBC meeting
- 04.02.24 Tappe/D+W Discussion on Scheduling Visioning and Existing Conditions, detailed work plan and make-up of working groups and alternate site analysis

April 2024

- 04.02.24 Meeting with Dave Kartunen to discuss KartoonEDU for public presentation materials
- 04.05.24 Translation of project website into foreign languages completed
- 04.05.24 Initial traffic consult on-site; scheduling discussion with BHS Superintendent
- 04.08.24 Internal Monthly Meeting
- 04.08.24 Issue Monthly Report, SBC Meeting Materials
- 04.08.24 Attend boring location site walk with BHS staff / vendor; survey crew on-site for next several weeks
- 04.09.24 Educational Visioning session with BHS staff and Instructional Leadership Team; civil engineer site visit
- 04.10.24 Attend site tour with structural engineer
- 04.11.24 Attend monthly SBC meeting
- 04.16.24 – 04.19.24 Scan vendor on-site throughout the building
- 04.16.24 Tappe / D+W meeting with Chamber of Commerce to discuss project and potential outreach opportunities with local businesses; outreach to SBC members to obtain feedback / interest in participating in proposed working groups
- 04.22.24 Internal Monthly Meeting
- 04.23.24 Review of educational visioning meeting notes and distribution to BHS ILT team
- 04.26.24 Tappe / D+W meeting to review progress, schedule and next steps
- 04.29.24 Internal Monthly Meeting
- 04.30.24 Assist with scheduling and planning traffic study; plan to be on-site on 7 May

#### **IV. 30-DAY LOOK AHEAD**

Activities planned for the month of May (scheduling on-going):



April 2024

- Complete Site Survey
- Existing Conditions Update/Report
- Working Groups
- Visioning Sessions
- Option Development
- Educational Program Development
- Programming Non-Educational and High School

## V. PROJECT BUDGET



**Project Details**

DWMP Project No.	23-0130	Project Type	High School
Project Name	Burlington High School	Scope Type	TBD
Project Address	123 Cambridge St Burlington, MA 01803	MSBA Project?	No
Project Phase	Feasibility Study		
Phase End-Date	11/30/2025		
Phase % Complete	24%		

[Edit Project Details](#)

- [Budgets](#) | 
 [Budget Transfers](#) | 
 [Contracts](#) | 
 [Invoices](#) | 
 [Vendors](#) | 
 [Meetings](#) | 
 [Monthly Reporting](#)

**Project Budget Summary**

Budget Category	Orig. Budget	Transfers	Upd. Budget	Contract Amt.	% Committed	Expended	% Expended	Contract Remain'g	Bud. Balance
0000-0000 Feasibility Study Agreement									
0001-0000- OPM - Feasibility Study	\$450,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00	\$450,000.00	100%	\$90,000.00	20%	\$360,000.00	\$0.00
0002-0000- A&E - Feasibility Study	\$750,000.00	\$0.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	100%	\$0.00	0%	\$750,000.00	\$0.00
0003-0000- Environmental & Site	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00	100%		0%	\$200,000.00	\$0.00
0004-0000- Other	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$100,000.00		0%		0%	\$0.00	\$100,000.00
<b>Total - 0000-0000 Feasibility Study Agreement</b>	<b>\$1,500,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$1,500,000.00</b>	<b>\$1,400,000.00</b>	<b>300%</b>	<b>\$90,000.00</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>\$1,310,000.00</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>

**Contract Items Pending Approval**

The following contract items are pending approval by the Owner/Building Committee. Contract totals above do not incorporate these items until they are approved.

Approval Status	Contract Item Value	Associated Contract	Contract Line Item Notes	Budget Category
No Data				

**Invoice Items Pending Approval**

The following invoice items are pending approval by the Owner/Building Committee. Expended totals above do not incorporate these invoices.

Approval Status	Invoice Line Value	Associated Invoice	Invoice Notes	Budget Category
⚠ Pending	\$18,000.00	#006 - DWMP (BHS)		0001-0000- OPM - Feasibility Study
⚠ Pending	\$42,855.00	#240409 - Tappe (BHS)		0002-0000- A&E - Feasibility Study

## VI. POTENTIAL ISSUES

There are no issues to report this month.

## VII. OPM ACTIVITIES

Support all PDP activities as identified in the attached materials related to the Tappé work plan.

## **VIII. ARCHITECT ACTIVITIES**

Refer to the attached work plan.

