The meeting was called to order at 6:20 PM, joining the School Building Committee (SBC) in open session. Those present included Vice Chair Linda Chow, Secretary Matt Kelley, and members Sharon Gray and Jim Roberti. Members of the SBC present included Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Mary Gard, Steve Gagosian, Matt King, Meghan Jop, Superintendent David Lussier, Assistant Superintendent Cynthia Mahr, Hunnewell Principal Ellen Quirk, Jose Soliva, Facilities Management Department (FMD) Project Manager Richard Elliott, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy, Tim Bonfatti of Compass Project Management, Alex Pitkin and Kristen Olsen of SMMA, and Director of Transportation Deane McGoldrick. School Committee Chair Melissa Martin was absent.

Ms. Chow, serving as chair of the meeting, announced that the meeting was being recorded by local media.

**HUNNEWELL FACILITIES PROJECT: SWING SPACE**

**Schedule and Next Steps**

Ms. Gray reviewed a schedule of upcoming meetings and proposed action:

- August 2 – Submit Feasibility Study Report to PBC and Advisory Committee
- August 6 – School Committee vote to approve Feasibility Study
- August 8 – Presentation of Feasibility Study to PBC
- TBD – School Committee present Feasibility Study and discuss project with Advisory Committee
- December 9 - potential Special Town Meeting to request design funds (pending work on swing space)

In response to a request by Mr. Kelley for clarification, Ms. Gray said that the School Committee will be the proponent of the project. Mr. Ulfelder said the Board of Selectmen would vote on the project as a whole, including swing space, when it is ready to go to Town Meeting.

**Swing Space**

Ms. Gray said that the project team has been working to provide more detail on the early and late Hunnewell swing space options. She said that the only early Hunnewell swing space option, allowing a school to open in 2023, is internal swing space. The St. Paul’s School option is no longer under consideration because the church is working to finalize a lease with another party for that property.

Mr. Kennedy presented information about the internal swing space option. This plan would use existing space in the district's other elementary schools for Hunnewell.
students during the 18-24 months of construction (3 or 4 school semesters). Additional classroom space for Hunnewell students will be created, in order of priority, by:

- Class consolidation made possible by projected declining enrollments within the host schools,
- Reclaiming former classrooms,
- Converting space into a classroom, or
- Using either music or art rooms.

Each grade level at Hunnewell would be hosted at one school, kept together and taught by Hunnewell staff. Students would remain at that school for the entire period of construction (3 or 4 semesters) to minimize student transitions.

Dr. Lussier noted that the District has often used internal space to meet temporary needs. PAWS classrooms have used elementary school classrooms and specialized spaces such as art and music rooms have been repurposed to accommodate enrollment. He added that classroom consolidation would occur due to declining enrollment and that class size guidelines (18-22 for K-2nd grade and 22-24 for 3-5th grade) would remain unchanged. Dr. Lussier emphasized that the lowest priority would be to use art or music rooms for classrooms, but even if those spaces are temporarily repurposed, the art and music curriculum will still be delivered, as the Spanish curriculum is now delivered to all elementary students in their own classrooms rather than in specialized rooms.

Mr. Kennedy and Dr. Lussier presented a chart showing projected enrollment and sections per school for the upcoming school year and the two years of construction to demonstrate how declining enrollment may free up internal swing space.

Dr. Lussier noted that Schofield enrollment is not projected to decline, and in fact may slightly increase, which will make it challenging to host swing space there. Upham, due to its small size and the space needs of the Skills program, may also be unable to host swing space, though it is too early to make a determination. Based on projected enrollment decline at Bates, Fiske, Hardy, and Sprague, those schools should be able to host swing space, and Sprague and Bates might each accommodate two grade levels of Hunnewell students. The exact details of the swing space plan will not be finalized until the winter of 2021.

Ms. Chow asked if the Warren School was under consideration. Dr. Lussier said that classrooms hosted there would not have access to school infrastructure that is available in WPS buildings (nursing and OT/PT as examples) creating isolation and operational inefficiency.

In response to a question from Ms. Gard, Dr. Lussier said given the existing school infrastructure, it would not be possible to redistrict into 6 schools now.
Dr. Lussier said that many Hunnewell parents have expressed support for an early Hunnewell project, including internal swing space. There is a plan to talk with all of the elementary school communities in September about swing space and redistricting.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that there has been extensive and detailed work done since last spring to develop the internal swing space option, which supports the conclusion that it is, in fact, viable.

