

**School Building Committee – DRAFT Minutes**  
**January 31, 2019**  
**Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall**

**Present:** Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Joubin Hassanein, Matt Kelley, Matt King, David Lussier, Ellen Quirk, Blythe Robinson, Heather Sawitsky, Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Dick Elliot, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Alex Pitkin of SMMA; Kristen Olsen of SMMA, Tim Bonfatti of Compass Project Management and Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management.  
**Absent:** Ryan Hutchins, Cynthia Mahr, Charlene Cook, Jeffery Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being aired live by Wellesley Media and is being recorded for later viewing.

**Citizen Speak**

Catherine Johnson, speaking as a citizen and member of the Planning Board, thanked the SBC for the recent public forum, but said she questions how the committee will evaluate the options presented there. She said she understands that educational program is the most important consideration, but she believes that in keeping with the core values she has seen referenced, the entrance of the school must be welcoming to students and the scale should be approachable from the front. She said the new construction options presented at the forum had large, perhaps two-story exterior walls near the front entrance and she questions whether a small child would want to go inside. She acknowledged that the building's floor plan needs to work for educators and students. She said she is not advocating saving the 1938 portion of the building for the sake of saving an historic building, but because the 1938 building expressed a welcoming value.

**SBC Business**

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Ulfelder moved that the School Building Committee approve the minutes of 12/13/2018, as amended to correct a typographical error, and the minutes of 12/20/2018 and 1/10/2019 as distributed. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

**Member Reports**

Ms. Gray distributed her written responses to three recent emails to the SBC and invited feedback from committee members.

Ms. Gray reported that the SBC has been given the opportunity to submit a brief report to Annual Town Meeting to be printed in the Advisory Committee book and suggested that the Subcommittee on Outreach and Communication work on a draft report.

**Hardy/Upham Project**

**MSBA OPM**

Ms Gray reported that documents related to OPM selection are due to the MSBA by February 6 for the March OPM Panel meeting. FMD has negotiated with Compass Project Management on behalf of the SBC and the negotiated financial terms were distributed for review. A draft contract will be reviewed at a later meeting.

Mr. Elliot noted that the negotiated base fee for Compass Project Management is \$394,000. The fee negotiated for estimating services is \$30,000, which is \$10,000 more than was assumed for the OPM estimating tasks due to industry cost escalation.

Ms. Gray clarified that the financial terms will be submitted as Attachment A to the MSBA. Mr. King asked for a breakdown of the hours and tasks used to negotiate the financial terms. Mr. Elliot and Mr. Gagosian confirmed that FMD has that information but not with them at the meeting. Mr. Hassanein asked if it is possible to approve the terms contingent on a later review of the requested breakdown by the committee. Mr. Kelley asked what effect a contingent vote would have on the submission to the MSBA. Mr. Elliot said that before the MSBA OPM Panel meeting in March, there will be opportunity for the SBC to revise its numbers if upon committee review of the requested breakdown the SBC revises Schedule A. He anticipates, based on his conversation with the MSBA, that there will be a period of back and forth. The requested information will be distributed to the committee and responses should be directed to Mr. Elliot.

Mr Ulfelder moved that the School Building Committee vote to support the selection of Compass Project Management as the Owners Project Manager for the Hardy/Upham Project, described as the Ernest F. Upham Elementary School, and to submit documents related to the OPM contract to the MSBA. Mr. Hassanein seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr Ulfelder moved that the School Building Committee vote to support the scope of work described in the Request for Services for a total fee of \$424,785 subject to additional due diligence by members of the committee. Ms. Freiman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## **Hunnewell Project**

### **Review Updated Shortlist Options**

Mr. Pitkin said that since the SBC voted a tentative short list of four options on January 10, he has talked in more detail with educators about the educational organization of each option. He said there has been less comfort with a three-story option and a desire for a two-story building if possible. The Addition/Renovation Option 5 was the only three-story option and it had the gymnasium in the back. He said that the goal of making community use spaces more accessible was expressed.

Mr. Pitkin presented a refined Addition/Renovation Option 4a/5. This option is two stories, maintains the front of the 1938 building, could possibly maintain the oak tree, improves the loading area location and includes more program area toward the back of the building than Option 4a provided. The entrance and administration space is in the 1938 building. The cafetorium and gymnasium are side by side near the front of the building and could be closed off after hours. There are some cluster plan classroom neighborhoods, which seem to be the general preference expressed in the draft educational plan, but also a more linear plan for some of the classrooms. The approximate building footprint is 48,000 square feet and an initial calculation of lot coverage is approximately 28.1%.