## **IX. CONTRACTOR ACTIVITIES**

None during the Month of April.

## **X. ATTACHMENTS**

SBC Meeting No. 5 04.11.2024 Minutes (draft – to be approved at SBC Meeting No. 6 on 05.09.2024)

Project Schedule

Tappé Detailed Schedule Work Plan

## **XI. PROJECT PHOTOS**

None at this time.

**SCHOOL COMMITTEE / SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**



Project: Burlington High School  
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting  
 Location: BHS/Webex Conference Call  
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No:  
 Meeting Date: 4/11/24  
 Time: 6:30 PM  
 Prepared By: R. Rincon

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Katherine Bond*	SBC Chair		Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Christine Monaco*	SBC Vice Chair		Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Jeremy Brooks*	SBC/SC Member	✓	Steve Brown	DWMP
LATE	Melissa Massardo*	SBC/SC Member		Mike Cox	DWMP
✓	Meghan Nawoichik*	SBC/SC Member	✓	Terry Hartford	DWMP
✓	Eric Conti*	Superintendent		Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Lisa Chen*	Asst. Superintendent		Charlie Hay	Tappe
✓	Nichole Coscia	Business Manager	✓	Christopher Blessen	Tappe
✓	Bob Cunha	Director of Operations	✓	David Gould	Tappe
✓	Mark Sullivan	BHS Principal			
	Joe Attubato	Dir. of Support Services			
	Neil Guanci	Maintenance Manager			
	John Danizio	Town Accountant			
	Paul Sagarino Jr.	Town Administrator			
✓	Doug Davison	Ways & Means			
✓	Wendy Czerwinski	BHS Teacher			
	Laura Maida	BHS Teacher			
	Tom Regan	BHS Teacher			
✓	Gail Pinkham	Parent			
✓	Christopher Campbell	Parent			
✓	Mimi Bix-Hylan	Parent			
✓	Martha Simon	SBC Member			
	Colin Irwin	BHS Student			
	Esther Ma	BHS Student			

Item No.		
5.1	<p><b>Call to Order &amp; Pledge of Allegiance:</b> 6:34 meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Bond with 5 of 5 voting members in attendance.</p>	Record
5.2	<p><b>Approval of March 14, 2024 Minutes (Vote Expected):</b>            A motion to approve the March 14, 2024, meeting minutes made by J. Brooks and seconded by L. Chen. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes, K. Bond – Yes. E. Conti – Yes, L. Chen – Yes. Abstentions: C. Monaco – Abstain, M. Nawoichik – Abstain. All in Favor. Motion passes. Minutes approved. 4-0-2</p>	Record
5.3	<p><b>Invoices and Commitments for Approval (Vote Expected):</b>            A motion to approve Dore &amp; Whittier Invoice No. 5 in the amount of \$18,000.00 made by C. Monaco and seconded by M. Nawoichik. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes, C. Monaco – Yes, M. Nawoichik – Yes, K. Bond – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, vote approved, 4-0-0.</p>	Record
5.4	<p><b>Public Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record
5.5	<p><b>Enrollment Projection (Vote Expected):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ T. Hartford explained that to create a space summary, an enrollment projection is necessary, following the standard set by the MSBA. They feel it's appropriate to adopt this standard to provide the design team with a parameter.</li> <li>➤ In recent Statements of Interest (SOIs) submitted to the MSBA, the projection has consistently been 950 students.</li> <li>➤ During the previous SBC meeting, the committee had requested additional information and data to support the 950-enrollment projection.</li> <li>➤ Dr. Conti provided projected enrollment in grade combinations from 2019 to 2030, sourced from the New England School Development Council.</li> <li>➤ T. Hartford pointed out that while the average number of students is just under 930, projecting forward for the next five years suggests a figure closer to 970.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Conti shared that using the NESDC projections is calculated differently than the MSBA's method. However, it seems reasonable to increase the enrollment projection from 950 to 1,000 due to larger classes anticipated in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Non-Educational Programming will need to address enrollment projections for Pre-K. This will be addressed during working group discussions, as it is a crucial aspect to account for. Presently, the Pre-K enrollment stands at 110.</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ E. Conti inquired about the potential impact of increasing the enrollment projection by 50 students on the square footage. C. Blessen responded, explaining that while there would be some effect, the current number already</li> </ul>	Record

