Building Committee Members Present: Emily Barron, Jackie Belf-Becker (non-voting), Ben Berman, Sarah Fox, Ken Lord, Amanda Maniaci, John McGinn, Maryann Perry, Jeremy Pollender, Elizabeth Rudzinski, Sean Satterfield, Bob Schaeffner (non-voting), Cindy Schieffer, Aimee Sheppard, Ralph Wallace, Erik Weibust, Donna Zaeske, Jim Zisson and Ben Szalewicz.

Building Committee Members Absent: Eileen D'Amour, Dave Harris, Kelly Lyons, Catherine Martin, Richard Matthews.

School Committee Members Present: Maryann Perry, Meredith Tedford, Kate Lipsitz and Jennifer Schaeffner.

School Committee Members Absent: Dave Harris

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

1. Call to order

Mr. Wallace called the Building Committee meeting to order at 7:00PM. Ms. Tedford called the School Committee meeting to order at 7:00PM.

2. Approval of Building Committee Minutes from 03/20/2018

Mr. Saindon indicated the minutes were sent out on the previous night, that edits were received today and that a new draft was emailed to the Committee prior to this meeting. A motion to approve the updated minutes from the 03/20/18 meeting was made by Ms. Fox. The motion was seconded by Ms. Zaeske and passed unanimously by those present tonight and at the March 20^{th} meeting, 14-0-5-3. (Yes/No/Absent/Abstained).

Mr. Berman, Mr. Satterfield and Ms. Schieffer abstained, as they were absent at the March 20th meeting.

3. Approval of Building Committee Invoices and Commitments

Mr. Wallace indicated that there were no invoices or commitments for Building Committee ("BC") review and approval tonight.

4. Chairman Update(s):

Mr. Wallace welcomed the School Committee ("SC") to the joint meeting and turned the floor over to Ms. Tedford, who introduced the School Committee and explained the reasons that the SC asked for this to be a joint meeting. She noted that this was an important juncture for both Committees and that it's important for the SC to have an awareness and confidence level with the feasibility study process leading into such a big milestone in a few weeks when the BC will select a preferred option and

the SC will vote on whether to support that option. She continued that the SC wants to understand both the criteria the BC will use for selection of the final option and the BC's rational behind the ability of all stakeholders to come together behind this option. Additionally she indicated it was important for the SC to hear directly from all involved parties including the BC and attendees of BC meetings. She noted there was a lot to accomplish at tonight's meeting and other upcoming ones, indicated all public comment would be held at the end of the meeting and asked all Committee members to keep decorum and speak through the Chair. She noted that there has been a tendency for the BC to step backwards and re-study items that were previously vetted and reminded the BC that its next step is to select the project's site and preferred option among the two remaining.

Mr. Wallace noted that as discussed at the previous BC meeting, comments on the PDP submission were received from the MSBA and subsequently that Mr. Lord posted them on the BC Dropbox. He noted that responses to these comments are due back to MSBA by April 2 and reiterated that a number of the questions are specific and are able to be addressed directly and succinctly by the consultant team and School Department while other responses will require more detailed explanations. He indicated that he felt that the pending responses to the PDP do not have any material impact on any decisions that the BC needs to make tonight or at the next meetings, and specifically noted that the Initial Space Summary ("ISS") was not going to be locked down between now and the April 2 PDP response deadline. He noted that the team is going to respond in a thoughtful way to the comments, but the BC's focus should be on site and preferred option selection. Finalization of the ISS will occur regardless of which of the remaining options is selected later in April and in May during the Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") phase. Mr. Weibust asked a question about an MSBA comment on page 11 of the PDP response comments which suggested a different enrollment of 340 might need to be studied. Ms. Perry replied that the team was told when the PDP was being developed that the MSBA looks at SPED programs as being unique community-tocommunity and based on the referenced comment assumed that the MSBA might believe that SPED classrooms are be emptied at Glover to move into new spaces in the new building, but that in practice this would not be the case. She indicated that the team has a meeting scheduled for this Friday to discuss this with MSBA, and in general felt that miscommunication is what most likely resulted in this comment. The BC further discussed where this comment might have arisen from, how SPED services are handled in the existing schools and how they would be handled in both of the remaining options. Mr. Wallace noted he felt this comment might be intended as an exercise to challenge the project's space plan and via the discussion find a better understanding of the BC and project's thinking. He noted he did not feel that the MSBA is literally asking for a 340-student option to be considered in addition to the two 450-student options remaining under consideration. Ms. Tedford asked for

RDA or Leftfield's opinion on the matter, and Mr. Saindon responded that the project's enrollment only contained two options for study and that neither were 340. Mr. Weibust requested that a summary of the School Department's response to the MSBA about this item be provided to the BC in advance of the next meeting, and Ms. Perry noted it would be provided.