Mr. Pitkin presented some three-dimensional images of Option 4a/5 to illustrate massing.

Mr. Kelley asked what elements in Option 4a/5 are preferable to Option 4a. Mr. Pitkin said that

upon review he recognized that program space immediately at the front of the building in Option 4a was tight since it included the warming kitchen, art, STEAM, music, administration and custodial. Option 4a/5 pushes some of those spaces back into the building.

Mr. Soliva said that Option 4a/5 might lend itself well to three stories, possibly eliminating the need for setback relief and could allow classrooms to be larger if that was desired. He noted that it will be a question for the community whether it is a priority to keep a two-story scheme which requires setback relief or to have a three-story building.

Dr. Lussier said he is concerned about the location of the gymnasium and cafeteria in option 4a/5. Egress to the playground at the front of the building is a security concern for students.

Mr. Hassanein said that there are a number of issues with a three-story building beyond cost, which is a factor. It may be hard to integrate even the two-story option with the 1938 building.

Ms. Olsen said that this is an iterative process to determine if we are going in the right direction to keep the existing building and to strive to keep the tree in the addition/renovation options.

Ms. Gray asked if there is a more compact option that removes the tree and retains the 1938 building. Mr. Pitkin said that was worthy of study in the next round.

Mr. Hassanein said that he struggles to see that Option 4a/5 is an improvement on Option 4a and what is gained in the merger of 4a with 5.

Ms. Andrews said that she does not want to eliminate option 4a from continued study. Mr. Pitkin said that 4a and 4a/5 could both be looked at.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the challenge remains to relocate the location of the gymnasium to the south side of the building as the educators have prioritized but to keep the footprint of the building within the blue line as much as possible for permitting purposes.

Ms. Quirk said that it is important to have classrooms on the quiet side of the building. She said exploring how all the options line up with the educational plan will be critical. She said that the location of the administrative space needs to be closer to the center of the school and the gymnasium needs to have egress to the play space. She said it is not educationally optimal to have only classrooms on a third floor disconnected from other spaces.

Mr. Gagosian suggested that it would be safe to give direction to the architect to make the building two stories in light of the feedback. We should figure out what the optimal solution is for the educational program first and then make the case to the town for any relief.

Mr. King asked for clarification of what "quiet side" refers to. Dr. Lussier replied that it refers to the area of the building that does not face out to outdoor activity that is distracting to students.

There was continued discussion of the challenge of locating the gymnasium where there is easy egress to play space for students and appropriate site lines from the cafeteria for security, but also where after-hours access to the rest of the building may be limited.

Mr. Pitkin presented a modified New Construction Option 5a. This is a two-story option that turns the building massing toward the neighborhood rather than Washington Street, increases

the length of a car queue line, moves the loading location to the library side but not accessed by a common driveway. The entrance and administration is moved back into the site and the classroom neighborhoods are oriented toward the back. Mr. Pitkin said that part of the open space in the front of the building could be used for the car line but closed off as play space during the school day. The lot coverage is approximately 26.3% and the building footprint is 47,000 square feet.

Mr. Pitkin presented some three dimensional images of Option 5a to illustrate massing. He said that the open plaza space as an entrance could be beneficial. Pitkin said that preliminary feedback from the library trustees who saw this option was positive to the orientation of the building away from the library side.

Mr. Pitkin presented a modified New Construction Option 6. The loading area is improved and the entrance is now in the front. Lot coverage in this option is approximately 26.2%. A version of this option without the tree could be configured in a "T" shape rather than an "L" shape as shown.

Mr. Pitkin said that Library Trustees were not positive about the connection of the parking area to the driveway used for library access, expressing a concern about congestion.

Mr. Pitkin presented some three dimensional images of Option 6 to illustrate massing. Tall facades are turned toward the play areas to the south.

Ms Quirk said the original Option 5 had the gymnasium placed horizontally along Cameron Street but in the new designs the long wall between gymnasium and cafeteria would make the cafeteria too long and narrow. In both new options, the administration area feels more a part of the building.

Dr. Lussier would like to see the "shoulder" of this option flipped. Mr. Hussein thinks this option if flipped would be much more attractive.

