

School Building Committee Minutes
June 13, 2019
Kingsbury Room, Wellesley Police Department

Chair and School Committee member Sharon Gray, Vice Chair and Selectman Thomas Ulfelder, Superintendent David Lussier, Executive Director Meghan Jop, School Committee Chair Matt Kelley, Selectman Marjorie Freiman, Hunnewell Principal Ellen Quirk, PBC member Matt King, FMD Director of Design and Construction Steve Gagosian, Community members Joubin Hassanein, Ryan Hutchins and Jose Soliva, Project Manager Kevin Kennedy of the Facilities Management Department; Alex Pitkin of SMMA, and Jeff D'Amico of Compass Project Management, Kien Ho of BETA.. Absent: community members Virginia Ferko and Heather Sawitsky, Hardy principal Charlene Cook and Upham principal Jeff Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:35 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being recorded by Wellesley Media.

Public Comment

Beanie Spangler, Birch Street, member of the Hunnewell community supports "early Hunnewell" but asks that the terminology be changed to reflect that what "early Hunnewell" means is new schools that will support the town's educational, safety and environmental standards, as soon as possible. In response to concerns she has heard expressed about the impact of swing space options on the art and music program, she said her children's experience with art and music on a cart was successful.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Gray announced that the draft May 16, 2019 minutes have been posted on the town website and distributed to committee members but will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

Hardy/Upham Project

Review and Approval of Invoice for Compass Project Management

Mr. Kennedy presented an invoice that he has reviewed from Compass Management for work in May.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve Invoice number CPM 74-03 in the amount of \$12,888. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Hunnewell Project

Review and Approval of Invoice for Compass Project Management

Mr. Kennedy presented an invoice that he has reviewed from Compass Management for work in May.

Mr. Uldelder moved to approve Invoice number CPM 69-11 in the amount of \$15,527. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Site Design

Mr. Pitkin presented an overview of the Hunnewell site noting that:

- During the 2000's Hunnewell had 362 students and operated as an 18-section school as recently as 2002. The projected new school capacity is 365 students;
- The site is near where many students live and is in a highly walkable neighborhood with adjacent pathways;
- Site acreage is well within state averages and on par with recent (and larger) schools in peer communities.
- Nearby assets such as the Library and Cameron Street parking lot create the site's "campus" quality
- Open space goals and protected area at the back of the site are a treasure and highly desirable for schools

Mr. Pitkin addressed the question of why the total square footage of the building is doubling.

- Robust special education program, partially state mandated
- State mandated building code requirements
- Modern teaching practices (the critical core of the education plan)
- Real sized gym, cafeteria, media center (but does not translate into a proportionate increase in staff and parking needs). He noted that if we were building a 12-section school using MSBA standards for these common spaces, the size of these spaces would not decrease very much

Mr. Pitkin showed a slide illustrating some refinements to the design of the north corner of the building and said that many strategies will be available during schematic design to improve this area and also the traffic circulation area in front of the building, to make it more plaza-like.

Review Parking, Site Circulation Plan and Traffic Memorandum

Mr. Pitkin reported that he has met with school administrators concerning traffic circulation design. He noted that his objective is to provide a design that will be flexible over time. He showed an illustration of a morning circulation pattern that depicted bus drop-off in the traffic circle at the front entrance with car drop-off along the street, utilizing "lay-by" street cuts. The afternoon pattern depicted buses utilizing the lay-bys and cars queuing in the traffic circle and street.

Mr. Pitkin presented a comparison of two parking scenarios: A & B.

Scenario A features 47 (+/-) onsite parking spaces, for an estimated lot coverage for the building and paved areas of 29-32%. 25 additional spaces are currently dedicated to Hunnewell in the Cameron lot and Library driveway. 25 parking spaces on Cameron Street are frequently used by school parents and visitors. The total of all these various spaces is 97 (+/-) of which 72 (+/-) are off-street.

Scenario B features 60 (+/-) onsite parking spaces, for an estimated lot coverage for the building and paved areas of 32-35%. 25 additional spaces are currently dedicated to Hunnewell

in the Cameron lot and Library driveway. 25 additional parking spaces on Cameron Street are frequently used by school parents and visitors. The total of all these various spaces is 110 (+/-) of which 85 (+/-) are off-street.

