

School Building Committee Meeting Minutes
Remote Online Meeting
August 6, 2020, 4:30PM

Present: Chair Sharon Gray; Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder; Virginia Ferko; Marjorie Freiman, Meghan Jop; Matt King; Melissa Martin; Heather Sawitsky; Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; FMD Project Manager Dick Elliott; Patti Quigley of the Advisory Committee; Cricket Vlass of the Department of Public Works; Tim Bonfatti of Compass Project Management; Alex Pitkin, Kristen Olsen, Martine Dion, and Michael Dowhan of SMMA.

Absent: Steve Gagosian, Ryan Hutchins, Ellen Quirk, Jeff Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 4:32 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being broadcast live and recorded by Wellesley Media for later viewing. Participants joined via Zoom conferencing, with each vote to be recorded by roll call. She noted all SBC members in attendance and mentioned that Patti Quigley of Advisory Committee has been appointed to the SBC by the Board of Selectmen but had not yet been voted in by the School Committee.

Public Comment

Amy Gottschalk of 44 Audubon Road expressed concerns that the committee had not considered increased carbon emissions due to idling, at Weston Road and other impacted streets around the town depending on the site that is selected.

SBC Business

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of June 18, 2020. Mr. King seconded. Roll call: Mr. Ulfelder – Yes, Ms. Ferko – Yes, Ms. Freiman – Yes, Ms. Jop – Yes, Mr. King – Yes, Ms. Martin – Yes, Ms. Sawitsky – Yes, Mr. Soliva – Yes, Ms. Gray – Yes. The motion carried unanimously 9-0.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of July 30, 2020. Mr. King seconded. Roll call: Mr. Ulfelder – Yes, Ms. Ferko – Yes, Ms. Freiman – Yes, Ms. Jop – Yes, Mr. King – Yes, Ms. Martin – Yes, Ms. Sawitsky - Yes, Ms. Gray – Yes. The motion carried unanimously 8-0-1. Mr. Soliva abstained.

Hardy/Upham

Mr. Pitkin introduced Ms. Olsen, Ms. Dione and Mr. Dowhan who will be discussing sustainability. Ms. Dion touched upon each of the following updates.

- New MA Energy and Stretch Code was approved in February. The MSBA requires 10 percent better than base code, and Wellesley has mandated an Energy Use Intensity (EUI) of 30. Currently, Upham is at 86 EUI and Hardy at 109 EUI.
- MSBA has a goal of LEEDv4 Certification, which should be achievable at both sites. The addition/renovation at Hardy is expected to have a slightly higher EUI. EV charging stations will be available.

- Comparing sustainability criteria between Upham 6a, Hardy 4 and Hardy 7b, energy performance is mostly the same with slightly less efficiency at the Hardy add/reno; with solar orientation – Hardy site has an optimal east-west orientation; with each option, preliminary photovoltaic roof capacity can provide 25-45% of annual energy use.

Mr. Dowhan reviewed the impact to natural habitats for the remaining Hardy options and one Upham option. He shared an open space comparison chart of the options as they are currently drawn. Town bylaws call for keeping lot coverage to 25 percent retaining 75 percent open space and for the building footprint to be limited to 15 percent of the total lot size without seeking relief through the permitting process.

- Upham Option 6a (new): 25.6% lot coverage, 9.5 percent building footprint
- Hardy Option 4 (add/reno): 26.2% lot coverage, 13.1% building footprint
- Hardy Option 7 b (new w/o old Hardy remaining): 30.8% lot coverage, 12.8% building footprint
- Hardy Option 7b (new w/ old Hardy remaining): 34.4% lot coverage, 16.3% building footprint

In response to a question from Ms. Gray, it was confirmed that permeable asphalt would count the same against open space as impermeable asphalt.

Mr. Ulfelder asked for more definitive review of open space numbers in order for them to be considered as part of the decision process. Given the limitations of a feasibility study, Mr. Pitkin suggested a conservative approach of anticipating not being able to make the 25% and planning for requesting zoning relief.

Mr. Dowhan reviewed the tree analysis performed on both the Hardy and Upham sites. SMMA's landscape architects walked both the Hardy and Upham sites documenting existing trees and developed a quantitative and qualitative analysis. They created site grids calculating quantities of trees 1" caliper or greater, while also developing a color-coded plan for each site, rating 6" caliper trees or larger as good, fair, or poor.