	<p>incorporates some extra space. Increasing it to 1,000 would provide a buffer for future fluctuations. E. Conti expressed confidence in justifying a projection of 1,000 given the projections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ J. Brooks voiced agreement with Dr. Conti and suggested considering additional padding, especially in light of the Mall Road district rezoning. He suggested a comfortable figure of 1,000 but proposed padding further, perhaps by 20-50 students, with an upper limit of 1,100. When asked if he'd be comfortable with 1,100, J. Brooks affirmed.</li> <li>➤ C. Monaco concurred with J. Brooks, citing potential changes on Mall Road as a factor. K. Bond echoed agreement with both J. Brooks and C. Monaco.</li> <li>➤ T. Hartford urged caution, noting that increasing enrollment from 950 to 1,100 represents a significant jump of about 20%. This would directly impact square footage figures, which are crucial for community understanding.</li> <li>➤ K. Bond inquired about the square footage difference with an additional 100 students. C. Blessen explained that for every 25 students added, another classroom plus support space is needed, equating to about 1,200 square feet per 25 students.</li> <li>➤ J. Brooks cautioned against excessive square footage increases, as they come with added costs.</li> <li>➤ K. Bond suggested a compromise between 950 and 1,200 students, settling on 1,100.</li> <li>➤ M. Bix-Hylan raised concerns about the discrepancy between actual enrollment growth and proposed projections, citing only 58 new students enrolled in Burlington public schools since 2009.</li> <li>➤ D. Davidson emphasized the need to consider square footage costs and advocated for a compromise.</li> <li>➤ M. Sullivan shared enrollment statistics, indicating 60 new enrollments at the high school but also 30 departures, finding M. Bix-Hylan's figure of 58 surprising.</li> </ul> <p><u>Vote:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve BHS Statement of Interest Enrollment Projection of 1,100 for use in the Preliminary Design Program. made by C. Monaco and seconded by M. Nawoichik. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes, K. Bond – Yes. C. Monaco – Yes, M. Nawoichik – Yes, M. Massardo – Yes. Abstentions: None. All in Favor. Motion passes. Vote approved. 5-0-0</li> <li>➤ The Advisory Committee agrees.</li> </ul>	
5.6	<p><b>Alternate Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ T. Hartford explained they reviewed all of the town owned properties using Patriot Properties and searching for “Town of Burlington” as the “owner.”</li> <li>➤ Then filter sites to show 22+ acres of land.</li> <li>➤ 12 sites met the criteria.</li> <li>➤ Of those 12:</li> </ul>	Record



