**Building Committee Members Present:** Emily Barron, Jackie Belf-Becker (non-voting), Ben Berman, Eileen D'Amour, Sarah Fox, Dave Harris, Ken Lord, Kelly Lyons, Amanda Maniaci, Katherine Martin, John McGinn, Maryann Perry, Jeremy Pollender, Elizabeth Rudzinski, Sean Satterfield, Cindy Schieffer, Aimee Sheppard, Ralph Wallace, Erik Weibust, Donna Zaeske and Jim Zisson.

### **Building Committee Members Absent:**

Richard Matthews, Bob Schaeffner (non-voting) and Ben Szalewicz.

### **School Committee Members Present:**

Maryann Perry, Meredith Tedford, Kate Lipsitz, Dave Harris and Jennifer Schaeffner.

## **School Committee Members Absent:**

None.

**Guests:** David Saindon, Jim Rogers, Brian Dakin (Leftfield), Gene Raymond and John Bartecchi (RDA).

# 1. <u>Call to order</u>

Mr. Harris called the Building Committee meeting to order, and Ms. Tedford called the School Committee meeting to order, at 7:05PM. Mr. Harris lead a moment of silence in the wake of the school shooting in Florida.

# 2. <u>Approval of Building Committee Minutes from 2/1/2018</u>

A motion to approve the minutes for the 2/1/18 meeting was made by Mr. Wallace. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lord, and passed unanimously by those members of the Building Committee present tonight and at the February 1<sup>st</sup> Building Committee meeting, 15-0-2-5. (Yes/No/Absent/Abstained). *Mr. Berman, Ms. Fox, Ms. Lyons, Mr. Pollender and Ms. Schieffer abstained, as they were absent at the February* 1<sup>st</sup> *meeting.* 

# 3. Approval of Building Committee Invoices and Commitments

Mr. Saindon presented an invoice log dated February 15, 2018 including an RDA invoice for period ending February 28, 2018 in the amount of \$30,937.50 and a Leftfield invoice for the period ending January 31, 2017 in the amount of \$10,278.00.

Mr. Wallace made a motion to approve the invoices as presented and listed on the invoice log dated February 15, 2018 for a total value of \$41,215.50. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schieffer and approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 20-0-2-0.

Mr. Saindon recapped that two weeks ago the Building Committee approved a proposal to execute a traffic analysis study on the three remaining sites, but the Committee deferred the approval of a wetlands delineation proposal for Bud Orne. At the meeting two weeks ago, when the deferred approval occurred, RDA wasn't present to explain their need/desire for the wetland delineation to occur. Mr. Saindon indicated that his preference was to proceed with this work. Tonight, RDA is present, and Mr. Raymond explained that RDA's goal in completing this scope of services is to get as much info as possible on the constraints of that site, which is the only site with wetland characteristics. Mr. Raymond indicated that he has had discussions with Ms. Martin and doesn't expect to find anything that would rule this site out of consideration but added that it will help the site development process. Mr. Harris asked what information these services would create that is in addition to what is already publicly available about the site. Mr. Raymond noted that the flagging process yields more accurate results than what is on public record, which could influence site layout in a positive or negative way. Mr. Saindon added that this wetlands delineation has value to the Town even if the Bud Orne site does not end up being chosen. Ms. Fox asked Leftfield and RDA if the project is where it was expected to be in terms of budget allowance usage. Mr. Saindon indicated this \$3,000 cost would be funded via the \$15k budget line titled environmental permitting. Mr. Raymond added that he felt the project was at a good spot in terms of budget allowance usage and noted that more attention will be given to uncovering all issues on the final site that ends up being selected. Mr. Zisson commented that this wetlands delineation has to be done at some point but noted previous discussion that the best time to do it is in Spring. Considering this, he felt that the delineation should occur in April. Mr. Harris noted the services can be authorized but not started immediately. Ms. Martin noted that \$3k is not a large burden to the budget, but it would be preferable to have some weeks elapse to understand if Bud Orne was gaining interest. She also encouraged Committee members to read the site analysis section of the PDP, which she has already reviewed, as it provides good information about the limitations and process that would be incurred by building on Bud Orne. She agreed that the study would yield valuable Town information if Bud Orne drops from consideration as a host site for this school. Mr. Raymond requested that the proposal be approved tonight so he could get the sub-consultant under contract and the scheduling of the flagging could wait until after the next Building Committee meeting.

Ms. Fox made a motion to approve the proposal from BSC group for wetlands delineation and mapping at Bud Orne park for a lump sum of \$3,215, which will equate to a commitment value of 3,536.50 (#3,215.00 x 1.1 = 3,536.50). The motion was seconded by Ms. Martin and approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 20-0-2-0.