Mr. Kelley pointed out that a reduction in the number of sections at many schools will occur as a result of declining enrollment, whether or not that school hosts internal swing space.

Mr. Roberti asked how internal swing space would impact special education classrooms. Dr. Lussier said that most special education services are delivered in classrooms but there has been a careful look at the space needed for the Hunnewell TLC students at host schools and also at how to move some special education students to more appropriately-sized spaces at host schools to free up full-sized classrooms for swing space.

Ms. Jop asked if 4th and 5th grade Hunnewell students could be integrated into the 4th and 5th grade populations at host schools rather than hosting them in separate classrooms. Dr. Lussier said that if efficiency were the only goal, that could make sense, but Hunnewell parents have expressed support for keeping Hunnewell grade level cohorts together so that peer relationships can be maintained.

Mr. Pitkin reviewed the transportation analysis done by BETA relative to internal swing space. He summarized BETA’s conclusions as follows:

- There are preexisting transportation issues at the elementary schools with delay and queuing on Weston Road, Rt. 9 and Kingsbury Street.
- The analysis used the most conservative data (highest values) for vehicles and demographics.
- Small increases in volume are manageable and not expected to significantly exacerbate traffic operations.
- Most vehicle trips are offset by declining enrollment, except at Schofield.
- Increases in queue lengths are likely, particularly in the afternoon. Carpools or buses could mitigate these concerns.
- Additional management for drop-off and pickup is required, particularly at Hardy and Schofield (if it is used for swing space).
- Limited capital project work would be required at school sites, other than some pavement striping, signage, etc.

Mr. Pitkin then presented aerial views of each elementary school with car, bus, and pedestrian access identified on each image.
Dr. Lussier and Mr. McGoldrick presented potential plans for internal swing space transportation, specifically the hybrid transportation model that features:

- Centralized staging area within the Hunnewell attendance zone for students going to Fiske (and Schofield, if used for swing space) with an estimated ride time of 15 minutes.
- Morning pickup from each of five Hunnewell neighborhoods on buses that will then travel to each of the host schools – Bates, Hardy, and Sprague (and Upham, if used for swing space) – with estimated travel time from 8-12 minutes to 25-30 minutes, depending on the host school.
- Afternoon drop-off from buses that travel directly from each host school to Wellesley Middle School for parent pickup. Buses drop off on Donizetti Street and students would be picked up on Calvin Road, occurring well after WMS dismissal.

Ms. Mahr presented internal swing space transportation cost estimates as follows:

- $690,822 in School Year 2021-2022
- $738,288 in School Year 2022-2023
- $1,429,110 Total

These estimates include the cost of 6 buses, bus monitors, and additional vans for the TLC program.

In response to a question from Mr. Ulfelder, Mr. McGoldrick confirmed that the number of buses could be reduced if ridership is low.

Dr. Lussier said that Hunnewell families with children assigned to multiple schools will have the option of open enrollment, based on space availability, to keep siblings in one school. Ms. Quirk said that she is confident that carpooling to assist parents with students in multiple schools will be organized by parent volunteers.

Late Hunnewell swing space options were then reviewed by Mr. Pitkin.

Late Hunnewell Options with redistricting include (potential number of students at each school is noted in parentheses):

- Option 1A – Redistrict and use New Upham (365) with Hunnewell split between Old Upham (182) and Old Hardy (183) without modulars.
- Option 1B – Redistrict and use New Hardy (365) with Hunnewell split between Old Hardy (182) and Old Upham (185) without modulars.
- Option 1C – Redistrict and use New Upham (365) with Hunnewell (365) at Old Hardy with modulars.
• Option 1D – Redistrict and use New Hardy (365) with Hunnewell (365) at Old Upham with modulars.

Late Hunnewell Options without redistricting include:

• Option 2A – No redistricting, use New Upham for Upham (195), Old Upham for Hunnewell (256) (for a combined 451 students on the Upham site) and Old Hardy for Hardy (277).
• Option 2B – No redistricting, use New Hardy for Hardy (277), Old Hardy for Hunnewell (256) (for a combined 533 on the Hardy site) and Old Upham for Upham (195).

Mr. Pitkin referenced the presentation by BETA at the last SBC meeting and reviewed some of the conclusions of BETA’s study related to late Hunnewell:

• Pre-existing conditions currently operate with significant delay and changes in traffic patterns will temporarily exacerbate conditions, adding some delay but not reducing intersection grades.
• In these scenarios, vehicle trips are less likely to be offset by declining enrollment.
• Mitigation measures such as carpools and buses should be considered.
• The study was done using the most conservative data (highest values) for vehicle and demographics.