In response to a question by Ms. Gray, Mr. Bonfatti said that generally a project goes into the design and permitting phase with the number of requested parking spaces pinned down. During design and permitting that number may change.

Mr. King said PBC will look to affirm parking needs and goals of the building. On street spaces can be considered.

Ms. Quirk confirmed that 55 parking spaces will be needed for staff.

Ms. Jop said on-street parking is under the jurisdiction of the Board of Selectmen. She clarified that for school projects the parking needs to be accommodated do not include the short-term pick-up/drop off by parent cars. On street parking is presumed for these purposes and requires monitoring and enforcement over time.

Ms. Quirk noted that Hunnewell staff, parents and students are patrons of nearby businesses and the library. They also use the parking for those activities.

Mr. Ulfelder said during the design and permitting the actual number of needed spaces will be well vetted. If the scenario with the larger number of spaces is recommended, it is possible that during permitting other factors will be considered and may reduce those spaces. In building consensus around this project it may be best to present scenario B with a larger number of spaces as the preferred option, assuming one option needs to be presented.

Mr. Kelley said that the project is feasible with the parking spaces that have been identified. He suggested that a plan with the desired number of parking spaces be submitted for permitting rather than a plan with the largest number of spaces and to let the permitting process play out to determine how many will actually be required.

Ms. Gray suggested presenting a plan showing a range of 50-60 on-site parking spaces for a total of 75-85 off-street spaces.

In response to a question by Ms. Freiman, Ms. Jop said visitor parking needs are determined by applying national averages as well as local expectations and the information that all schools have about visitor activity.

Ms. Jop suggested that all presentations show the full Hunnewell site to clarify that only about 1/3 of the site is proposed to be paved or built upon.

Mr. Gagosian suggested eliminating the spaces adjacent to classrooms that are shown on the north strip of parking in scenario B. If parking is not extended to the area adjacent to the

classrooms, Mr. Pitkin said there may still be a net of 10 spaces on that north strip (as opposed to the 18 spaces shown there now).

Mr. Gagosian recommended that Mr. Pitkin make an effort to redraw the parking on the north side to depict this revision. Mr. Pitkin agreed.

Mr. Pitkin introduced Mr. Kien Ho of Beta, SMMA's contracted traffic consultant.

Mr. Ho said that his firm has performed a comprehensive traffic analysis. The study area consisted of 8 intersections, 3 of which are signalized and analyzed the periods of drop-off and pick-up at the school.

The analysis presumes full enrolment of 365 students at Hunnewell, 109 more students and 67 more household vehicle trips than current. For the sake of this analysis only, it was presumed that the additional students will be from an area where students now go to Sprague and might be redistricted to Hunnewell. Mr. Ho said that the estimated number of vehicle trips is a conservative number that does not assume students will walk to school even though approximately 23% of Hunnewell families surveyed in 2016 reported that they walk. The analysis presumes 85% will be driven and 15% will take the bus.

The traffic evaluation consisted of traffic analysis conditions for 2018 Existing, 2023 No-Build and Build Early Hunnewell and 2026 No-Build and Build Late Hunnewell.

Mr. Ho displayed a Level of Service Summary for 2023 that he said shows the project will have little impact on most intersections other than the intersection of Washington Street/Central Street and Grove Street, in particular the Grove Street northbound approach. This intersection is especially impacted by the well-used pedestrian signal cycle which adds 30 seconds in all directions when activated. The Grove Street northbound approach to this intersection, which has an existing level of service of "F", will experience additional delays of approximately 40 seconds in both the 2023 and 2026 build scenarios.

Mr. Soliva asked if there is opportunity to alleviate some of the traffic issues at this intersection. Mr. Ho said there may be minor adjustments particularly in the afternoon but it would be challenging to change the other signal times significantly to impact this one.

Dr. Lussier noted that the two areas most likely to be redistricted include many students who will probably walk along the path. Mr. Ho said the conservative new trip estimates he presented presume no walkers and the actual number of new trips will likely be fewer due to walkers.

Ms. Jop said that during the Project of Significant Impact review if a project meets certain thresholds for new trip generation and intersections are negatively impacted as a result, mitigation measures may be required. She said that often for a project like this which has historically had the same amount of traffic generated, improvements in sight lines or pedestrian access are the typical mitigation measures. In response to a question by Ann-Mara Lanza,

Library Trustee, she said that background growth, including the new library traffic and general annual increases in traffic, have been taken into account in the traffic analysis.

