MassArt Board of Trustees
Special Committee on Tower
July 10, 2018 – 2:00pm – 4:00pm
Huntington Studio, Design and Media Center, MassArt

MINUTES

Trustees present: Linda Snyder (Chair), David Lee, Bill McQuillan, Pamela Parisi, and David Nelson (Ex-Officio)
Trustees absent: Peter Nessen
Others: Sarah Felton (DCAMM); Cathy Bell, BK Boley, Chris Brown (Stantec); Jim Grossmann (Suffolk); John Swift (BuroHappold); Bob Perry, Howie LaRosee, Cam Roberts, Andres Villalba (MassArt), and Susana Segat (Board Secretary).

Call to Order
Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 2:00pm and asked for approval of the minutes.

Approval of the Minutes: May 3, 2018
On a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously
VOTED: to approve the minutes of May 3, 2018

Draft Final Options and Presentation for Final Comments
Chair Snyder thanked the group for their focused effort to finalize the draft report. She noted that the goals of this meeting would be to both understand the recommendations and determine next steps. Program Manager Felton added that the goal for this part of the study was to determine the optimal first phase of addressing the Tower issues remaining disciplined and focused on the replacement of the exterior envelope systems and the heating and cooling systems with which the envelope is integrated. The floor was then yielded to Stantec and the consultant team for their presentation (Power Point slides attached and quoted throughout the paragraphs below).

The consultants provided a brief history of the study, whose goal was to focus on the optimal necessary architectural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and potentially structural work necessary to replace the failing façade and bring the building into compliance with MAAB, building code, and energy requirements required by the Commonwealth. They stressed that the scope necessarily include the revisions to systems that are directly caused by removal and replacement of the curtain wall.

Their proposed implementation approach is to replace the façades in phases as necessitated by the type of replacement system and its installation requirements. The result will be that indoor areas on the perimeter of the building would receive more light, since the windows heights would expand from 4' to 11'.

They recommended that the first step to address the exterior and energy code issues would be the replacement of the curtain wall. Since the HVAC ventilators are integrated to the existing curtain wall, these ventilators must be replaced. The air handling units and piping risers would also need to be upgraded and replaced. The value of the curtain wall and HVAC upgrades would trigger MAAB accessibility and other code upgrades to the entire building.

The consultants described the implementation approach to replacing the Tower façade, including the installation of temporary walls in some locations 8' to 10' from exterior walls; disconnecting the old MEP system; demolishing the existing façade curtain wall and installing new risers; installing new façade panels, bottom up, in vertical sections; adding new MEP systems as space is enclosed; installing the next set of panels façade; patching ceilings, preparing workspaces, removing the temporary wall; and moving on to the next section to be replaced. Approximately 5,000 square feet over five floors equals one state of construction, each phase would last for 8 weeks, and we would need 11,000-16,000 square feet of total swing space per phase.

Trustees discussed the number of phases needed and the availability of swing space. The consultants suggested that there would be anywhere between 7 to 12 separate phases and that it would take 3.5 to 4 years to complete (1 year of procurement and 2.5 to 3 years on site). In discussing swing space on campus, Mr. Roberts explained that there is a minimum of 16,000 feet of unassigned space around campus that could be used as swing space.

They listed the complications to their proposed baseline scenario:
- There is equipment not part of 'Base-Line' that is already past its usable life and needs to be replaced – Reference Alternate in pricing.
- Replacing this equipment after a 'Base-Line' project will add cost overall, lose efficiency of doing all at once, may require redundant work.

- Future revision of floor layouts to make more efficient is potentially limited by existing equipment locations.
- Limited renovations in the +/- 10' perimeter zone do not allow a reconfiguration of spaces to a more ideal MassArt layout.
- This scenario only patched ceiling areas, thus, leaving existing ceiling plane to partially obscure the new curtain wall in finished condition

Trustees discussed accelerating the phasing plan and whether schedule efficiencies could be created by increasing the amount of swing space, thus limiting the impact of the construction on building occupants. .