Ms. Sawitsky asked why the classroom neighborhoods look like fingers out the back and wondered how the outside space would look and if any grass would grow there. Mr. Pitkin said that was to provide more daylight to each classroom but that it might be possible to tighten that up a bit.

## **Recap of Recent Meetings**

Public Forum - January 29, 2019

Ms. Gray reported that the Public Forum was well attended and that Mr. Pitkin did a good job presenting the tentative options and explaining the opportunities and constraints of the site. Participants broke into small groups to review the options and discuss elements that they liked and did not like. Mr. D'Amico circulated a "Hunnewell Community Forum Feedback Review" summarizing comments and questions. Ms. Gray summarized some of the comments. She said some participants had a strong interest in saving the oak tree, some said do not limit design to meet educational program in order to save the tree and some said find a way to memorialize the tree if it needs to be removed. There was interest in studying the tree further. There was an expressed preference for a two-story building, an interest in daylighting, site orientation and energy efficiency. There was interest in making the building welcoming to the community and in outdoor learning spaces and classrooms facing Cold Brook and Fuller Brook. Some expressed an interest in keeping the 1938 building.

Permitting Review meeting – January 25, 2019

Mr. D'Amico reported that the updated options were presented to representatives of the NRC and the Wetlands Protection Committee (WPC).

Mr. D'Amico said that the NRC was appreciative of the opportunity to provide early feedback. Ms. Gray noted that the NRC controls Simons Park and also has written to the SBC to ask that the oak tree be saved if possible.

Ms. Gray noted that the WPC oversees permits for encroachment on the riverfront setback. Mr. D'Amico said that representatives of the WPC said they would require an alternative analysis to prove why any encroachment is merited and there are limits to how much encroachment may be allowed. Mr. Pitkin said that generally replication of the area already disturbed within the riverfront setback is allowed. Ms. Gray suggested that the team circle back with WPC for further feedback.

Mr. D'Amico said that meeting participants expressed interest in engagement of the Fuller Brook area in the design, dark sky compliant lighting and in a two-story building.

Library Coordination Meeting – January 31, 2019

Mr. D'Amico reported that the updated options were presented to representatives of the Library Trustees. There was a preference expressed for the revised New Construction Option 5 with a distinct school entrance separate from the shared driveway used by the library. There was concern about the connectivity between the school site driveway and the shared driveway shown in New Construction Option 6. There was continued discussion about parking and a request that any outdoor play space proximate to the library parking lot control for stray balls, etc.

Hunnewell PTO – January

Ms. Gray reported that she and Mr. Kelley attended this regularly scheduled School Committee outreach meeting with the PTO on behalf of the School Committee. Mr. Ulfelder and Mr. Bonfatti also attended.

Ms. Gray said that parents who attended were very interested in the details of the project. She said that Principal Ellen Quirk eloquently described the project mission and spoke about educational programming. There was an interest among parents in swing space, an opportunity for expression of concerns and a discussion the School Committee's prior guidance on swing space. Swing space options were not available to present that evening. Ms. Gray noted that SBC received three letters from Hunnewell parents today.

### **Finalize Short List Options**

Mr. Ulfelder asked for a clarification of the options on the proposed short list. Mr. Pitkin said that he will now include a version of the Addition Renovation Option 4a and a modification of Option 4a/5 that takes away the tree if necessary and attempts to move the gymnasium and cafeterium to the south side of the building. New construction options include Option 5a and 6.

Mr. King asked when we will look more closely at queuing and traffic. Mr. Pitkin said that the next refinement of the options will take a closer look at those considerations.

Mr. Ulfelder said there was a recent Green Collaborative meeting that included a presentation about increased use of school buses. A transportation subcommittee of that group is considering ways to increase school bus use in Wellesley.

Mr. Ulfelder moved that the School Building Committee approve a short list consisting of the Addition/Renovation Options 4a and 4a/5 and the New Construction Options 5a and 6. Mr. Soliva seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Parking Options Overview**

Mr. Pitkin reviewed existing parking area and said there are 61 existing spaces for school use and we should assume the need for 80-85 spaces for the new building.

Mr. Pitkin presented an overview of parking options. He said that if we assume approximately 20 on-site parking spaces and target the Cameron lot for the additional spaces, we will need approximately 57 there plus the five spaces now used in the library lot.