Discuss Project Handoff to Permanent Building Committee

Ms Gray said SBC needs to understand when and what it needs to present to the PBC and whether complete information about swing space will be required at that time or may be subsequently presented.

Mr. King explained that generally the proponent board(s), following their vote to go forward with a project, present the feasibility study to the PBC.

Mr. King said the issues related to timing of the swing space component of the project will be on the PBC agenda for discussion. He had a preliminary conversation with the PBC Chair concerning the timing question. Their understanding is that a project must be presented to the PBC at least 120 days before Town Meeting for PBC to make a presentation there in support of a design fund request. If swing space is internal and does not involve PBC, then it need not be presented along with the project. If the swing space option involves PBC because it is a vertical construction project expected to exceed \$500,000 in cost, the PBC would need a presentation of a feasibility study for that swing space project 120 days before Town Meeting.

Ms. Jop said if Special Town Meeting were on December 9th, the project would need to be presented to the PBC by August 9 to meet the 120 day requirement. Notice of the project to Advisory Committee is also required by that date.

Schedule and Next Steps

Mr. Bonfatti reviewed a swing space evaluation timeline for the SBC which included authorization of additional services for swing space evaluation at this meeting (June 13th), review the results of the additional swing space evaluation and a draft feasibility report at the next meeting (July 11) and review swing space options and the feasibility solution to proceed to PBC and Advisory Committee at the July 25th meeting. Mr. Bonfatti clarified that an SBC recommendation on swing space is also pending further work and outreach by the School Department.

Review and Approve Swing Space Amendments

Mr. Bonfatti described four proposed amendments to the SMMA contract for additional services related to swing space. He suggested that the two amendments related to St. Paul's be approved with the understanding that they will be executed only if the St. Paul's option becomes available for further consideration, based on the status of the Archdiocese's negotiations with another party. The other two amendments are for further site planning and traffic analysis related to the internal swing space option and the various late Hunnewell swing space scenarios.

Mr. Ulfelder clarified that all viable late Hunnewell options will be evaluated.

In response to a question by Mr. Soliva, Mr. Pitkin said that the general design assumptions used for the Hunnewell building, (two-stories, 19 classrooms) would be employed for purposes of this evaluation of late Hunnewell scenarios, understanding the feasibility study for Hardy/Upham will determine those design features.

There was a general discussion of the timing of the SBC swing space decision. Ms. Gray noted that a feasible building project could be presented to the PBC in time to meet their timing requirements for preparing a Town Meeting request for design funds while the SBC does further work on swing space in the fall.

Mr. Hassanein asked how we will capture the programmatic impacts of late swing space options. Ms. Gray suggested it might be appropriate to revisit the swing space matrix earlier developed by the SBC.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Designer Services Proposal amendment 003 to perform St. Paul reduced scope evaluation services as detailed in the scope of work for a lump sum fee of \$10,300. Dr. Lussier seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Designer Services Proposal Amendment 004 to perform site planning analysis for swing space options as detailed in the scope of work for a lump sum fee of \$16,300. Dr. Soliva seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Designer Services Proposal Amendment 005 to perform traffic consultant services for "Late Hunnewell" scenarios as detailed in the scope of work for a lump sum fee of \$24,200. Mr. Soliva seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Designer Services Proposal Amendment 006 to perform traffic consultant services for the St. Paul swing space scenario as detailed in the scope of work for a lump sum fee of \$6,050. Dr. Lussier seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

At approximately 8:00 p.m., upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and second by Mr. Hutchins, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn.

Documents and Exhibits Used

- Compass Project Management Invoice number CPM 69-11 in the amount of \$15,527
- Compass Project Management Invoice number CPM 74-03 in the amount of \$12,888
- Compass Project Management/SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC June 13, 2019
- SMMA Designer Services Proposal Amendment 003 dated 6/13/2019 (\$10,300)
- SMMA Designer Services Proposal amendment 004 dated 6/13/2019 (\$16,300)
- SMMA Designer Services Proposal amendment 005 dated 6/13/2019 (\$24,200)
- SMMA Designer Services Proposal amendment 006 dated 6/13/2019 (\$6,050)