

Approved October 16, 2019

**Advisory Committee Meeting
Juliani Room, Wellesley Town Hall
Wednesday, September 18, 2019, 7:00 p.m.**

Those present from Advisory Committee included Julie Bryan, Todd Cook, Jennifer Fallon, Mary Gard, Neal Goins, John Lanza, Bill Maynard, Deed McCollum, Paul Merry, Lina Musayev, Patti Quigley, Betsy Roberti, Mary Scanlon and Ralph Tortorella.

Todd Cook called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

7:00 p.m. Citizen Speak

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

7:00 p.m. Permanent Building Committee (PBC) – General Introduction

Matt King, Vice Chair, PBC and Steve Gagorian, Design and Construction Manager, PBC were present and provided a general introduction of the PBC and how the PBC works.

- PBC is a five-member board
- For school projects a voted member of School Committee (SC) is assigned to PBC and is a voting member of PBC for that project. Other boards assign a liaison for their building projects
- PBC is responsible for all vertical construction in town
- PBC website has a lot of useful information including user manuals
- Article 14 of the Town bylaw – a project comes to PBC after feasibility and the output of the feasibility study is provided to PBC
- PBC is appointed and is not an advocate for any project; PBC is focused on the construction of a building and it has no agenda carried forward with these projects

Advisory had questions regarding the individuals, time allotments and coverage and whether an OPM or Clerk of Works is used for these projects. The gray boxes are in-house OPM. Project costs are lined out on a timeline year by year and only done when a construction contract is awarded. The spending and borrowing depend on the magnitude of the project. PBC met with Finance who determines the inside and outside the levy borrowing in any given year. Under project tasks, the red lines are debt exclusions. The Precedent column tracks links through the project. The Hunnewell OPM is SMMA due to the scale of the project being too large to handle in-house by FMD. A question was asked about projects for Annual Town Meeting (ATM) - Town Hall Annex design funds and Town Hall interior design funds and when PBC will be ready to talk to Advisory about these. Another question was asked about PBC's role in determining the capacity of taking on a project. Capacity is limited by a town's appetite for expenditures. There has been an emergence of cash capital projects. There was a discussion of cash capital projects and what determines a cash capital project and the resources utilized.

7:32 p.m. Minutes/Liaison Reports/Administrative

Julie Bryan moved and Patti Quigley seconded a motion to approve the August 28, 2019 minutes. The motion passed unanimously (12-0-1)

7:35 p.m. Liaison Reports

School/Lina Musayev

School Committee has been meeting over the last few weeks. At the meeting last night, School administration presented initial FY20 projections and anticipated needs.

- Collective bargaining for next 3 years resulted in a 3.48% increase
- General education needs
- Special education needs – budgeted only the known needs
- 4.31% which is above the guideline that the Board of Selectmen (BOS) is modeling (2.5% to 3%) however BOS is still working on the guidelines
- Current needs are higher than the guidelines
- Since ATM the SPED need has increased by about \$1 million due to out of district placements
- The budget modeling base will need to be higher
- Looking into the current budget to see what can be done – circuit breaker and SPED stabilization fund
- Question is what to do going forward

A question was asked why the collective bargaining number is so high and different. Negotiations were finished after ATM. In addition, steps and lane changes are included in the collective bargaining number and this is consistent with past years. Out of district placements are higher than anticipated as well. There was a discussion of circuit breaker funding and the timing of this funding. A comment was made that it is important to understand the starting point. The collective bargaining number is level services and perhaps this is an opportunity to revisit the type of budgeting for the schools.

Library/Betsy Roberti

- The Library is working with focus groups to look at all aspects of the interior design including needs and wants
- Design funds were approved at the 2019 ATM. It is anticipated there will be a Special Town Meeting (STM) in September 2020 for this project
- The Library is also working with the Foundation regarding their contribution to the project. The Foundation will have a number of fundraising projects

7:45 p.m. SBC – Hunnewell Project

David Lussier, Superintendent, Wellesley Public Schools (WPS); Sharon Gray, Chair, School Building Committee (SBC), School Committee (SC); Melissa Martin, Chair, SC; Matt Kelly, SC; Jim Roberti, SC; Tom Ulfelder, SBC; Matt King, PBC; Kevin Kennedy, FMD; Jeff D’Amico, Senior Project Manager, Compass; Alex Pitkin, Principal Architect, SMMA; and Kristen Olsen, Project Manager, SMMA were present.

On August 6, SC unanimously voted to approve the Hunnewell project and to proceed to PBC. On August 8 Hunnewell was officially presented to the PBC.

The presentation walked through the plan including the need for the project and the educational planning process as the driver of the project. The reasons for rebuilding Hunnewell were reviewed and it was emphasized that this would be a presentation only about the building project and not the swing space.

- The plan for the Hunnewell site includes a conceptual plan for 19 classrooms for 350 students with 3 classrooms per grade and one additional classroom for blips in enrollment
- The current building was built in 1938 and added on to over the years. Fixing the issues with the building cannot be done through renovation. The best solution is to re-build
- The Hunnewell process was reviewed to provide a historical perspective

- The swing space recommendation is expected in early October
- Community engagement was reviewed and discussed. SBC met with the stakeholders
- The key elements of the Hunnewell Educational Plan were reviewed which are grounded in an emerging vision of education
- Elementary School Design Patterns highlighting Neighborhood Learning Commons were reviewed. This design pattern helps teachers work as teams and is organized around the three-classroom co-hort. It was emphasized that this is early conceptual thinking.
- Two story school and the first and second floor plans were reviewed

There were questions about the library location and accessibility for kids with mobility impairments within the building. With the new building there will be complete access from the front door through the entire building. There was a question about the ability to add a fourth classroom if necessary. The specific schematics have not been developed but flexible walls and flexible spaces will be evaluated. There are many possibilities for flexible options.