### 4. <u>Chairman Update(s)</u>:

Mr. Harris explained that the School Committee called a meeting earlier tonight to discuss a disclosure by Ms. Schieffer that she is an abutter to one of the locations still being considered as a host site for a new school. Ms. Schieffer communicated with the State Ethics Commission and submitted the appropriate documents to identify that she abuts a property being considered for development by this Building Committee and is seeking an exemption to remain involved in Committee deliberations and decisions. Mr. Harris reported that the School Committee voted unanimously to sign the document, noting that they did not feel any conflict was substantial enough so as to require Ms. Schieffer not to participate. Ms. Tedford noted that the disclosure paperwork will be filed with Town Clerk and a record will be filed by the School Committee.

### Glover/Eveleth Highlights Discussion; Community of Learners

Mr. Brian Ota, the Glover principal, introduced himself and noted that he was asked to share the experience of moving in to the Glover School. He noted that Ms. Julie Duggan, a Glover parent, and Ms. Constance Mostyn, a Glover kindergarten teacher, would also share their experience in this process.

Ms. Duggan detailed her child's transition from the Eveleth School to Glover, noting he was thrilled to go from the older and smaller school to the newer and larger one but that it retained familiarity because of the teachers and classmates. This step from Eveleth to Glover later helped Ms. Duggan's child make the transition to the Village School. She noted that while the Eveleth did have a small community feel, the community feeling was not lost at the Glover, rather is was supplemented with better facilities that in turn opened up opportunities for students.

Ms. Mostyn noted her prior experience outside of Marblehead teaching in a very small school that had no library, cafeteria or staff rooms where students and teachers spent the entire day in the same classroom, including recess and lunch. The playground was a block away. She noted that when she arrived at Glover she felt that it had everything that was needed to deliver education, including spacious and flexible classrooms, plenty of storage, students having their own lockers, wall display space, access to daylight, technology, proper heating and convenient access to sinks and bathrooms. Compared to her earlier experience, these resources changed the quality of education and convinced her that modern, larger schools provide the best ability for teachers to deliver quality education.

Mr. Ota showed the Committee photos of the flexible usage of larger spaces at the Glover School, including the multi-use cafeteria space that this meeting is using, the library, remote learning areas and the gymnasium. He noted all of these spaces that come along with the comparatively larger population were flexible, useful and bright and encouraged people to come visit to see the school's size and understand how it is used.

Mr. Harris noted that the next Public Forums are tentatively being scheduled for Tuesday March 6<sup>th</sup> at Glover and a morning session on March 7<sup>th</sup> at the Village School due to space availability. He indicated he is looking into having the sessions recorded and ultimately posted to the project website. Mr. Berman and Mr. Harris discussed the importance of Committee review and confirmation of any update presentation for future public forums, and Mr. Harris indicated he'd work towards sharing a draft with Committee at the March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Mr. Harris walked the Committee though a draft overhaul of the project webpage and thanked the volunteers who helped bring it together including Ms. Baron and Ms. Day. Mr. Lord noted that the School Department needs to review this from a technical perspective and figure out how to implement it with a School/Town URL, and Ms. Perry noted that it is a general School Department policy not to include any photos of children on any material including websites. Mr. Harris noted this would be revisited and reviewed the draft sections of the website including Who We Are (the Committee agreed that showing roles/professions of all Committee members was important). Background of OPM and Designer, and a Project Background / FAO section. Mr. Berman noted the importance of getting this FAQ section vetted by the Committee and "right the first time" is of utmost importance, while noting that the progress the Committee is seeing is positive and will be helpful. He stressed that this needs to get updated to include all important points and respond to all questions that are out among the public but that it also needs to get posted and available to the public as soon as possible. Ms. Tedford noted that the School Committee is also working on a FAQ that addresses the Gerry steam leak issue and expressed the School committee's desire to keep people aware that this Feasibility Study and the repairs at Gerry are two separate processes despite the core issues being related. Mr. Berman noted that there should be some overlap, such as how/why the Gerry site and building options were removed from consideration during the PDP phase of the Feasibility Study, and references to how much work would be needed to renovate it. Ms. Tedford generally agreed but noted that any items specific to the steam leak and repairs have nothing to do with the Feasibility Study from an administrative, policy or cost perspective. The Committee continued review of the draft website, noting the list of meetings, agendas, presentations and handouts all being posted. Ms. Schieffer asked who would be responsible to manage any updates to this new website moving forward. Mr. Harris noted this is vet to be determined. Mr. Lord noted keeping such a site continuously up to date is time consuming. Ms. Schaeffner noted that like all other School webpages, this really needs to be managed by a School Department employee. Mr. Harris noted that the desire was for a member of the Building Committee to maintain the new site, and perhaps whoever this person ends up can work directly under the guidance of School staff in they do not already fill that role.