The consultant team identified the recommended alternates not included in the baseline estimate:
- Large infill and re-work at Huntington Ave Entry to level out floors and create new lounge and display areas
- Premium to leave ceiling 10-one at perimeter 'exposed'
- Replacement of equipment and distribution systems not replaced as part of 'Base-line': Chiller and pumps, Hot Water Heat Exchangers, Duct distribution from core, Secondary electrical distribution, Standby power distribution, Auditorium Systems, Changing Constant Air System to VAV, Building Management System)
- New Lighting Throughout
- New plumbing fixtures in toilet rooms, studios, classrooms
- Any Rework of walls for a more ideal layout for MassArt
- Rework of Ceilings Throughout
- A full renovation of the Tower all at once

They listed the projects not part of the baseline, either because they were unnecessary or undesired:
- Floor additions or infills at levels 8, 10, 11, 12, 13
- Infill of entire auditorium to level out lower levels (Not desired)
- Structural analysis (Full analysis not required if minimal infill)
- Seismic Updates (Not deemed necessary if no upper level infills)
- Freight elevator + adjacent stair fire department access (Not Required

They listed the projects completed by DCAMM or MassArt under separate efforts, so no longer required:
- Switchgear replacement
- Fire pump replacement
- Domestic hot water temperature adjustments
- Refrigerant leak detection system connections
- Fire alarm devices + system replacement
- Fire protection repairs + making whole coverage more deficient
- Occupancy sensors

They then showed various façade structures, described the difference between a 4-year implementation schedule and a 3.5-year implementation schedule, and went over their proposed construction cost only summary.

Façade Replacement:	$42,849,000
Code & Accessibility Upgrades:	$ 7,032,000
Total Baseline Costs:	**$49,881,000**
Add Alternates:	
A. Ground Floor Lobby Infill:	$3,220,000
B. High Perimeter Ceiling work:	$2,622,000
Total Add Alternates:	**$5,842,000**
Deferred Maintenance Alternates:	
Alternate C:	**$38,578,000**
Total:	**$94,301,000**

Trustees discussed the high perimeter ceiling work, the ground lobby infill, and the rest of the add-alternates. Chair Snyder reminded trustees that the budget numbers provided do not include soft costs such as the architecture and engineering fees, permits, testing, management services, furniture and equipment, which normally adds 35%-40% for a state project. Construction cost escalation is currently very high, at about 5-6%/year, which might increase the cost significantly depending on the schedule. The expense of escalation motivates the college to accelerate the schedule in any way possible. Trustees discussed the potential of shortening the schedule if the swing space were doubled or design and

construction phases shortened. Trustees discussed the importance of the schedule also as far as students were concerns, needing to tie start dates to semester start dates.

Trustees talked about the Alternate C proposals and agreed that they could be produced as one-offs. They discussed the potential cost savings created by energy improvements and efficiencies. In discussing next steps, Ms. Felton offered that the state's energy division could provide a study of the impact of the energy upgrade projects. Executive Director LaRosee offered to provide the current costs to run Tower, but estimated that the utilities currently run at about $2m per year (not including housing buildings) and that the new windows could potentially save about $400,000 per year.

The consultants recommended the following next steps for MassArt:

- Further study leaving the ceilings 'open' and exposed as an aesthetic
- Further study, programmatically, what is ideal MassArt floor layout
- Further study impact of construction on adjacent spaces… can adjacent spaces really be occupied during construction?
- Study assumes fully occupied building and 5 to 10K SF swing space. Further Study to look at the program and the summer occupancy to see if phasing were made more efficient and shorter by taking more of the building at a time.
- Quantification of energy impact of new curtain wall and perimeter systems
- Testing to understand the exact nature of existing conditions and further analysis of building code requirements.

Trustees agreed that this is the right list of next steps for due diligence. They discussed possible ways to approach the costs of this construction project, whether there might be a less expensive version, and explored possible efficiencies and contingencies.

Chair Snyder thanked the consultants for their study and presentation. She talked to trustees about meeting to explore next steps, get more details on finances, tie the project to strategic academic priorities, and a plan for a design phase. She asked Mr. Boley to produce a final report that includes the presentations and back-up materials so that trustees may have all the information on hand.

Adjournment

On a motion duly made and seconded at 3:25pm, it was unanimously

VOTED: to adjourn.

Documents provided: Notice of meeting; Agenda; Minutes 2018 05 03; 5/3/18 slide handout; presentation for 7/10/18.