

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

<b>Building Committee Members Present/Absent</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Late [time arrived]</b>
Emily Barron	X		
Jackie Belf-Becker [non-voting member]		X	
Ben Berman	X		
Todd Bloodgood		X	
Michelle Cresta	X		
Eileen D'Amour	X		
Sarah Fox	X		
David Harris	X		
Kelly Lyons		X	
Catherine Martin	X		
William McAlduff	X		
Jeremy Pollender	X		
Sean Satterfield	X		
Cindy Schieffer	X		
Aimee Sheppard	X		
Jason Silva	X		
Ben Szalewicz		X	
Ralph Wallace	X		
Erik Weibust		X	
Donna Zaeske	X		
Jim Zisson	X		

<b>School Committee Members Present/Absent</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Late [time arrived]</b>
Sarah Fox	X		
Sarah Gold	X		
David Harris	X		
William McAduff	X		
Meghan Taylor	X		
Jennifer Schaeffner	X		

**Guests:** David Saindon, Jim Rogers, Brian Dakin [LF], Gene Raymond [RDA], Tripp McElroy, Karen Flint (Gilbane)

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Harris called the Building Committee meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Ms. Gold called the School Committee meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Saindon noted that meeting minutes were distributed to the Committee on Monday.

Mr. McAlduff made Building Committee motion to approve the meeting minutes from 12/04/19. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wallace and approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present tonight and on 12/4.

**3. Approval of Monthly Invoices For Contracts**

Mr. Saindon indicated that there were no invoices for approval tonight but there will be at the January 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**4. Approval of Project-Related Commitments**

Mr. Saindon noted there were no new commitment for tonight's meeting but indicated that Gilbane is anticipating finalizing an RTA [Recommendation To Award] letter for abatement and demolition scope within the next week. He explained that on past projects, Leftfield is typically authorized to review and execute all RTA's, often with an assigned point person from the Committee. He noted that a typical RTA document includes a list of the bidders and their proposed values, identification of a low bidder plus a list of any additional holds or allowances versus the control budget. He also noted that the value of RTA's versus the control budget will vary by award, some will be over while most are hopefully under. He explained that due to the time sensitivity often involved with making these awards, Leftfield recommends that the Committee authorize Leftfield and either Mr. Wallace or Mr. Pollender to approve RTA's and report the information back to the Committee at the next meeting. He continued, explaining that RTA's would ultimately be grouped together and processed as a contract amendment to Gilbane. These contracts amendments would align with early scope release packages and culminate in a GMP amendment for the entire construction value. He indicated that there will be a consistent flow of RTA's over the next 6-10 months. Mr. Harris noted that if an RTA were not time-sensitive and there was a pending Committee meeting, those could come directly to the Committee. Mr. McElroy explained that Gilbane's RTA letters closely align with Mr. Saindon's explanation and added that backup includes all detailed bid information. Ms. Fox noted that she would rather see these approvals completed by a sub-committee. Mr. Berman asked for confirmation that a single point-person could consult others on the committee. Ms. Fox responded that even if this is the case it can't be mandated. Mr. Rogers noted that prompt approval of RTA's is often required due to the schedule. Mr. Saindon noted that a committee structure and posting would slow this process down. Ms. Fox noted disagreement and reiterated that a sub-committee would be preferred. Ms. Martin agreed. Ms. Fox asked Gilbane how often RTA's must be approved within 48 hours. Mr. McElroy responded that it happens somewhat often and indicated that subcontractors will not act or release any material (even with long lead times) until their contracts are approved and signed. Ms. Martin noted that a sub-committee could meet to

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

authorize the pending first RTA then afterwards the duties could be assigned to an individual. Ms. Fox added that the sub-committee could propose the individual. Mr. McAlduff noted that in his experience these RTA letters are pretty much never denied for approval as they are pre-vetted and include the low responsible bidder. He asked if the Committee had the authority to deny acceptance of a low responsible bid. Mr. Saindon noted agreement and responded that in his experience he has never seen a proposed RTA not approved, as due diligence it performed in advance by the CM and project team. Mr. Wallace confirmed that certainly with the filed-sub-bid trade categories, there are very few options outside of accepting the low responsible bid. Mr. McAlduff added that he has had experience with a previous committee that attempted to approve RTA's and encountered issues with timeliness. The Committee discussed the demo and abatement scope being on the critical path due to it being the first activity that all others follow, and further discussed whether to approve RTA's at a sub-committee or individual point-person level.

