

**School Building Committee –Minutes  
July 25, 2019  
Kingsbury Room, Wellesley Police Station**

**Present:** Chair Sharon Gray; Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder; Marjorie Freiman ; Virginia Ferko; Mary Gard; Steve Gagosian; Joubin Hassanein; Matt King; David Lussier; Ellen Quirk; FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; FMD Project Manager Richard Elliott; Tim Bonfatti and Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management; Alex Pitkin and Kristen Olsen of SMMA; **Absent:** Ryan Hutchins; Meghan Jop; Melissa Martin; Heather Sawitsky; Jose Soliva; 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**

No members of the public provided comment.

**SBC Business**

**Approval of Minutes - July 11, 2019**

Mr. Gagosian suggested correction of a typographical error on page 3 and the addition of omitted language on page 4 as follows: “due to the fact the added per square foot cost is an increment of the original square foot cost.”

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2019 SBC meeting, as amended. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the minutes were approved. Mr. King and Ms. Freiman abstained.

**Hardy/Upham Project**

***Review Proposed Contract and SMMA Fee for Feasibility Study Phase***

Mr. Elliott distributed for review SMMA’s fee proposal, including SMMA’s outline of reimbursable consultants for the feasibility and schematic design phases of the Hardy/Upham project and his memo summarizing costs and reflecting a total proposed fee of \$1,073,085.

Mr. Bonfatti clarified that these documents contain the terms that will be incorporated into a standard MSBA contract.

Mr. Elliott confirmed that the scope of services provides for complete feasibility studies on both the Hardy and Upham sites, similar in scope to the feasibility study done for Hunnewell.

Mr. Gagosian, in response to a question from Ms. Gray concerning the relative roles of SBC and PBC in approving design fees, suggested that SBC should approve the feasibility study fee and the PBC should confirm the portion of the fee for schematic design.

Ms. Olsen explained that the schedule included in the proposal was extrapolated from one generated by the Owners Project Manager in coordination with Facilities Management to meet MSBA required

milestones and its presumed meeting dates based on its regular quarterly schedule. The proposed schedule, subject to change, reflects submission of a preliminary design program (PDP) to the MSBA in December 2019 and the preferred schematic design (PSR) to the MSBA in May 2020.

Ms. Gray confirmed that the SBC's recommendation of a preferred site and solution and the subsequent review and supportive votes on that recommendation by School Committee and Board of Selectmen, as well as a presentation to Town Meeting, will occur prior to submission of the preferred design to the MSBA.

In response to a question from Ms. Gray, Ms. Olsen confirmed that the site selection criteria and questions proposed by the Sustainable Energy Committee and included in the appendix to the RFP will be incorporated into the study and covered by the basic fee.

Ms. Gard asked where in the process addition/renovation vs new build will be considered and Mr. Pitkin said those options would be evaluated as part of the preferred schematic design process.

Ms. Gray instructed members to submit any further questions to Mr. Elliott and said that the SBC will vote on terms of SMMA's proposal at the next meeting.

Mr. Bonfatti said that a more detailed schedule and explanation of the MSBA process will be presented in late August or early September.

### **Hunnewell Project**

#### **Parking Plan options and recommendation**

Mr. Pitkin presented updated parking and pick-up and drop-off scenarios. He reviewed the list of site parking spaces for the project developed by Ms. Quirk that reflects the need for 65 striped spaces and one non-striped space for the custodian. He noted that in the permitting phase that number will be fine-tuned.

Mr. Pitkin noted that 25 off-site parking spaces in the Cameron Street lot/ Library driveway are presumed in each scenario. He said that an additional 25 on-street spaces have been identified but not included in the parking numbers presented. He presented the parking scenarios as follows:

Parking Scenario A provides +/- 47 on-site spaces

Parking Scenario B provides +/- 60 on-site spaces

Parking Scenario B Revised provides +/- 55 on-site spaces for a total of 80 spaces.

Parking Scenario B Revised alters the loading zone design shown on previous drawings to reflect the type of loading area actually used by town elementary schools. Ms. Gray said she responded favorably to the revised Scenario B because it preserves a landscaped buffer between the school and the library and does not extend parking into the area that abuts classrooms. Ms. Quirk said that she likes the revised proposed drop-off and pick-up design that shows bus traffic in the traffic circle and space for car

queuing in a new lay-by lane adjacent to the street. Mr. Pitkin said the revised design would make the drop-off and pick-up plan the same in the morning and afternoon and allow emergency vehicle access closer to the entrance of the school.

Mr. Ulfelder clarified that the SBC's role is to present a parking plan that is feasible and may be permitted but noted that the Town's process for permitting is exhaustive and will result in considerable evaluation of parking prior to approval of a final plan.

In response to a question by Ms. Gray about playground size, Ms. Quirk noted that because the gymnasium also now serves as the cafeteria, three grade levels (6 classrooms) use the playground at one time. She said in the new 18-section school with a separate cafeteria and gymnasium, a similar number of students will use the playground at one time, two grade levels (6 classrooms).

Dr. Lussier noted that the targeted population for the new Hunnewell is similar to the number of students Hunnewell has served at times in the recent past.

Mr. Pitkin said that the quality of active play zone design will be improved and that detailed playground design work will occur in the next phase.

In response to a question from Mr. Hassanein, Mr. Pitkin pointed out the areas where outdoor classrooms may be designed.

Mr. Ulfelder clarified that while there may be a slightly smaller area available for play space in the current plan, better turf management and better space design are available to optimize use of the space.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the revised Scenario B be included in the feasibility study report.

