

**School Building Committee –Minutes**  
**July 11, 2019**  
**Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall**

**Present:** Chair Sharon Gray; Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder; Virginia Ferko; Mary Gard; Steve Gagosian; Joubin Hassanein; Meghan Jop; Melissa Martin; David Lussier; Heather Sawitsky; Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management; Alex Pitkin of SMMA; and Kien Ho of Beta Group.

**Absent:** Marjorie Freiman; Matt King; Ellen Quirk; Cynthia Mahr; Charlene Cook; and Jeffery Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:35 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being aired live by Wellesley Media and is being recorded for later viewing.

**Public Comment**

Beanie Spangler, Birch Road, has been a Hunnewell parent for 11 years and is in full support of new schools as soon as possible. She said the concerns about swing space can be worked out and there is a need to build consensus in the community based on facts. She encouraged efforts to disseminate more factual material about the school building projects.

**SBC Business**

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the SBC minutes for May 16, 2019, June 6, 2019 and June 13, 2019. Mr. Soliva seconded and the minutes were approved. Ms. Gard, Ms. Martin and Mr. Hutchins abstained from the vote relative to the May 16, 2019 meeting. Ms. Gard, Ms. Martin, Mr. Ryan and Ms. Sawitsky abstained from the vote relative to the June 06, 2019 minutes. Ms. Ferko, Ms. Gard, Ms. Martin and Ms. Sawitsky abstained from the vote relative to the June 13, 2019 minutes.

**General SBC Reports**

Ms. Gray introduced and welcomed two newly appointed members to the SBC: Mary Gard representing the Advisory Committee, replacing Jane Andrews; and Melissa Martin, Chair of the School Committee, replacing Matt Kelley.

Ms. Gray announced that Compass Project Management has been asked to oversee the development and maintenance of a separate website for the two school building projects. An amendment to the Compass contract (s) will be presented to SBC for review and approval at a future meeting.

**Hardy/Upham Project**

**Project Update**

Ms. Gray reported that the MSBA Designer Selection Panel has selected SMMA as designer for the project. The town will negotiate contract terms for approval by SBC. In response to a question by Ms. Gray, Mr. Gagosian said that PBC will want to review the contract terms relative to schematic design.

Mr. D'Amico said that inspections of both schools will be done in August and September. A kick-off meeting with the MSBA will occur in mid-August.

### **Review and Approve Invoice**

Mr. Kennedy presented a project invoice from Compass Project Management for services in June, 2019. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve Compass Project Management Invoice CPM 74-04 in the amount of \$12,891.00. Mr. Soliva seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Hunnewell Project**

#### **Review and Approve Invoices**

Mr. Kennedy presented a project invoice from Compass Project Management for services in June, 2019. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve Compass Project Management Invoice CPM 69-12 in the amount of \$8,658.00. Mr. Hutchins seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kennedy presented a project invoice from SMMA for services in May and June 2019. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Invoice 51045R in the amount of \$54,940.00. Mr. Hutchins seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **Project Schedule Update**

Mr. D'Amico presented a potential timeline for an early Hunnewell project which includes presentations to Advisory Committee and PBC in late summer and early fall of 2019 and a Special Town Meeting for an appropriation of design funds in December 2019. Schematic design, design development and permitting would occur in 2020 and early 2021 with a request to Town Meeting and voters for construction funds in the spring of 2021 if the internal swing space option is pursued. Swing space under this timeline would be utilized for one and a half school years.

Mr. D'Amico said that if St. Paul's is the selected option for swing space, the retrofitting of that building would need to occur in the first 9 months of 2021, requiring approval of funding for the project late in 2020. Mr. Ulfelder noted that the party currently in negotiations with the church has strengthened its position by increasing the amount of space it seeks to lease. Mr. Ulfelder said it is probable that negotiations between St. Paul's and the other party will be successful, but that the SBC will continue to try to engage with St. Paul's if possible.

Mr. D'Amico explained that the request for construction funds would be based on a GMP, guaranteed maximum price, rather than on bids in hand. This would allow some earlier work on trade packages and an expedited start to the construction schedule, which could be condensed into approximately 17-18 months, with a building occupancy target of January 2023.