Mr. Berman made a Building Committee motion to authorize Mr. Wallace to review and approve RTA's on behalf of the Committee. All approved RTA's are to be reviewed at the subsequent Building Committee meeting. Mr. Wallace will consult with other Committee members as needed. In the event that Mr. Wallace is not available to review and approve any specific RTA, Mr. Pollender is authorized to perform the same role. The motion was seconded by Ms. Martin. Mr. Zisson noted the importance of approved RTA's being presented to the Committee at the next meeting. The motion was approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present.

**5. Chairman Update**

*The Committee proceeded to complete Agenda Item 6.1 below before returning to this Agenda Item 5.*

Mr. Harris noted that a new Superintendent was hired Monday and thanked the screening committee. He indicated that at some point in coming months the new Superintendent would replace Mr. McAlduff on the Building Committee.

Mr. Harris noted that himself, Ms. Martin, Mr. Zisson and Mr. Wallace attended the January 13<sup>th</sup> Bell Neighborhood Meeting and that it went very well. Ms. Martin indicated that Gilbane gave a straight forward presentation and assured attendees that they will be a respectful guest in the neighborhood. She indicated that there were good questions, that the panel provided good responses and that overall it was a very positive meeting. She also noted that the website is coming online and other forms of communication are being launched. Mr. Harris noted one question was whether work on Saturdays could start at 9AM instead of 8AM and noted that the Project was going to take that point under consideration as subcontractors are hired and detailed worked out with the schedule. He also noted that rock crushing was brought up and it's limitation or elimination from the site would also be considered.

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

Mr. Zisson noted that a study should pursue whether this was feasible and added that offsite trucking could also pose issues to the neighborhood in terms of truck noise, dust and traffic. Mr. Pollender requested that Gilbane investigate options and estimate a financial impact. Mr. McElroy confirmed Gilbane would look into this.

Mr. Saindon indicated that the project was recently invited to attend a newly required Design Development-phase check-in meeting with the MSBA. He noted that previous MSBA check-in meetings have occurred throughout the process and have included the District/MSBA kick off meeting held after the OPM and Designer were hired, the FAS [Facility Assessment Subcommittee] meetings which occurred in 2018 as part of the PSR [Preferred Schematic Report] phase and the Project Scope + Budget Meeting which occurred after the submittal of the Schematic Design and prior to the MSBA BOD approval. He indicated that this DD check-in meeting is a new requirement of the MSBA and was held yesterday at the MSBA's offices in Boston. The intent of the meeting was to debrief the core MSBA team about design changes that have occurred from Schematic Design to the pending DD submission, to provide an update on the reconciled construction estimate, to confirm that the pending DD submission budget was going to be in alignment with previous milestone budgets and to provide MSBA with a schedule update. Mr. Saindon reported that Mr. Raymond did a great job. Mr. Raymond presented a summary of the design updates that have occurred and were presented to the MSBA. Mr. Saindon indicated that though this was a new meeting within the MSBA process, all those involved agreed that RDA's presentation would be used as an example for future meetings. Mr. Saindon indicated that Leftfield presented a high-level construction estimate reconciliation including the updates that the two estimates are within .34% of each other and that the Project is on budget based on implementing a nominal amount of value management. Mr. Harris noted that the MSBA said there are 15 MSBA projects out to bid this year and that larger projects were struggling with bid results while smaller ones were having more success. Mr. Raymond reported that square footage hasn't moved despite the presented changes, which were driven by staff input and have made the building a lot better in RDA's opinion.

