

**School Building Committee –Minutes - APPROVED**

**August 29, 2019**

**Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall**

**Present:** Chair Sharon Gray; Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder; Virginia Ferko; Marjorie Freiman; Mary Gard; Steve Gagosian; Meghan Jop; Matt King; David Lussier; Melissa Martin; Heather Sawitsky; Jose Soliva; FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management.

**Absent:** Joubin Hassanein; Ryan Hutchins; Cynthia Mahr; Charlene Cook; Ellen Quirk and Jeffery Dees

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

**Public Comment**

No member of the public provided comment.

**SBC Business**

**Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Gray announced that the draft July 25, 2019 and August 1, 2019 minutes would be posted to the Town website and presented for approval at the next SBC meeting.

**Member Reports**

Ms. Gray announced that the SBC would try to schedule future meetings on the first and third Thursday of every month.

Ms. Gray said a good number of resumes were received for the temporary part-time administrative assistant position and Ms. Martin and Ms. Ferko have volunteered to help her with the selection process.

**Website Update and Proposal**

Ms. Gray announced that in an effort to improve the delivery of information to the community about the SBC projects she developed a preliminary layout and design for an independent and more user friendly website for the SBC to be inked to a town account.

Jeff D’Amico presented Compass Project Management’s proposal for website services that includes support services for further development of the site and ongoing maintenance and updates for the next seven months, through Annual Town Meeting, at rate of \$60/hour not to exceed \$22,188. The contract may be extended after that date if more work is needed.

Ms. Gray noted that all documents and records will be stored on the Town site and linked to the new site. She said there will be a useful “Frequently Asked Question” section with current information.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the Compass Project Management (CPM) proposal for website services as outlined in the revised proposal dated 8/28/2019 for a sum not to exceed \$22,188 subject to formal amendment of the contract with CPM. Mr. King seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Hardy/Upham Project**

**Feasibility Study Process and Update**

Ms. Gray reported that MSBA representatives recently met with district officials, toured both school sites and discussed the MSBA's Module 3 /Feasibility Study process.

Mr. D'Amico reviewed items that will be on the next meeting agenda with focus on the Hardy/Upham project, including: timeline and work plan; MSBA process; SBC role and decision points; MSBA reimbursements (and exclusions); community engagement and next steps. He said that the project team has been working on existing condition assessments and traffic studies are due to begin shortly. He then presented a preliminary timeline and noted two SBC milestones: Preliminary Design Plan (PDP) in January 2020 and Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) in May 2020. The PBC will then move the project through schematic design.

**Hunnewell Project**

**Invoices**

Mr. Kennedy presented and recommended approval of a project invoice from SMMA for services in July 2019.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve SMMA Invoice 51174 in the amount of \$23,400.00. Mr. King seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kennedy presented and recommended approval of a project invoice from Compass Project Management for services in July 2019.

Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve Compass Project Management Invoice CPM 69-13 in the amount of \$9,894.00. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Feasibility Study Process and Update**

Mr. D'Amico presented a list of upcoming Hunnewell project meetings including parent meetings at each of the seven elementary schools. Dr. Lussier said that the focus of these meetings would be on internal swing space but also an HHU update and discussion of the upcoming redistricting that is required as part of the process.

Ms. Martin noted that the School Committee is scheduled to review the project with the Advisory Committee on September 18, again on October 16, and Advisory Committee will conduct its public hearing on the warrant on November 6.

Mr. D'Amico said that School Committee and SBC votes on swing space are anticipated on October 1 and 3 respectively. The Board of Selectmen is scheduled to discuss the project on October 7. The last day for BOS to open the warrant for an early December Special Town meeting is October 21.

Mr. Soliva suggested that information about Late Hunnewell also be available at the parent meetings. Ms. Ferko asked what the forum for abutters who want information about internal swing space would be and suggested that reviewing the presentation on internal swing space that was presented at the last SBC meeting and presenting any feedback during the public comment opportunity at SBC meetings might be better than a specific meeting for abutters. Ms. Gray noted that questions or feedback to the SBC are always welcome.

### **Swing Space Discussion**

Ms. Gray said there is a consensus among the project team that specific analysis of swing space options has progressed as far as it can at this point in the process. She suggested that the committee discuss the remaining viable options: internal swing space which would allow the Hunnewell project to proceed independent of the Hardy/Upham project, and the late options that require the Hunnewell project to wait for construction of the Hardy or Upham building.

Dr. Lussier said that the Late Hunnewell options have not been clearly explained to the community.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the SBC must accurately describe and communicate the late swing space scenarios and should present only responsible and reasonable approaches to late Hunnewell should that be the option chosen.

Mr. D'Amico displayed some of the late Hunnewell swing space option slides presented at the last meeting.

*For reference the options (with estimated populations in parenthesis) are as follows:*

#### *Late Hunnewell Options with redistricting:*

- *Option 1A –Redistrict and use New Upham (365) with Hunnewell split between Old Upham (182) and Old Hardy (183) with no modulars*
- *Option 1B - Redistrict and use New Hardy (365) with Hunnewell split between Old Hardy (182) and Old Upham (185) with no 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:*

- *Option 2A – No redistricting, use New Upham for Upham (195), Old Upham for Hunnewell (256) (Combined 451 students on Upham site) and Old Hardy for Hardy (277)*

- *Option 2B – No redistricting, use New Hardy for Hardy (277), Old Hardy for Hunnewell (256) (combined 533 on Hardy site) and Old Upham for Upham(195)*

Committee members expressed their observations, preferences and concerns about the various swing space options.