Mr. Harris concluded the Chair update by again encouraging Committee members to visit all three sites remaining for consideration as a host for the project.

## 5. <u>Designer Update(s)</u>:

## PDP Update, Approval and Next Steps

Mr. Saindon began with a schedule update, recapping the PDP delivery plan from two weeks ago which outlined that the existing conditions section would be reviewed by Mr. Lord and that the Site Development Requirements section would be reviewed by Catherine Martin; both occurred. Mr. Saindon then went to remind all that the PDP delivery was to occur on February 20<sup>th</sup> based on a Joint Building and School Committee Meeting approving the PDP tonight, on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February. However, he learned that prior to the meeting, there were concerns raised on the approval of the PDP. He indicated that once the PDP is submitted to MSBA it is reviewed by their staff and comments are issued within 21 days. The project team then has 14 days to respond to those comments. He noted that there are roughly 10 weeks to complete the PSR, which is scheduled to go to the MSBA on May 9<sup>th</sup> to meet the deadline for inclusion on the June 27<sup>th</sup> MSBA Board of Directors meeting. After the PSR is submitted the project will then meet with MSBA Facility Assessment Subcommittee.

Mr. Weibust commented that it seems increasingly likely Gerry won't open again and asked about the possibility of accelerating this project and working towards a special Town meeting in Fall. He noted open questions such as what the procedure would be and whether this was possible at all but felt that is should be discussed and explored. Mr. McGinn responded that this was not really a question for the OPM. Mr. Weibust asked Mr. McGinn if it's achievable. Mr. McGinn responded that it would depend on timing and noted that a special Town meeting is very different than a regular one. He added that the last special Town meeting was a disaster, and that in general a single-issue Town meeting is risky. Mr. Weibust asked whether it was worth exploring. Mr. McGinn responded that the Committee should see where the process leads, noting he felt this discussion is premature and depends on a lot of variables that can't be worked though tonight. Mr. Weibust noted that if there is any desire for a Fall special Town meeting then the process should work backwards from that target date, noting that he felt the faster the Feasibility Study finds its preferred solution and it is authorized by the Town the better.

The Committee discussed the sequence of events that would occur in the event that a Bud Orne project becomes the preferred option, because a Town vote on the land swap would not be complete prior to submission of the PSR. Multiple options were discussed including submission of the theoretical Bud Orne option in the PSR then retraction of the PSR if the land transfer were not approved at Town vote, or also sending in a PSR that was written with the preference of the Bud Orne option, with a second option identified within the document in case the subsequent land transfer

vote failed. The Committee requested that Mr. Saindon discuss the sequence with the MSBA. Multiple Committee members noted concern about the possibility of a two-option PSR scenario, and also noted the importance of focusing on the immediate next steps of the PSR phase.

Mr. Saindon noted that the various sections of the PDP that Committee members had requested to review have been ongoing or are completed, including Ms. Martin reviewing the site analysis sections and Mr. Lord and Ms. Perry reviewing existing conditions and various summary sections. He continued that the plan was to authorize RDA and Leftfield to submit the PSR's to the MSBA at tonight's meeting, and have the School Committee approve the action, then for Leftfield to complete the Local Actions Letter and Committee meeting minute package, review the entire PDP document for conformance and then to certify its completion in a cover letter and, with RDA's assistance, deliver it to the MSBA on the 20th. Mr. Raymond indicated that RDA was on board with that plan and was ready to have the document completed for the 20<sup>th</sup>. He noted his plan is to drop off a binder to the School Department on Tuesday in parallel with the MSBA's copy. He also noted the document will be made available in PDF format and will likely be in the range of 1,600 pages. He summarized that the PDP is a detailed document of everything that the Committee and project team have discussed at meetings and working sessions ranging from the educational visioning process to the educational programming and space studies to existing conditions, 21 testfits and all comparative cost data complete with descriptions, summaries and backup detail. Ultimately, the document identifies the 6 options that the Committee elected to study further in the next (PSR) phase. He indicated that the PDP does not advocate for any of these options over the other, but that the next steps in the PSR begin to do exactly that.

Ms. Fox asked whether the MSBA review of the PDP provides any breakdown of reimbursement by option. Mr. Saindon responded that the MSBA PDP review does not yield this information, but that the project team would continue to analyze this as options were developed.