Ms. Fox noted that it seemed that, due to the configuration of the second floor, that the current design did not support the ability to close the civic area of the building off from the school for night and community events. Mr. Raymond indicated that RDA has not forgot about this requirement and will resolve how it is accomplished in the coming weeks and months.

Mr. Harris indicated that upcoming meetings include the January 28th ZBA hearing at 8:30PM in the Abbot Hall Selectmen's Room and the January 29th Planning hearing at 7:30PM at the 10 Humphrey Street Community Center.

Mr. Harris noted that Ms. Martin recently sent a memo to himself and to School Committee. Ms. Martin noted that she sent the memo on January 9th to Ms. Gold and Mr. Harris's attention based on the School Committee meeting January 2. She

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

explained that she felt the School Committee wanted more information and oversight of the Building Committee to understand how the Project was progressing. As a result, she made a list of topics that the Committees should see including typical classrooms, typical special education spaces, security, the kitchen, cafeteria and general site plan to help manage expectations. She indicated that she has spoken with Mr. Saindon and understands that some of these items are already planned to flow through the Building Committee when the right time comes. She noted that the Committee, or a sub-committee should be presented more details about the MEP system and know it can be run. Mr. Saindon indicated that the project's mechanical design engineer, GGD, is lined up to attend the January 30<sup>th</sup> Building Committee meeting and that topics will include MEP and security systems, site lighting, typical classrooms, the media center, the cafeteria, geotechnical considerations plus others. Mr. Raymond noted that the major mechanical systems have already been selected. Mr. McAlduff noted that he has never seen a mechanical system selected or detailed based on the current staff's ability to run the building or operate the system. He explained that these systems are new for each project and indicated that ample training and an understanding of future operating costs are very important. Mr. Saindon noted that Leftfield has a mechanical specialist on staff who will help fill in the gaps in training and will remain available into occupancy to assist getting staff accustomed to the required systems and maintenance. Mr. Harris noted that Michelle Cresta (the School's new Business Manager) has replaced Rebecca Curran on the Building Committee roster and also that Elizabeth Rudzinski was removed as she resigned from the Committee. He reported that the updated roster was delivered to the MSBA yesterday.

**6. Designer, Contractor, Owners Project Manager Update(s):**

**6.1 Contractor Controlled Insurance Program (CCIP) presentation**

Mr. Sandon noted that is a type of project insurance offered by some large Construction Management firms. Ms. Karen Flint presented the Committee a summary of CCIP insurance and contrasted it with a "traditional" approach including general liability, workers comp, builders risk, professional liability and others. She explained that the main difference was that with the traditional approach, all parties carry their own insurance and build it into their costs. In the event a claim arises, all parties insurance works to determine who is responsible for coverage. Typically this approach results in general liability limits totaling \$25m. Under a CCIP the general liability and workers comp for all subs and Gilbane are covered under one single policy with claim limits of \$100m. She added that the CCIP program also works down the line when warranties might be expired. Ms. Flint noted that CCIP policies tend to help attract smaller subcontractors and smaller shops who have excessive insurance costs. She summarized that the net impact to the project estimate is approximately \$133k in savings to go with the CCIP plan. Ms. Fox asked what percentage of projects of comparable size to this project size end up with a CCIP insurance plan. Ms. Flint responded that while approximately 25% of all

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

Gilbane projects use CCIP, closer to 80% of projects above \$25m in construction value do. Ms. Flint and the Committee discussed trade contractor pre-qualification, the administrative process of claims in a CCIP plan, requirements for monthly certified payroll, and the benefit of Gilbane holding and managing all insurance events for subcontractors. Mr. Wallace noted that he has had the opportunity to review the proposal and has confirmed that the costs are at the low end of the spectrum for such a plan. He noted that most CM's ultimate profit off of these plans, but when the finances work in the project's favor it's an easy decision as the coverage is much better than a traditional policy.

Mr. Wallace made a Building Committee motion to authorize Gilbane to proceed with a CCIP insurance policy for the Project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fox and approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present.