Mr. Pitkin presented a parking deck option for the Cameron lot that he said could be created by sinking the lot down to the level of the library underground parking entrance and adding a deck. There is currently a berm between that entrance and the lot. This could increase the number of parking spaces in the lot from 260 to 360 or 417 depending on whether green space is added at Washington Street or if the whole lot is decked. Connection between Cameron Street and the library underground entrance could be achieved.

Mr. Pitkin presented images illustrating examples of decked parking and images of various types of photo voltaic arrays over parking lots and a potential photo voltaic plan for the site.

Mr. Pitkin said that building parking fully underground on the site, under the gymnasium and cafetorium, will be studied but that option would be very expensive and there have been expressed security concerns. In response to a question by Mr. King, Mr. Pitkin said none of the parking options encroaches on the flood plain. Mr. Ulfelder noted that the challenge of waterproofing the underground parking would significantly add to cost.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the Board of Selectmen has not specifically discussed this decked parking option but noted that there are significant benefits to increased Cameron lot parking to the retail district and to the Library, as well as the potential solar array to generate energy.

Ms. Andrews asked what the process and timing for development of the Cameron lot option would be. Ms. Freiman said that the Board of Selectmen would need to decide to coordinate a Cameron lot plan with school construction. Ms. Gray said that the Board of Selectmen would need to authorize the SBC to continue to explore decking of the Cameron lot as an option and Ms. Freiman agreed.

Mr. Ulfelder said that ideally a decked parking project would go to Town Meeting for approval at the same time and would be built at the same time as the school project. In response to a question by Ms. Ferko, Mr. Ulfelder said that Town Counsel has confirmed that SBC has the authority to use Hunnewell feasibility study funds to study the decked parking option. Additional and separate authorization would be required for design funds.

In response to a question by Dr. Lussier, Mr. Pitkin said that construction of a decked lot would likely take less than 12 months.

Mr. Hassanein suggested that there might be an opportunity provided by prepping the lot to a lower elevation to use that lot for modular classrooms during the school construction. Ms. Freiman said there would be a concern about taking the Cameron lot off line for businesses, commuters and shoppers, especially if another project in Wellesley Square impacts parking at the same time.

Mr. Soliva asked about the permitting mechanism related to parking for projects on two separate lots. Mr. Gagosian said that a town bylaw allows the use of some public parking lot spaces located within 600 feet of a project to satisfy onsite parking requirements. The number of spaces needed in this case may require zoning relief.

Mr. King asked if there was potential to use any of the Cameron lot for school related queuing. Mr. Pitkin said that could be looked at. Ms. Quirk said that currently parents park without cost in the lot during a window of time for school pickup.

### **Schedule and Next Steps**

Ms. Olsen said that after today's narrowing to an approved short list of options there will be further adjustments to the floor plans, development of rough cost information, a look at car queuing, traffic and parking. There will be work on energy models to discuss with the SEC and WLP.

### **Swing Space Overview**

Mr. Pitkin referenced the School Committee's Swing Space Guidance to the SBC (August 2017) and reviewed the swing space options SMMA has been studying.

Hunnewell site: Modulares will not fit.

Cameron Lot: The Board of Selectmen, so far, have deemed the Cameron lot unacceptable for swing space modulares.

"Space mining" or modulares at multiple elementary sites: Sprague and Schofield are preferred initial sites for full- or half-school schemes with the Sprague generally preferred. Mr. Pitkin said the school administration and school staff have expressed a preference for keeping the school on one site. The Bates field is not under school jurisdiction, the Fiske site is too restrictive, and use of the Hardy or Upham site are potentially in conflict with the Hardy/Upham study.

Alternate sites: Recent conversations with the Village Church have clarified that only the basement space/multipurpose room would be available there, which significantly impacts the viability of this option. Ms. Gray expressed appreciation to the Village Church for their willingness to try to help solve the swing space problem. St. Paul's was studied in 2016 and deemed cost prohibitive.

Wait until the Hardy/Upham project is complete: The cost of waiting until the Hardy or Upham project is complete to use one of those sites for swing space will be assessed.

In response to a question by Mr. King, Ms. Freiman said that the Board of Selectmen has not discussed the use of the North 40 as swing space.