Mr. Saindon indicated that the team needed the approval of the Building Committee and then the School Committee to submit the PDP, it it's the will of the Committee. Mr. Harris indicated that he was recently told that there are people who are not comfortable authorizing the submission without signing off on the final document. Ms. Martin indicated that she had a discussion with Ms. Perry and there is a desire for Ms. Perry or the School Committee to review the final document. Ms. Tedford noted that the School Committee was prepared to approve the motion with the caveat that the Superintendent approve it prior to submission to the MSBA. Mr. Harris noted that there might be other members interested in such a review. Ms. Tedford responded that based on her understanding of the discussion at the last Building Committee meeting no other Building Committee members wanted to review the document prior to its submission.

Mr. Pollender made a (Building Committee) motion to authorize submission of the PDP to the MSBA by Leftfield and RDA pending final review by the Superintendent. Mr. Wallace seconded the motion. Ms. Martin asked whether anyone else on the Committee wanted to see the document. Mr. McGinn noted it should be put in the Committee Dropbox. Mr. Lord noted that having read the parts he's asked for, edits have been minor and generally the information is consistent with what has been discussed throughout the process. Mr. Weibust noted that the schedule includes submission of the PDP to MSBA on Tuesday. Mr. Saindon responded that that was the intent but based on this new information it might get delivered in the following days after the Superintendent completes the review. The motion passed unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 20-0-2-0.

Ms. Schaeffner made a (School Committee) motion to authorize submission of the PDP to the MSBA by Leftfield and RDA pending final review by the Superintendent. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lipsitz and passed unanimously by the School Committee, 4-0-0-0.

- <u>OPM Update(s):</u>
  <u>PDP Update and Approval (in conjunction with Designer Update)</u>
  Refer to section 5 above.
- 7. <u>Preliminary Design Program (PDP) Updates:</u> Refer to section 5 above.
- 8. <u>School Committee Discussion / Vote of PDP Submittal</u> Refer to section 5 above.

### 9. New Business

Mr. Harris noted that the next meeting is scheduled for March 1<sup>st</sup>, where the Building Committee will start with PSR process. The Building Committee also discussed having three meetings in March by adding one on the 29<sup>th</sup> that can be cancelled if not needed.

The School Committee meeting was closed via motion from Ms. Schaeffner that was seconded by Ms. Lipsitz and approved unanimously 4-0-0-0.

Mr. Zisson informed the Committee that he has spoken with Mr. Nick Freeman and that Mr. Freeman has had heart surgery and is doing OK. He continued that Mr. Freeman wanted to attend tonight's meeting, and that he looks forward to future attendance. Mr. Zisson made a motion for the Committee to extend best wishes to

Mr. Freeman for his recovery. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris, and approved unanimously by those present, 20-0-2-0.

Mr. Berman communicated an idea to the Building Committee and to the remaining members of the School Committee in the audience acknowledging what he was about to request may be beyond the scope and authority of the Building Committee to execute. He indicated the idea was a discussion-starter and not a proposal, and something he has independently talked to some members of the Committee with including Mr. Zisson. He explained that in the event that a Bud Orne project is selected as the preferred option, that the School Committee consider using the Coffin property to develop satellite parking for the new school at Bud Orne and perhaps a park, leaving more space on the new school site for amenities to support the school itself like play space. He added that the same concept could apply if a Coffin project was selected as the preferred option: onsite sitework could be optimized for school operations and the Bud Orne site could be developed for satellite staff parking and park space. Mr. Zisson added that it would be acknowledged that the "offsite" parking and developments would be nonreimbursable, and that satellite staff parking is not ideal, but it's not a long walk and this could be a great solution to develop a school with the appropriate onsite support space but also retain area park space for the community. Mr. Satterfield responded that having to take children offsite to a park is far from ideal, and Mr. Berman explained that the offsite parking would be for staff, not drop-off or pick-up, and that the park for the community would be at that offsite location. Play space for the school would then be able to be full sized at the school/project site. Ms. Perry asked RDA that if onsite parking were scaled down for the 450-student Bud Orne options whether the building could be lowered from 3 to 2 stories. RDA and Leftfield discussed that this type of development was possible in the PSR phase. Mr. Pollender noted that a 3 floor building isn't necessarily less expensive than 2 floor building if both are the same square footage. Ms. Martin asked Mr. Pollender is there might be cost premiums associated with mobilizing on 2 sites. Mr. Pollender responded that since the two sites are very close it's not likely to be a major factor.