6.2 Permitting Update

Mr. Saindon referenced the attached permitting outline. He summarized key approvals including Zoning Board special permit approval in January and February and site plan review and land disturbance with the Planning Board which is targeted for March completion. He explained that there is no local permit required for abatement activities but it is listed here as it is regulated by the DEP. He indicated that the demolition permit is close to completion. Mr. McElroy indicated that Gilbane was two signatures away from that signoff. Mr. Saindon noted that Mr. Roche from Gilbane has already met with the Tree Warden to discuss the shade tree application, that the structural peer review was underway and due next Friday and that the fire protection peer review is scheduled to occur further into design. Mr. Saindon also summarized target dates for permits issued by the Building Commissioner beyond demolition.

Mr. Pollender asked if this schedule has been reviewed with the various associated Town departments. Mr. Saindon indicated that this schedule was based on various conversations with the Town including the Building Commissioner.

Ms. Fox noted that there was a lot of concern at recent School and Building Committee meetings about permitting which lead to this joint meeting. The Committees discussed how communication about the development of the Project's permitting path and schedule evolved from November into Committee meetings in early December. Ms. Fox expressed concern that updated information did not make it to Committee meetings and asked why the plan to attend Zoning and Planning Board meetings changed in December. Ms. Schaeffner agreed with Ms. Fox and noted that the Project seems to have had to submit for local approvals at the last minute. Mr. Saindon indicated that the Project's permitting plans did evolve based on new information received during the month of December and that he felt the Project handled the changes well and that key stakeholders were kept updated as the plans changed. He indicated that in the hours before the Building Committee meeting at Eveleth School on December 4<sup>th</sup>, he and Mr. Silva had an initial discussion

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

that indicated the previous project permitting plan had to change. He indicated that the full impact of the changes were not understood at the time and that the project team and Town needed time to understand the impact and identify solutions. He continued, explaining that leading up to the School Committee meeting on December 12<sup>th</sup> Leftfield and the Town worked to recalibrate the permitting schedule and an outline was sent to the Building Committee prior to the December 12<sup>th</sup> School Committee meeting. He indicated he understood the email was forwarded to the School Committee and that as of the December 12<sup>th</sup> School Committee meeting, the Project's intent remained to commence with local permitting submissions on December 19<sup>th</sup>. However, based on further conversations with Mr. Silva, Ms. Curran and RDA on December 17<sup>th</sup>, the plan was again revised to move initial local permitting applications from December 19<sup>th</sup> until the next available dates in early January. Mr. Saindon summarized that despite these changes, the presented outline tonight resolves the issued and there has been no schedule impact to commencement of site activities or the final move-in and project completion dates.

Mr. Silva provided additional context: Back in May the project team was given direction that by invoking the Dover Amendment, the Project would not be required to go through Zoning and Planning approvals. This was based on the Town's understanding at the time. He indicated that the Project proceeded under that direction/understanding and that the Town received a letter in November stating that the Project would invoke the Dover Amendment. Upon sending that letter to Town counsel several weeks elapsed before the Town received a phone call from Town counsel that indicated that the previous advice given to the project team was not in alignment with the details on the Dover Amendment interacts with local bylaws. He indicated that the phone call on December 4<sup>th</sup> was the first indication that the project would have to quickly alter course and go through Zoning and Planning approval. He indicated that he called Mr. Saindon and noted Mr. Saindon reacted methodically and worked with the Town and team to identify the impact of this news and to chart a course through new local approvals without a greater impact to the schedule. Ms. Martin indicated that she brought up concerns about the permitting timeline in October. Mr. Silva responded that he recalled the discussions, but that the understanding held at the time was up-ended by Town counsel input received more than a month after. Mr. Zisson asked whether the reason December 19<sup>th</sup> applications were not possible is because the information could not be hurried together in time. Mr. Raymond indicated that was effectively the case and noted that the Town's Planning Board worked with the Project to provide an additional schedule option that still lead the project to the same February Planning meeting that the Project would have attended if the December 19<sup>th</sup> applications could have been created properly in time. Mr. Zisson noted he felt it was evident that there has been no impact to the schedule as a result of these changes. Mr. Saindon indicated that a lot of details within the schedule will continue to change as project details come into focus but that completion dates will be held. He reiterated that the

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

changes to the permitting path have not affected any overall critical path schedule items. Mr. McElroy agreed.