Mr. Pitkin presented slides illustrating potential traffic circulation/drop-off and pickup scenarios, for the six late Hunnewell options.

Mr. Pitkin noted that options that continue to use an old school on the site of a new school present the challenge of delaying demolition and the completion of site work for the new school project.

Mr. Pitkin said that further study will be needed to determine how vehicles may be able to access Route 9 from the recently-acquired parcels on the Hardy site. Ms. Jop said that in her experience, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation is likely to approve curb cuts on Route 9.

Ms. Gray asked how teacher parking would be accommodated and what impacts there would be on playground space in the various late Hunnewell scenarios. Mr. Pitkin replied that there are a number of highly complicated variables to consider for a site when a new school is constructed while the existing school is in operation. This would be further complicated if the old school is then retained for Hunnewell swing space, delaying completion of the new school site work. There would need to be pre-design work done to plan for all the needs on the site: construction vehicles, playgrounds,
teacher parking and traffic circulation. He said it is anticipated there would be work on these issues as part of the design work for the MSBA project.

Mr. Kelley said that he does not see any advantage to Option 1A or 1B vs. 2A or 2B since the number of students on the site with two schools in operation is similar or greater, and Options 1A and 1B require the Hunnewell population to be split.

Mr. Soliva asked if the MSBA will allow a delay in closing out one of its projects, as would be required in the scenarios that propose operating two schools on the new school site for up to two years. Mr. Bonfatti said the MSBA is pushing districts to close out as soon as possible and his sense is they would not like it.

Mr. Pitkin presented the following Late Hunnewell conclusions:

- Highly complicated variables.
- Delays Hunnewell project and extends the need to operate Hunnewell until 2024 and current Hardy/Upham until 2026.
- Numerous impacts at host sites related to two schools on one site (parking, traffic, playgrounds, etc.).
- Tied to the Hardy/Upham project, which could influence final site selection and design of the new school and site in that project based on temporary Hunnewell swing space needs.
- Study was equitable between both the Hardy and Upham sites.

Mr. Gagosian noted that the risk associated with extending operation of the old buildings (Hunnewell, Hardy, and Upham) should not be minimized.

Mr. Ulfelder said it is important to understand that there has been extensive and detailed work and analysis of the late Hunnewell options, despite what may appear to be an emphasis on internal swing space at this meeting. Mr. Pitkin said there is not much more analysis of the late options that can be done at this point in the process.

Mr. Bonfatti reviewed the schedule and conceptual range of costs for the swing space options.

- Internal Swing Space – $3.3-$3.7M
- Late Hunnewell (using Hardy/Upham) – $10-$12M

Mr. Bonfatti presented a graph comparing construction cost escalation vs. the Consumer Price Index. The average change in consumer price index is forecasted at an average 1.48%/year and the average change in construction cost escalation is forecasted at an average 4.8%/year.
Mr. Ulfelder noted that these costs have not been updated to reflect the most recent Turner Cost Index that projects construction cost escalation to be even higher. Mr. Bonfatti said the Turner index was revised for 2019-2020 from 5.6% to 6.9%, but given the difficulty of projecting out multiple years and accepting that there could be economic factors that modulate cost escalation, the 4.8% figure was used to estimate costs.

Mr. Bonfatti presented conceptual project budget summaries for the swing space options as follows:

**Internal Swing Space:**
- $100,000 – Construction within buildings (potential partitions, etc.)
- $300,000 – Site work, signage, police details etc.
- $250,000 – Consultants fees
- $2,400,000 – Busing and TLC Program costs
- $450,000 – Moving, contingencies and other administrative costs
- $3,500,000 – Total concept budget

**Late Hunnewell with no redistricting:**
- $6,300,000 – Building cost escalation
- $1,000,000 – Delay demolition
- $0 – Modulars
- $300,000 – Consultant fees
- $900,000 – Busing
- $1,400,000 – Soft cost escalation
- $9,900,000 – Total concept budget

**Late Hunnewell with redistricting and modulars:**
- $6,300,000 – Building cost escalation
- $0 – Delay demolition
- $2,000,000 – Modulars
- $300,000 – Consultant fees
- $900,000 – Busing
- $1,400,000 – Soft cost escalation
- $10,900,000 – Total concept budget

Mr. Bonfatti reviewed timelines as follows:

- Late Hunnewell – Hardy/Upham construction beginning in mid-2022; Upham/Hardy move-in date in 2024; Hunnewell construction beginning in 2024; Hunnewell move-in date in 2026; old Hardy or Upham vacated in 2026, followed by demolition and completion of work on that site.
Ms. Gray encouraged committee members to submit questions concerning swing space to Mr. Kennedy and suggestions for developing a frequently asked questions document to her. She also told members to be prepared at the next meeting to discuss any lessons from the Hunnewell project that may help inform the process for the Hardy/Upham project.