Ms. Gray asked what is the typical construction duration is for elementary school projects of this size in Massachusetts. Mr. D'Amico said that it is usually 18-19 months but that the 17-month timeframe presented here is reasonable since start of construction may be expedited by early trade packages.

In response to a question from Mr. Soliva, Mr. D'Amico confirmed that funding based on a GMP is acceptable under the General Laws and noted that the MSBA process for the other school project will also require approval of construction funds in advance of bids in hand.

In response to a question by Mr. Hassanein, Mr. D'Amico said that the 17-month construction schedule would be for a building that can be occupied in January 2023 but that final paving, plantings and grass would need to be completed when the weather was appropriate.

Mr. D'Amico, in response to a question concerning cost estimates, said that there would be no additional costs associated with completing construction in 17-18 months. Previous discussions at SBC meetings about additional costs associated with an accelerated schedule related to shorter construction durations, such as 15 months.

Ms. Jop said that a Special Town Meeting date of December 9, 2019 has been suggested and she has done a schedule for the lead-up to that date.

Ms. Gray asked Mr. Gagosian to clarify what PBC requires 120 days prior to STM. Mr. Gagosian said PBC will want to see a feasibility study report that presents a viable project that the proponents support outlining project scope schedule and budget. The decision on swing space need not be presented at the same time as the building design fund request.

Ms. Gard noted that submission to the Advisory Committee is also required and Ms. Gray said that she had discussed the requirements with Town Counsel. Materials will be sent to Advisory at the same time they are sent to the PBC, and Advisory may then schedule a date for a presentation as its schedule allows.

### **Project Budget Update**

Mr. D'Amico presented a conceptual project budget totaling \$57,500,000, which is \$1 million higher than previous estimates as a result of the increase in gymnasium size from 6000 sq. ft. to 7000 sq. ft. (the size of the Sprague gym with seating capacity of 100) and other estimated increased costs including hazardous materials abatement.

The appropriation request for design and permitting, through bids in hand, is proposed for \$4.6 million.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that there have been expressed concerns about gymnasium parking and the SBC should determine first if the parking solutions discussed are adequate. Mr. D'Amico said that parking will be fully vetted during the design and permitting process. Mr. D'Amico noted that not all gym seats will be occupied by drivers since athletes also use them.

In response to a question from Mr. Soliva, Mr. Pitkin said that the parking analysis considered on-site parking requirements for the school. He noted that the updated parking plan has 56 on-site spaces and 25 off-site for a total of 81.

Mr. Hassanein noted that gymnasium parking needs are not directly related to the number of provided seats since those who attend will stand if seats are not available.

Ms. Ferko asked what the incremental increase to the budget estimate was for the larger gymnasium, to help assess the value of including a larger and more useful gymnasium. Mr. D'Amico said he could attempt to provide that information. Mr. Gagosian said he thinks the increased size of the gym could be considered a no-cost change in the budget at this macro level due to the fact the added per square foot cost is an increment of the original square foot cost.

Ms. Martin asked how this budget compares to the cost of other recently built comparable schools. Mr. Pitkin said the cost estimator has taken data on cost of other schools into consideration. He noted that the budget here is escalated out to the mid-point of construction.

Ms. Gray asked Mr. D'Amico to discuss escalation cost calculations. Mr. D'Amico presented a graph depicting two construction cost escalation indices (Turner and RLB) vs. consumer price index from 2014-2018. This comparison shows that the average change per year in consumer price index is much lower (avg. 1.48%) than the average change in construction cost escalation (avg. 4.8%/year).

Mr. D'Amico said that for purposes of estimates for this project a conservative 4.5% per year construction cost escalation has been assumed. He said there was no attempt to anticipate relative purchasing power in 2021, but instead project cost estimates have been presented in today's dollars.

Mr. Ulfelder added that the way the escalation calculations have been developed is in accordance with industry standards. This will allow projects to be fairly compared and a good faith cost estimate presented. Mr. D'Amico noted that Compass and SMMA have hired independent cost estimators to predict costs.

Mr. Hassanein confirmed that the approach used is consistent with industry standards.

### **Review Draft Report - Executive Summary**

Mr. Pitkin said that the Executive Summary draft incorporates feedback from members of SBC and FMD. The entire draft report will be circulated prior to the next SBC meeting.

There was a discussion of potential edits to the Executive Summary.