Ms. Schaeffner asked if there is any anticipated cost impact. Mr. Saindon responded there will be additional services for the Design team for the additional permitting events. Ms. Martin expressed disagreement that there should be any additional services for these permitting activities and noted they should have been carried in the project budget.

The Committees discussed perceived issues of communication and trust between Project entities. Ms. Schieffer asked what the thoughts of the School and Town were in regards to how the project has been developing. Mr. McAlduff responded that he feels very good about how the Project is proceeding and indicated the efforts of the OPM were essential in keeping the Project on track through the changes to the permitting process. He indicated that he has no concerns about the Project team or progress. Mr. Silva responded that he was at the MSBA DD debrief meeting and noted how the MSBA staff who attended said that they felt the Project's presentation could be used as a prototype for other projects who will be attending this new meeting in their process. He indicated that feedback was only positive, that the changes from SD to DD were well received and that the budget looks good. He summarized that his only concern was the successful resolution of the permitting process. Ms. Gold asked is Mr. Saindon had any concerns. Mr. Saindon responded that he'd request the Committees work enable the Project team to proceed in as efficient a manner as possible and noted that it often feels like the team's hands are tied in terms of making the hundreds of decisions needed to move a project of this complexity forward within it's planned process, schedule and budget. Mr. Rogers noted agreement that project efficiency is a key component to a Project's success and noted that while Leftfield is here to support the Committee, the team often spends more time handling political issues than actually working to move the Project forward effectively and as planned. He summarized that the length, complexity and detail of this meeting is a microcosm of the project itself. Ms. Gold asked Mr. Raymond what his feelings were. Mr. Raymond noted he was very frustrated and felt that after a few years of working together there would be more trust in the project team. Ms. D'Amour responded that there is trust among the teachers and staff. Mr. Satterfield agreed and noted that teachers are very excited and have got to know Mr. Raymond and his team through various meetings, presentations, discussions and question/answer sessions. He indicated that people are excited about the site and building design and commented that the building has exciting features and is not a large, boring box. Mr. Pollender noted that if the Committees can't enable the consultants to work efficiently than the project can be exposed to delays. Mr. Wallace agreed and noted he felt the Project had a solid team in place and that the Committee needs to enable them to move forward. He summarized that despite the surprises in permitting, he's hearing that the project is on schedule, on budget and that all news is good.



**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

6.3 Design Development Construction Estimate / Budget Update

Mr. McElroy explained Gilbane’s estimate process including reconciliation with the Designer’s estimate and noted it will repeat at 60% CD and 90% CD. Mr. Saindon presented a DD estimate summary:

<b>Elbridge Gerry Elementary School DD Estimate Reconciliation/VE Summary</b>		
<b>Schematic Design Control Estimate</b>	<b>\$ 43,786,427</b>	12/6/2018
<b>DD Estimate Reconciliation</b>		
Gilbane	\$ 43,780,742	12/12/2019
Ellana	\$ 43,631,509	12/19/2019
Value Delta	\$ 149,233	
% Delta	-0.34%	
<b>Gilbane reconciled estimate</b>	<b>\$ 43,780,742</b>	
Pending VE items		
Increase design/estimating contingency	\$ 800,000	Increase from 3% to 5%
Civil/landscape	\$ (223,001)	
Architectural	\$ (374,529)	
MEP	\$ (199,001)	
<b>Adjusted Reconciled Estimate incl. VE</b>	<b>\$ 43,784,211</b>	
Over/(under) Schematic Design Control Budget	\$ (2,216)	