The SBC adjourned at 8:50 PM, and the School Committee meeting continued after a brief recess.

*Mr. Ulfelder, Ms. Ferko, Ms. Freiman, Ms. Gard, Mr. Gagosian, Mr. King, Mr. Soliva, Mr. Elliott, and Mr. Kennedy left the meeting at 8:50 PM.*

**HUNNEWELL FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT**

Ms. Chow introduced the topic of the Hunnewell Feasibility Study Report and asked Ms. Gray to lead the discussion.

Ms. Gray said that the Committee had previously received a draft of the report and had the opportunity to provide initial feedback. The intent is to send the updated and likely final draft, based on SC and SBC feedback, to the Committee in the next few days. The draft will not include the section describing swing space, as that discussion is ongoing. Ms. Gray confirmed that the draft will also be publicly posted for community review and feedback.

Ms. Gray listed two specific report topics for discussion at the current meeting, the parking plan and the project budget, both of which have been the subject of significant work since the last time the Committee discussed the report.

Mr. Pitkin presented the final site/parking plan, based on a review of the required number of spaces (determined in consultation with Ms. Quirk to be 65) and adjustments to the site and building plan in response to concerns about the front corner on the library side of the building. Highlights of the parking plan include layby/cutaway areas in front of the building in order to facilitate parking on Cameron St., which is relatively narrow. The plan provides space for school buses in the main circle at the front of the building, expecting room for three buses to load or unload. Mr. Pitkin provided clarification of the expected flow, and described how the flow addressed student safety concerns at pickup and drop-off.

The number of parking spaces along the library side of the building has been reduced from the previous plan, due to the significant grade on that part of the site, concern about some mature trees in the area, a desire to establish a connection between the library site and a side exit from the school via a crosswalk, and concerns about the appearance of the building from that side. In response to a question from Mr. Kelley, Mr. Pitkin described the reduced requirements for the service entrance on that side, and also described the potential of adjusting the second floor design of the library and media center to turn them and make them more of a “beacon” facing in that direction.
Mr. Roberti asked where parents were expected to park, and Mr. Pitkin said that it would likely be in the Cameron St. lot, where the expectation is to maintain the current 20 spots dedicated to use by the school. Ms. Quirk said that, currently, parents typically park on the street, and she would expect that to continue in the future.

Mr. Pitkin discussed the question of whether or not the existing play areas would be sufficient for the larger new school. He indicated that in-depth site programming has not yet been done, but that he is confident that the site would support the required space. He said that he has worked on sites that were even more constrained than Hunnewell. Future programming questions to be answered would include the need for outdoor learning spaces, the potential use of the fire lane for four-square or other play activities, whether or not a separate play space for Kindergarten and 1st grade is required, whether and how to provide access to adjacent trails, etc. In response to a question from Ms. Chow, he confirmed that the fire lane would typically be blocked off to traffic.

Mr. Bonfatti then presented an overview of the estimated project budget. The total budget is $57.5M, of which $45.25M is for building construction. The appropriation request at a fall Town Meeting would be for $4.7M.

Ms. Gray described that the plan is that the Permanent Building Committee will take this budget and continue to review and refine it, with the support of the project team, leading up to Town Meeting. PBC will present the budget at Town Meeting, and if the appropriation is approved, will take over the project at that point. In response to a question from Mr. Roberti, she confirmed that the previously appropriated funds for feasibility study would cover all of those activities leading up to Town Meeting. Ms. Chow asked if there will be another decision point on swing space before Town Meeting, and Ms. Gray confirmed that there will be significant work and conversation on swing space continuing in September, and the School Committee will be expected to weigh in on the subject.

Ms. Gray recommended that the members of the Committee send any further comments they have on the draft to Mr. Kennedy.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:30 PM, upon a motion by Mr. Kelley, seconded by Mr. Roberti, the Committee **unanimously VOTED** to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Kelley
Secretary
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- Hunnewell Elementary School Project (7/23/2019)
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 08/01/2019
- Draft Hunnewell Feasibility Study Report and Appendices (08/01/2019)