Ms. Ferko suggested that the language describing SBC action on the final parking recommended plan be clarified and asked if cost should be listed as a factor in the paragraph describing the evaluation of building alternatives since it was not a differentiating factor among options considered. Mr. Ulfelder and Mr. Soliva clarified that cost should be listed as a factor and it was a consideration even if in the end the alternatives had similar estimated costs.

Mr. Hassanein suggested that the goals of the project be documented in the report and Mr. Pitkin said he would incorporate the six educational design priorities into the document.

Ms. Martin asked Mr. Gagosian to clarification the PBC's requirement for receipt of the Feasibility Study Report by August 8. Mr. Gagosian said that PBC would like the final rather than draft report, but for the pending section concerning swing space. He said the PBC would expect an SBC recommendation to School Committee and School Committee, as project proponent, would accept the report and present it to PBC.

### **Swing Space Update**

Mr. Pitkin said that at this meeting Kien Ho of Beta Group will present traffic impact analysis for late Hunnewell swing space options. Data related to the early Hunnewell internal swing space option will be presented at a later meeting.

Mr. Ho noted that for the purposes of analysis some assumptions about potential redistricting scenarios have been utilized, but cautioned that those scenarios do not reflect any decisions about redistricting. Ms. Gray added that the redistricting scenarios Mr. Ho was presenting were the conceptual scenarios previously used by the Master Planning Committee for HHU (MPC).

Mr. Ho outlined the options that Beta analyzed:

Option 1A Redistrict (without modulars)

New Upham and use both Old Upham and Old Hardy as swing space for Hunnewell students

Option 1B Redistrict (without modulars)

New Hardy and use both Old Upham and Old Hardy as swing space for Hunnewell students

Option 2A No Redistricting (without modulars)

New Upham, Old Hardy and use Old Upham as swing space for Hunnewell students

Option 2B No Redistricting (without modulars)

New Hardy, Old Upham and use Old Hardy as swing space for Hunnewell students

Mr. Ho reviewed a map of the study area showing sixteen intersections that would be impacted by the Hunnewell families traveling northbound to the various swing space options. He explained that the analysis at this stage was qualitative. A more detailed analysis would not be cost effective given the large number of scenarios under consideration.

Mr. Ho said that expected vehicle trips were analyzed for each scenario. He noted, in response to a question from Ms. Gray, that the current percentage of bus ridership was assumed (15%) and the analysis did not account for increased bus ridership that may occur with a swing space plan. Dr. Lussier noted that providing free transportation is contemplated in both the early and late Hunnewell swing space options and would likely increase ridership.

Mr. Ho presented the following conclusions:

- pre-existing conditions operate with significant delay and queuing on Weston Road, Route 9 and Kingsbury Street;
- changes in traffic patterns will exacerbate conditions;
- More intersections will be impacted if Hunnewell relocates to Upham;
- Mitigation measures would include carpooling and buses.
- Option 1A – redistributing traffic impacts will be more concentrated in the area of Upham School. Additional impacts to Washington Street, Kingsbury Street and Route 9.
- Option 1B - redistributing traffic impacts will be more concentrated along Weston Road. Additional
- Option 2A –Additional impact to Washington Street, Kingsbury Street and Route 9.
- Option 2B - Weston Road at Route 9 interchange and Hardy Driveway at Weston Road significantly impacted.

In response to a question from Dr. Lussier, Mr. Ho said that from a purely traffic perspective, there would be less impact on traffic in the non-redistricting scenarios (2A and 2B).

Mr. D’Amico noted that 2 additional options that include the use of modulars were not studied since the addition of modular units will not impact traffic analysis. More information about all six late Hunnewell swing space options will be presented at the next meeting.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 7:20 pm, upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and seconded by Dr. Lussier, the Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

### **Documents and Exhibits used**

- Meeting Minutes of May 16, June 6 and June 13, 2019
- Project Invoice: Compass Project Management CPM 74- 04 (\$12,891.00)
- Project Invoice: Compass Project Management CPM 69-12 (\$8,658.00)
- Project Invoice: SMMA 51045R (\$54,940.00)
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 07/11/2019
- Executive Summary - Hunnewell Feasibility Study Report (Draft-- 07/11/2019)

***Approved 7-25-2019***