He indicated that the estimates were performed from mid-November through early December and that they were not complete when the Committee met on December 4<sup>th</sup>. The following weeks into mid-December were spent reviewing, comparing, reconciling, and clarifying the estimates. As part of the process, the team developed a value management log. He noted that the previous estimating/design contingency was 10% (and that it will ultimately go to 0 once the project is completely designed and bought out) and that via reconciliation the team agreed to move the number to 5% based on the strong level of completion of the DD documents. He noted there was a debate as to whether to further reduce the contingency to 3% and therefore not have to identify value management items, but that the team agreed that 3% is too low to carry at this time mostly due to volatile market conditions. Mr. Saindon reviewed the value management log with the Committees, indicated that a number of items highlighted in yellow are more clarifications based on a lack of clarity on the developing documents as opposed to a more simple removal or limiting of scope cost drivers, and noted the recommended value management items total +/- \$800k. He indicated that by implementing this value management and retaining a 5% estimating and design contingency, the project remains on budget at DD. He also noted that as future estimating and buyouts are completed, certain items on this list could be brought back into the project scope as finances allow.

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

Ms. Martin noted she has no problem with the site wall type switch but noted she is a little nervous about reducing the playground structure budget as this equipment is expensive and the project needs to maintain good level of scope here. She asked that the team revisit the \$20k deduct value to remove the path on the North side of the building as it still seemed light to her. Ms. Fox asked if the savings from the CCIP could fund accepting less items on the value management log. Mr. Saindon responded that it's still very early in project buyout and that maintaining flexibility to buffer against some over-budget scopes is preferred. Mr. Harris noted that if the sole concern is the reduction of the playground equipment, then the Committee could defer on that item.

Ms. Martin made a Building Committee motion to not accept the reduction in the playground equipment allowance and to restore it to the pre-value management value in the final DD package. The motion was second by Mr. Zisson and passed unanimously by those Building Committee members present.

6.4 DD Space Summary Update & 6.5 DD – General Design Update

Mr. Raymond presented an update on recent activities including the DD cost estimate review meetings, the December 12<sup>th</sup> SC presentation, coordination with permitting officials over the holidays, Planning and ZBA application submittals on January 2<sup>nd</sup>, release of the Early Works Package #3 for site, underground MEP, elevator, foundation and steel on January 7<sup>th</sup>, the Neighborhood Meeting on January 13<sup>th</sup> and the MSBA DD debrief January 15<sup>th</sup>. He highlighted plan updates since SD including site updates and the reconfigured admin suite to provide better security and flow.

Mr. Satterfield noted he likes the concept of the revised entry lobby but doesn't want it to look and feel overly heavy and secure visually. Ms. Zaeske agreed.

Ms. Martin noted the site plan updates look great.

Ms. D'Amour asked how many student the amphitheater could accommodate. Ms. Martin responded upwards of two classrooms.

6.6 Approval to Submit Design Development to the MSBA

Ms. Schieffer made a Building Committee motion that, pursuant to the presentation made tonight on design changes from Schematic Design through Design Development including review of the construction estimate reconciliation and value management to maintain the construction and total project budget, I recommend RDA & Leftfield to submit the DD package to the MSBA for their review and consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wallace and approved unanimously by those Building Committee members present.

Ms. Gold asked if a motion was required by the School Committee. Mr. Harris and Mr. Saindon responded that one was not required.

**Gerry School Building Committee and Marblehead School Committee  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2020  
Glover Elementary School, 9 Maple Street, Marblehead, MA – 7:00 PM**

**7. Various Task Assignment Updates:**

None.

**8. New Business, not reasonably anticipated by the chair 48 hours in advance of the meeting:**

None.

**9. Public comment**

Leanne (Last name note recorded) – 5 Higgins Road – Noted concerns about rock crushing and it's associated noise and health risks and asked how notifications for hearings to the neighborhood will be handled. Mr. Silva indicated that notification to abutters will occur through the Planning Board.

**10. Adjournment**

Ms. Martin made a motion to adjourn the Building Committee meeting at 10:10PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Silva and approved unanimously by those present.

Ms. Gold made a motion to adjourn the School Committee meeting at 10:10PM.