### **Hunnewell Feasibility Study Report**

Ms. Olsen said that most edits have been incorporated into the current draft of the report. Feedback from Ms. Jop still needs to be included.

Ms. Ferko suggested more clarity is needed in the description of late Hunnewell swing space options. She noted that the three scenarios being studied can be confusing to understand and suggested using uniform terminology as it applies to each option would be helpful, in particular noting the number of attendance zones that will exist under each option and noting which options would require operation of two schools on one site.

There was a discussion of whether detail on the swing space options should be included in the Executive Summary before a section on the swing space investigation is ready for inclusion in the body of the report. Mr. Gagosian suggested a less detailed status report might be included instead. Mr. Ulfelder and Mr. Hassanein expressed support for inclusion of the information about all of the swing space options that are being studied.

Mr. Kennedy noted that Ms. Jop suggests eliminating reference to a zoning variance in the report because the expectation is that the town will not seek a variance but instead will seek a permit under the Dover Amendment.

Mr. Pitkin said that images of site plans and concept plans, including the parking plan revision discussed at this meeting, will be inserted in the final draft of the report.

Ms. Olsen displayed the section of the draft report that outlines the schedule leading up to a Special Town Meeting on December 9, 2019. Ms. Freiman provided recent updates to that schedule for inclusion in the final report and said that before the BOS agrees to open the warrant on October 21 she believes the members will need to be fairly sure that the deadlines in the timeline will be met.

Ms. Gray said there was a question from one of the liaisons to the project about the characterization of the difference in EUI for the new construction vs addition renovation option as "slight". Mr. Kennedy suggested that the difference be represented instead as a percentage and Mr. Pitkin said SMMA would verify and include that number.

Ms. Gray said that on August 1st the School Committee will receive the Feasibility Study Report and any project updates since the last joint meeting with the SBC on June 6<sup>th</sup>. The School Committee is expected to further discuss the report at its meeting on August 6<sup>th</sup> and may vote to present it to the PBC by August 8th to meet that committee's deadline of 120 days preceding Special Town Meeting.

Ms. Gray noted that the feasibility study report provides comprehensive and informative data for the community to understand the Hunnewell School and the building limitations that impact education, as well as how the SBC got to the preferred solution.

Mr. Ulfelder moved that the SBC approve the Feasibility Study Report for the Hunnewell Elementary School dated July 24, 2019 subject to further non-substantive edits by the chair, Sharon Gray, and subject to the comments from Meghan Jop, specifically related to the Dover Amendment. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

#### **Review SMMA and Compass Project Management Fee for design/bidding phases**

Mr. D'Amico said that SMMA's fee proposal will be distributed for discussion at the next SBC meeting and suggested that the Compass proposal that was distributed for review at this meeting be held for discussion until the next meeting as well.

#### **Project Budget**

Mr. D'Amico presented the Hunnewell project budget for review and noted that a change since the SBC's last review is an increase from \$4.6 million to \$4.7 million for the anticipated appropriation request to Special Town meeting for costs during the design phase. The total project budget for construction remains at \$57,500,000.

Mr. Ulfelder asked if any premium from acceleration of the construction schedule would be offset by a reduction in the costs associated with general conditions on that accelerated schedule. Mr. D'Amico said that could be the case. He noted that the largest components of general conditions costs are the construction manager's labor force including superintendent, assistant superintendent, project manager and assistant project manager as well as overhead such as the cost of trailers, utilities and daily site cleanup.

Mr. Ulfelder also asked if the guaranteed minimum price used with the construction manager at risk model (CM at Risk) is likely to result in a higher price than the design, bid build approach. Mr. D'Amico said that this model allows separate packages for early work to be separated and procured before design is complete, allowing acceleration. There is a contingency fund for the CM at Risk that may initially add to a perception that the initial price is higher than it would be with the design, bid, build approach, but this contingency fund is typically not fully utilized and the remainder would be returned to the town.

Mr. King noted that with the traditional design, bid, build model there are often many change orders that end up increasing the cost. Having a CM at Risk helps avoid costly change orders. Mr. Gagosian noted that CM at Risk is also helpful in prequalifying subcontractors.

Mr. Hassanein said that the CM at Risk model is one that shares risk with the project owner. The contingency fund belongs to the owner but helps insulate the construction manager from certain risks.

In response to further questions about which model might result in a lower cost Mr. D'Amico said there are too many factors that might result in one model costing more than another for him to provide an accurate answer to that question at this point in the process.

### **Swing Space Status Update**

Ms. Gray said that the swing space discussion would be deferred to the next two meetings.

### **Discuss next steps leading to Town Meeting vote**

Ms. Gray said that the discussion of edits to the feasibility study report earlier in the meeting covered next steps leading to the Town Meeting vote.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 7:10 pm, upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and seconded by Mr. Gagosian, the Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

### **Documents and Exhibits used**

- Draft Minutes for July 11, 2019 SBC meeting.
- SMMA proposal for designer services for the Hardy/Upham Feasibility Study and Schematic Design dated 7/23/2019, with attached memo from SMMA outlining the scope of services and

budget for reimbursable consultants and attached memo from Richard Elliott of FMD summarizing SMMA's proposed fee.

- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 07/25/2019
- Draft Hunnewell Feasibility Study Report and Appendices (07/24/2019)
- Hunnewell Feasibility Project Budget (updated 7/22/2019)
- Compass Project Management Proposal for services through design and bidding phases of the Hunnewell Elementary School Project (7/23/2019)

**Approved 9/5/2019**