Since completing the grids, they have confirmed their findings with town officials via a walk-through while the landscape is in full bloom. Mr. Dowhan reviewed each site's tree composition, growth, wildlife, and general health.

He also spoke to the carbon dioxide sequestration impact of the current sites, and showed the estimated sequestration for both the Hardy build options and the Upham build options. Large and healthy trees will be removed no matter what option is selected.

- Code upgrade at Upham: No changes
- Hardy Option 4 (add/reno): 69 of 163 trees removed, 45 replanted, least impact to carbon sequestration of remaining options
- Hardy Option 7b (new): 109 of 163 trees removed, 45 replanted, more significant impact
- Upham Option 6A (new): 447 of 599 trees removed, 35 replanted, most impact on carbon sequestration
- An Upham Option 6A with the baseball field replanted would add 500 additional small trees, and after 20 years would begin to approach the sequestration capability of Hardy Option 7b

Mr. Dowhan concluded with observations for consideration for each site listed here.

- Hardy Site: More specimen sized trees, parkland setting with mature bisecting open space, sound attenuation from route 9 properties. 50 percent of the trees are 1-4" caliper.
- Upham Site: Mostly Oak forest, greater share of "large" and mature deciduous trees, majority of trees are in good condition. Canopy is thick and healthy, minimal wildlife observed.

Mr. Ulfelder asked if it would be worth investigating the carbon emissions impacts for each site. It was noted by Ms. Olsen a quote for evaluating that work could be done by a consultant, but would be heavily driven by assumptions for the future: ie, in three years, how many vehicles are dropping off/picking up, how many are electric vs. gas, what will be the busing requirements, how many and what type of vehicles would likely to be idling. It is a hard number to rely on given the number of assumptions that would go into it. Ms. Dion said it would be a highly complex calculation, and even establishing the current baseline is a challenge.

Ms. Vlass spoke about her concerns about the appearance of invasive plants during reforestation. The current Upham site is made up of native species. Mr. Dowhan noted that maintenance and upkeep of a reforested area will increase the cost of the maintenance and upkeep of plants. In response to a question from Mr. Soliva, the MSBA caps site cost reimbursement at 8 percent of construction costs.

Mr. Pitkin recapped the conversation, noting that both sites are existing, viable sites with long histories as neighborhood schools, adding to the challenge of the decision-making. Many communities have a difficult time locating even one suitable site.

Criteria Review

Ms. Olsen reviewed the selection criteria as established before the hold period. She also highlighted some of the differentiators such as community fields, permitting, traffic, and impact to natural habitat. A review of cost estimates as well as initial criteria discussions are planned for the next meeting.

Mr. Hassanein asked if the criteria discussions could focus on which of the differentiating factors are most advantageous, in helping the SBC consider the options. For example, if in considering one of the criteria, none of the options has an advantage over the other, it would not be a critical factor to the decision.

Mr. Ulfelder suggested that the public should see the SBC discuss all criteria in the matrix, even if many of them are essentially "even." Mr. Bonfatti suggested that the consultants work to develop a process that will ensure the Committee has discussed, considered and analyzed them all and still arrive at a decision by September.

Approval of Invoices

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve Compass Project Management Invoices: #CPM 74-14 in the amount of \$2,493.00 dated 5/31/2020 and #CPM 74-15 in the amount of \$3,542.00 dated 6/30/2020 Mr. King seconded. **Roll Call:** Mr. Ulfelder – Yes, Ms. Ferko – Yes, Ms. Freiman – Yes, Mr. Hassanein- Yes, Ms. Jop – Yes, Mr. King – Yes, Ms. Martin – Yes, Ms. Sawitsky – Yes, Mr. Soliva – Yes, Ms. Gray – Yes. The motion carried unanimously 10-0

Adjournment

At approximately 6:16PM, Ms. Gray adjourned the School Building Committee meeting.

Documents and Exhibits Used

Minutes of June 18, 2020 and July 30, 2020 SBC meetings

SMMA Presentation Slides

Compass Project Management Invoices of 5/31/2020 and 6/30/2020