## 10. Public Comment

Kim Day – 18 Liberty Road – Noted development of the draft website was the result of previous discussion with the Committee, that it wasn't done in a vacuum and that she volunteered because knew members of the public were asking many questions that a website update could address. Moving forward she noted her commitment to help make sure the site is maintained and offered to assist and/or pass updates though a key Committee or School Department contact. She also thanked Mr. Ota, Ms. Mostyn and Ms. Duggan for sharing their experience of the transition into Glover and suggested topics like that should be covered at future public forums.

Alistair Connor – Echoed Ms. Day's comments and noted that she felt there is a hunger for factual and reliable information in the public, and that access to that information will help alleviate a lot of parent stress. She noted the discussion about both getting the website FAQ and background info accurate and also quickly posted, and suggested more summaries be added to the volume of info from meetings so that the information was accessible. She also addressed the desire to accelerate the project schedule and help minimize gap students who will not be able to benefit from this new school in time because it won't be finished. She added that she worries about the idea of carrying two options into a Town vote, as it could become a contest focused on people's preferences as opposed to proposing the best plan for the entire Town.

Tim Waldon – Noted to the Superintendent he was hopeful that returning students to the Gerry school next school year was being considered. He summarized the value of the Gerry School, noting that despite the Committee eliminating all Gerry options he felt these are things that the Committee needs to address with supporters of the Gerry School: the building is historical and is special because of its history, it's a beautiful building and site with ocean views. Just this would be a shame to lose. But beyond the building itself, it's special because so many families can walk to it and this creates a culture and builds connections. He compared this current situation to how Fenway Park was viewed in the 1990's when it was considered an inferior relic to new stadiums and noted how much that sentiment has changed after the proper preservation and restoration.

Jocelyn Cook – 39 Jersey Street – Noted that while she values all opinions, she would not advocate for returning students and staff to the Gerry School and that all children should have the opportunity to go to a new and modern schools like the Glover. She noted that the Gerry building and site could be used in many ways and continued that she felt that buildings don't make communities, people, teachers and families do. She concluded that while there is value in wanting to save Gerry it should not come at the expense of children's education.

Alfred Wilson – 39 Pleasant Street – Noted that he was likely a person who will disagree with whatever the final solution is because it seems like the Gerry school has been undervalued. He commented that 150 people walk to that school every day creating foot traffic and an economic impact that doesn't show up in Committee analysis. He also noted that health considerations for walking to school aren't being valued. He continued that while a new and modern school with technology sounds wonderful as a sales pitch, it is not necessary for children in kindergarten and lower grades.

Pat Franklin – 6 Merrel Road – Noted that a factual and understandable update is essential for the upcoming public forums and requested that the Committee confirm that no wetlands flagging has already been done at the Bud Orne site.

Holly Hanway – 8 Glover Square – Noted her surprise after hearing that the criteria to pare down the final 6 options is not already established. She felt that a lot of this discussion seems to be going backwards and this needs to be resolved prior to the public forums.

Rebecca Delguidice – Lyndsey Street – Noted that her family moved to Marblehead due to the reputations of its schools but that they are now looking at private schools because they didn't know that the Coffin and Bell were outdated in addition to Gerry. She noted the importance to her and other residents about the discussion of accelerating the process.

Seth Gomery – 86 Jersey Street – Noted his support of Mr. Weibust's comments about accelerating the schedule and the possibility of a Fall special Town meeting. He also noted he lives in Bud Orne neighborhood and that Mr. Berman and Mr. Zisson's ideas of what the School Committee could do with left-over buildings and sites is impactful to his support of the project's preferred solution.

Dianne Goram – 1<sup>st</sup> grade teacher at Glover – Noted that she respectfully disagreed with the statement that K and 1<sup>st</sup> graders don't need adequate space or access to technology in classrooms. She continued that she is currently teaching 23-1<sup>st</sup> graders to code. She also noted that she previously taught at the Eveleth School, and that she didn't hear any complaints from teachers or students after moving into the larger and more modern Glover building.

Mr. Martin made a motion to expand the scope of the already-approved traffic study to include investigating the idea of satellite parking between the Bud Orne and Coffin sites. The motion was seconded by Mr. Berman. Mr. Rogers noted there would likely be a cost to this, and after discussion Mr. Saindon noted he'd coordinate with RDA and the traffic consultant and review the scope with the Committee on March 1<sup>st</sup>, which is before when the study will commence on March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### 11.<u>Adjournment</u>

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Weibust and seconded by Mr. Pollender. The motion was approved unanimously by those present, 20-0-2-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:16PM.

Approved SC 3/19/2018