Mr. Soliva expressed concern about late Hunnewell options (1A&1B and 2A&2B) that require operation of two schools on the site of the MSBA project and thereby delay completion and close-out of that project. He said it creates questions about MSBA funding for the site completion after the swing space use is concluded. Ms. Gray expressed a similar concern and later, to this point, Mr. D'Amico said that the MSBA does not like to bundle or intermingle projects. Delaying completion of the MSBA project site work for up to two years could create concern for the MSBA. Mr. D'Amico said the MSBA does not typically respond to hypothetical questions and he has not received a direct response to this question and may not until facts are presented to the MSBA. Ms. Jop wondered if the consolidation scenario in this case presents a unique situation that might warrant accommodation by the MSBA.

Mr. Soliva also expressed concern that options requiring the operation of two schools on the MSBA project site for the period of Hunnewell swing space could disadvantage the Hardy site in the MSBA site selection process. He noted that the population that would need to be accommodated in swing space scenarios combining the Hardy and Hunnewell populations is higher than the populations combining Upham and Hunnewell in either 1A &1B or 2A&2B.

Ms. Ferko, Ms Gray and Ms. Freiman also expressed concern that the late Hunnewell options that require operation of two schools on the site of the MSBA project could influence the siting and design of a 50 year school for a two year temporary swing space solution. Ms. Freiman added that all options presented should be permissible and feasible and she is concerned that separating children and traffic from two schools safely on one site may not be feasible.

Mr. Soliva said that the late Hunnewell options 1C & D that include redistricting and do not run two schools on one site are cleaner but costlier than the other late options due to the expense of modulars.

Ms. Ferko said that given the cost and potential complexity of placing up to 6 modulars on the Upham or Hardy site in the late Hunnewell options 1C and 1D, following redistricting, there might be opportunity to use internal space to avoid all or most modulars. Given low elementary population numbers and the availability of three schools with superior infrastructure nearby, students who will be redistricted to Hunnewell might be accommodated for two more years at their existing schools and the then existing Hunnewell population may be accommodated at either old Hardy or old Upham using all available internal space. She suggested that there might also be operational savings associated with the administrative costs of running 6 rather than 7 schools during the swing space period and that the various late Hunnewell options might actually have similar price tags, with the bulk of the cost for each

of them being escalation costs. She suggested that a range of costs for modulars should be shown as \$0- \$2 million rather than the full \$2million for 6 modulars.

Ms. Jop noted that the lessons learned from the internal swing space investigation could also be used to develop the late Hunnewell options.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that there are liability costs associated with the ongoing operation of buildings in poor condition such as Hunnewell, Hardy, and perhaps Upham that may require costly repairs although they will only be needed temporarily. He said these costs could offset any operational savings associated with the late Hunnewell options.

Mr. Gagosian said that options 1C&1D are the only late Hunnewell options that leave us with a clean site for the MSBA project and among the late options are therefore preferable.

Ms. Gray noted that options 1A and 1B have not been socialized with the community and were added by SMMA recently. She is confused as to their value. (The estimated number of students on the site with two schools in operation is similar or greater to the predicted number in Option 2A&2B)

There was expressed support by many committee members for the early Hunnewell internal swing space option.

Ms. Freiman said that if the committee believes that early Hunnewell is better given the cost and complexity of the late options it should decide that and present an early Hunnewell project to Town Meeting.

Ms. Gard said if early Hunnewell is preferable then short term swing space issues should not lead to continued consideration of the late Hunnewell options.

Ms. Martin said that many early Hunnewell swing space options were evaluated. Internal swing space was presented in the spring and has evolved and emerged as the only remaining viable early Hunnewell option. Good information about internal swing space is now available to be shared with all the elementary schools this month.

Mr. King said that it is important to explain to the community why our investigation may have shown that waiting an extra few years and using a vacated school building for swing space is not necessarily the best option because many will assume that to be the easiest and usual solution.

Ms. Sawitsky agreed with Ms. Martin's description of the evolution of the internal swing space option, and noted that following the fire at Hunnewell members of that community came forward with a willingness to cooperate with the internal swing space plan. She said that many concerns about bus ride times and families with children in multiple grades have been addressed.

Ms. Gray added that more than one hundred Hunnewell parents have signed a letter of support for early Hunnewell. She reminded the committee of the many issues with the Hunnewell building documented in the Feasibility Study Report. She noted that late Hunnewell options would prolong the use of that building for 3 years longer than the early option and also require use of the old Hardy and/or Upham for an additional 2 years, resulting in students occupying buildings that they should not be in for a total of 5 extra years.

Mr. Ulfelder said that the upcoming meetings with parents about internal swing space will present a well-defined and thoroughly vetted solution thanks to the work of the WPS administration and FMD staff. The committee will be looking for constructive comments from the school community to make internal swing space work even better. Ms. Ferko said that the setting of the meetings in each of the potential host schools was conducive to an understanding of the impacts that internal swing space might have on particular schools, and an opportunity for PTO's in each school to assist.

Ms. Martin noted that the School Committee will deliberate and vote to support either the early Hunnewell/internal swing space option or late Hunnewell following outreach to each elementary school.

### **Adjournment**

At approximately 7:25, upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and seconded by Mr. Soliva, the School Building Committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

### **Documents and Exhibits used**

- Compass Project Management proposal for website services for the Hunnewell and Upham Elementary School projects dated August 28, 2019
- Compass Project Management Power Point Presentation to SBC 08/29/2019
- Compass Project Management Invoice CPM 69-13 for services in July 2019 in the amount of \$9,894.00 and attached project budget status report.
- SMMA Invoice 51174 for services in July 2019 in the amount of \$23,440.00 and attached project budget status report.