Mr. Pitkin presented modular school plans for a single site and for two sites. The goal will be to limit impact on the host school by providing as much of what is needed for the existing Hunnewell program within the modular. If two sites were used, there would be duplication of some spaces and increased cost.

Mr. Pitkin presented an image showing potential placement of a full-school modular at the Sprague site showing the modular structure on the current parking lot and temporary parking and play area on the grass field. The Sprague site has an activity and use limitation zone (AUL) for waste disposal area that limits development on the fields.

Mr. Pitkin presented an image showing potential placement of a full school modular at the Schofield site showing the modular structure on the fields. There might be opportunity to expand off the current permanent modular corridor. Some NRC controlled land and existing parking arrangements with Temple Beth Elohim would need to be considered.

Mr. Pitkin presented images showing potential half-school modular placement at both Schofield and Sprague.

Mr. Soliva asked if there could be a two-story modular structure option to reduce footprint. Mr. Pitkin said that would increase cost due to stairways and elevator.

Mr. Pitkin reviewed images of stacked modulators on the Hunnewell site and the limited use of modulators on the Cameron lot. Mr. Hassanein asked if the Cameron lot could accommodate some modulators in a phased construction option that keeps part of the school operational and provides temporary parking on the school site. Mr. Pitkin said that a phased construction approach would be extremely challenging given the location of the boiler and other services.

Ms. Andrews asked if interaction or shared play space with the host school would be anticipated. Dr. Lussier said that the Sprague site, due to its proximity to Hunnewell, would be the better site. The concern is that Sprague is very busy now, so it would be hard to accommodate two school populations in any shared building space or play space. He said that the site is congested, and there might need to be exploration of additional egress. Ms. Quirk said there would need to be busing of Hunnewell students to Sprague.

Dr. Lussier said that the Sprague softball diamond and grass field used for soccer would not be available for those uses for the duration of the project. Mr. Pitkin mentioned that there would be potential to replace the grass field with artificial turf at the completion of the project.

Dr. Lussier said that he thinks the Sprague site is a viable option with some issues that are worth resolving when weighed against the cost escalation of a late Hunnewell plan.

Ms. Quirk said there is momentum and positive energy around the project going forward, and a willingness within the community to get through two years of swing space in modulators.

Mr. D'Amico said next steps include further evaluation of logistics and cost. They will also look closely at what can be done on the no-build zone on the Sprague site.

Ms. Gray noted that the option of waiting until the Hardy or Upham project is complete also involves an evaluation of logistics. She asked when an estimate of escalation costs associated with waiting will be available. Mr. D'Amico said that cost information will be available in a couple of months.

Mr. Soliva asked why Hardy was not included as a site for modular swing space given the Town's acquisition of parcels providing access to Route 9. Mr. D'Amico said that the potential footprint and construction schedule for a project at Hardy, if that site is selected for the MSBA Project, limit its usefulness for this purpose.

### **Arborist Proposal**

Mr. D'Amico said that SMMA solicited a proposal for an assessment of the oak tree by an arborist who did a 2006 study of the tree.

Ms. Olsen said that the proposal is for two tasks: A health and risk assessment of the tree by the arborist who will be accompanied by SMMA's landscape architect and a report with recommendations on strategies, schedule and associated costs of reducing construction impact on the tree.

The cost for the arborist's services and the services of SMMA's landscape architect for these tasks is expected not to exceed \$3200.

The committee expressed general support for going forward with these tasks and an amendment to the SMMA contract will be presented for approval at a later date.

### **Project Invoice**

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from SMMA for work in December 2018.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the SMMA project invoice #50130 in the amount of \$74,860. Mr. Kelley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 8:15 p.m., upon a motion by Dr. Lussier and a second by Ms. Freiman, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

### **Documents and Exhibits Used**

Minutes of the 12/13/2018 SBC meeting

Minutes of the 12/20/2018 SBC meeting

Minutes of the 1/10/2019 SBC meeting

Project Budget – Hardy Upham

Attachment A to base OPM Contract

Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Rebecca Burstein

Email correspondence Ms. Gray/Michael Tobin

Email correspondence Ms. Gray/August Ventimiglia

SMMA Presentation of Concept Options, Parking and Swing Space 1/31/2019

Hunnewell Community Forum Feedback Review

Arboriculture Services Proposal: Tree Assessment and Protection During Construction Recommendation

Project Invoice: #SMMA 50130 (\$74,860)