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 are Schools (Fox Hill, Meadowbrook, Francis Wyman, Marshall Simonds, BHS)</li> <li>• 3 are Conservation (Mill St., Locust St., Mountain Rd.)</li> <li>• 2 are Water Stations (Middlesex Tpk, Terrace Hall)</li> <li>• 1 is Recreation (Route 3)</li> <li>• 1 is "Taking for High School" (L McGinnis Dr) – Associated with current site/Meadowbrook</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ J. Brooks highlighted that the only potential additional space would be vacant office space, which would require significant investment for land acquisition and building refurbishment. T. Hartford inquired about any large vacant office spaces in town. They expressed interest in exploring such spaces to assess their suitability. E. Conti offered to connect T. Hartford with the development officer, noting numerous office buildings that could be repurposed as classrooms.</li> <li>➤ M. Massardo inquired about the size of the Senior Center/original high school site. T. Hartford confirmed it is less than 22 acres.</li> </ul>	
5.7	<p><b>Tappe Architects – Project Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ C. Blessen provided an update on Tappe’s work plan.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Geotech has commenced on-site marking locations for borings.</li> <li>○ Traffic engineers have been present to observe traffic patterns.</li> <li>○ Surveyors began their work this week.</li> <li>○ Point Cloud scanning is underway, aiming to provide precise measurements of every wall, window, door, etc., facilitating the creation of a digital model of the building for concept and scheme manipulation.</li> <li>○ Engineers will be in the building next week to assess systems, technology, etc., taking advantage of the students' vacation.</li> <li>○ Following tonight's meeting, the team will begin crafting the space summary for 1,100 students.</li> <li>○ Visioning sessions have commenced this week and will continue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ C. Blessen emphasized that the detailed calendar view offers more comprehensive information regarding Tappe's activities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Nawoichik raised the point that a DSC Program (Developmental Skills Program) is not discussed under "other" in the non-educational programming section of the document, where other special education programs at the high school are listed. M. Nawoichik emphasized the importance of including the DSC in the space planning to ensure proper planning and congruency to the district’s growing need for K-12 (vertical) alignment of the DSC program.</li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Simon countered, suggesting that the DSC program should be considered part of the educational program.</li> <li>➤ Additionally, M. Simon brought up the previous extensive HVAC feasibility study conducted for the building, expressing a desire to avoid paying for redundant reviews.</li> <li>➤ C. Blessen clarified that "non-educational" refers to elements not typically included in the standard space template used for developing typical high school programs.</li> <li>➤ M. Nawoichik noted that DSC Program is an educational program, yet specialized programs are organized under "other" in the document under review.</li> </ul>	
5.8	<p><b>Working Groups:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ C. Blessen outlined the 9 working groups as follows:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustainability</li> <li>○ Design</li> <li>○ Facilities Assessment</li> <li>○ Ed Planning/Learning Technology</li> <li>○ Site Logistics</li> <li>○ Community Outreach</li> <li>○ Interior Design</li> <li>○ Exterior Design/Landscaping</li> <li>○ Financial Bonding</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Furthermore, C. Blessen presented a spreadsheet indicating the level of commitment required from each working group.</li> <li>➤ T. Hartford noted that this is a revised version of the original working groups. Although members volunteered for more groups, it's typical for working groups to consist of 3-4 people each. Exceeding this number would transition the group from a working group to more of a general meeting. However, the aim is to include all interested parties, so adjustments can be made accordingly based on individual preferences. These slides will be circulated to SBC members for review, and updates will be made based on feedback.</li> <li>➤ T. Hartford added that some meetings will be held remotely during the day, around lunchtime, to accommodate those who are working and to ensure inclusivity.</li> <li>➤ C. Blessen stated that these groups will provide reports at SBC meetings, with members of each group presenting their findings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Meet the Team</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ D+W and Tappe have suggested holding a hybrid information session before the end of the school year. During this session, the project team would provide a brief presentation to introduce themselves, explain the project process, and give the high school project its own voice.</li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dr. Conti emphasized that, up to this point, discussions about the high school have primarily focused on financial aspects rather than the necessity for the building. There is a need to change the framing and make it an exciting community conversation. It's important for people to be aware that the project is happening and to know how they can get involved.</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Bond noted the importance of ensuring that the new member of the School Committee has an opportunity to review the working groups and choose any she would like to participate in.</li> <li>➤ Additionally, K. Bond stated that she will contact Amy Warfield to confirm whether agendas need to be posted for these groups.</li> <li>➤ M. Massardo clarified that while these groups are not subject to open meeting laws, they can still be posted for transparency purposes.</li> <li>➤ Dr. Conti reiterated the need to shift the discussion about the high school from purely financial to emphasizing the necessity and excitement surrounding the project, fostering community involvement.</li> <li>➤ K. Bond agreed, highlighting the success of the video concept for Fox Hill and the importance of generating excitement about the high school project and its significance to the community.</li> <li>➤ C. Monaco cautioned against overshadowing other ongoing projects like Fox Hill and the Police Station, which are also important for the community.</li> <li>➤ C. Campbell suggested showcasing Burlington High School through the decades via pictures or videos to build support and pride, while also highlighting areas that need modernization for competitive education.</li> </ul>	
5.9	<p><b>Schedule/Timeline:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PDP – July 2024</li> <li>➤ PSR – November 2024</li> <li>➤ Schematic Design – August 2025</li> <li>➤ Fall Town Meeting – September 2025</li> </ul>	Record
5.10	<p><b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Bond informed the group that Amy Warfield would be attending the next SBC meeting to swear in remaining advisory committee members.</li> </ul>	Record
5.11	<p><b>Public Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record
5.12	<p><b>Upcoming Meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ May 9, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> <li>➤ June 13, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> <li>➤ July 11, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> <li>➤ August 8, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> <li>➤ September 12, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> <li>➤ October 10, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ November 14, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li><li>➤ December 12, 2024 @ 6:30 p.m.</li></ul>	
4.13	<b>Adjourn:</b> 7:42 PM a motion was made by M. Massardo and seconded by C. Monaco to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: C. Monaco - Yes, J. Brooks - Yes, M. Massardo - Yes, M. Nawoichik K. Bond - Yes. None. Motion passes, vote approved, 5-0-0. Adjourn.	Record

Sincerely,

**DORE + WHITTIER**

Rachel Rincon

Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.