Additional questions:

- How many schools in Massachusetts are configured with the learning commons? The MSBA recognizes the needs for this type of learning and schools built in the last five or six years feature these learning commons
- How difficult is it to retrofit if educational models change?
- Is there an elevator? In the center of the building
- What is the size of the gym? The Sprague school gym was used as a model due to the constraints of the site

The constraints of the site were reviewed and mandated protection areas were outlined. The building site needs to be the existing building site because as a new school cannot be built behind the current school and then the existing school torn down.

Site considerations and the site plan were reviewed. The site plan zoning bylaw requirements were reviewed. There were questions and discussion about the use and the impact of the Dover Amendment.

Questions included:

- How the current Hunnewell compares to the new. The existing Hunnewell School is less than one-half the square footage at one story. The building would be a similar footprint but two-stories
- If there would be the same amount of play area. There is an opportunity for outside learning and outside play but this hasn't been designed yet. There will not be an impact to the open space requirements
- Why not make the school smaller. It goes back to the educational plan and model and is part of the visioning that the elementary schools are 18 to 19 classrooms with a minimum of three classrooms per grade level even with the declining enrollment. This was a discussion with the town several years ago and School Committee studied it
- Would the footprint be saved by adding another floor. There is not a lot of space on a third floor and it would be isolated. The common areas placed on the 1st floor like the gym, cafeteria and library exceeds the 15%

This project will go through a number of planning processes as all large construction projects do.

Site circulation and parking considerations were reviewed. Current drop off and loading does not work. There are 55 parking spaces on-site and 25 parking spaces off-site.

Parking questions included:

- Width of parking spaces to accommodate larger cars
- Where do parents park

Concerns about the use of the Cameron lot were expressed and discussed. A comment was made that employees in town use the Cameron lot and it might not be good to assume it is available for parents to park. According to police, the Cameron lot is not at capacity most of the time. Parents currently do not have a problem finding a space there and it is expected that this will continue.

A question was asked since this is a larger school with more people accessing it if there was a traffic study. There was discussion that there will be more kids and more cars in the car line and how this impacts traffic. A traffic study is in the appendix of the report.

There was continued discussion about the car line and parking for teachers.

A comment was made about the need for a conversation about alternative transportation as additional parking impacts the open space. The town permitting processes will vet what parking is necessary for this school and allow for a more holistic evaluation of the property.

Outdoor Learning Opportunities were presented and reviewed. The sustainability goals were reviewed and the building is being looked at as a net zero energy building. The SEC and Wellesley Green Collaborative are supportive of this building. The key elements of sustainability are to move away from fossil fuels and utilize all electric systems and to use highly efficient systems. Renewables, conservation and high-efficient systems are necessary to achieve net zero energy. MEP considerations were reviewed and discussed with a preliminary energy performance summary presented. A question was asked about cost savings. The annual energy usage is projected and can be compared to current usage. There was a discussion about energy usage. A comment was made that it will be a much larger school so there will be more energy usage for the increase in size. Renewables are critical.

A question was asked about the return on investment. This information is being prepared and will be ready for the PBC presentation next week.

The schedule and budget next steps were reviewed.

- Swing space options are still under consideration
- Internal swing space using existing assets in other schools and separated out by grade is being considered
- For late Hunnewell, old schools or moth balled schools and modulars would be used to handle the school population.

The early Hunnewell School project timeline was reviewed with the goal of going to 2021 ATM. The conceptual project budget summary was presented at \$57.7 million (\$1,780 per student for early Hunnewell) and reviewed. A question was asked if the costs include town staff. The costs do not include staff costs.

A question was asked if the \$4.7 million is under the levy or how would it be funded. This is still under discussion. The design phase budget was reviewed and the \$4.7 million is included in the overall estimated project costs of \$57.5 million.

The feasibility project budget was presented and reviewed.

Swing space options were presented with early Hunnewell internal swing space costs presented along with late Hunnewell with no redistricting and late Hunnewell with redistricting costs. The late Hunnewell School project timeline and budget were reviewed.

A question was asked about the cost for busing.

The next steps in the design process were discussed and the Hunnewell project actions and timeline were presented. A question was asked if after the meeting with PBC, the dollars of the project would change. It is possible they might change.

SBC was reminded that the questions from the meeting will be helpful for future presentations and STM presentation. A question was asked about enrollment and the decline projected in the enrollment study. The actual decline in enrollment was higher.

A comment was made that this looks like a very exciting and attractive school

9:45 p.m. Additional Liaison Reports

Playing Fields Task Force (PFTF)/Mary Scanlon

- Sprague turf fields were replaced during the summer however they weren't installed to contract. The height of the turf was reversed on the two fields. This will be remediated after the summer.
- NRC asked PFTF to study lights at different fields

PBC/Neal Goins

- Meeting on Town Hall Annex – Oct. 10

Board of Health (BOH)/John Lanza

- Discussion of EEE. We don't have data on mosquitos in town. The spraying in town is by MDPH

Advisory members were advised that meetings would continue on a weekly basis and committees need to be scheduled to come in. There are available dates on the calendar.

10 p.m. Adjourn

Patti Quigley moved and Paul Merry seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

Items Reviewed during the meeting:

- *PBC Proponent User Manual*
- *PBC Capital Projects Look Ahead Schedule*
- *Hunnewell Feasibility Study Overview, Power Point Presentation, September 18, 2019*