5. OPM/Designer Update(s)

Mr. Raymond reviewed updates regarding traffic, wetlands flagging (completed), geotechnical borings (completed), and general building massing. He noted that as a follow-up to the last meeting's discussion he spoke with the traffic engineer who was non-committal about the possibility of a traffic signal at West Shore Drive. Highlights for the Bell site option include test borings showing ledge (which was expected) but also some areas of soil which would require replacement for structural reasons, and a likely subsurface stormwater retention basin under the downhill parking lot. Mr. Raymond reviewed site sections and shadow studies which showed little direct impact to abutters. Mr. Raymond presented similar updates for the Bud Orne site options, highlighting the problematic site exit onto Fader Place, concerns that exiting traffic could back up into the site and completed wetlands flagging which slightly (but manageably) encroaches on the parking area. The BC discussed the impact of the wetlands perimeter, the ability to relocate/replicate wetlands at a 1:2 ratio onsite, and the potential impact to the space available for outdoor play. Mr. Raymond continued the update, including showing space for a subsurface stormwater retention basin under the main parking area and boring results which show the expected shallow ledge across the site. Mr. Raymond also presented site sections that showed a more direct impact on abutting structures due to the proximity of the building to the property line and because it is a 3-story configuration. Shadow study showed multiple impacted abutting properties and structures. The BC discussed an option that would eliminate vehicular site egress onto Fader Place. Mr. Raymond noted that this option was previously looked at, and that his team felt that sending the exiting traffic deeper into the neighborhood did not fix the issues with vehicular congestion. The Committee further discussed additional development options and tweaks to the Bud Orne option, with Mr. Berman noting that he felt this option needed some more development to ensure that it was on par with the development of the Bell site option.

Mr. Wallace moved on to item 5c in the meeting agenda and asked Ms. Perry for an update, who noted she was asked to put together plan for student reassignment

during construction. She proceeded to present slides summarizing the plan to house Bell and Gerry Kindergarten classes at the Eveleth School, Bell and Gerry First grade classes at the Coffin School, Bell and Coffin Second grade classes at the Coffin School, and Bell and Coffin Third grade classes at the Village School. She noted that per DESE guidelines bussing was required for students residing more than 2 miles from a school site, that shuttle bus transportation to and from Eveleth would be provided at T.B.D. stops in the Bell and Coffin school neighborhoods, and that staggered start times would be determined. She noted that outsourcing bussing in this plan could potentially have a \$72k cost impact, that \$15-25k would be required for moving classroom and building furniture and technology and that \$10-25k in work would be required at the Eveleth including carpets, locks, paint and playground equipment. Members of both Committees held a spirited debate about many factors of this plan, including temporary traffic considerations, the impact to education and temporary measures to control traffic and prevent congestion and unsafe conditions. It was also discussed how such temporary issues and concerns should be weighed against the long-term benefit to the Town and it's students. It was agreed that the details of temporary traffic management were not within the scope of the Building Committee to plan and implement, while several members of the Building Committee noted that such details are important in their final deliberation about which remaining option was more beneficial.

Mr. Wallace moved the discussion to meeting agenda item 5d, selection criteria for the preferred option. Mr. Saindon indicated that he sent out a draft/proposed list of criteria to the BC late last week. He indicated that the list was separated into "current" and "on hold" categories. The current category includes geographic location in Town, off-street parking / queuing for student drop-off and pick-up, neighborhood impact, outdoor play area, regulatory/approval risk and complexity, cost and educational impact during construction. Items that were in the "oh hold" category included programmatic parity across the District (removed because both remaining options are 450-student schools that would be equal in delivering parity to the school district), delivery of education (both options are based on new constriction of a full space program), external-to-the-site traffic (as it was determined to be covered by the existing/current neighborhood impact item), design flexibility (neutral between remaining sites), responsible design/sustainability (neutral between remaining sites) and voter risk (as it was determined to be covered by the existing/current regulatory/approval risk and complexity. Mr. Schaeffner thanked Mr. Saindon for preparing the summary and

suggested that Item 4 on the "on hold" list, design flexibility, be moved to the current criteria because he felt at this point it's clear that the two sites differ significantly in this respect, especially considering 2 versus 3 stories. He also noted that on the current list, Traffic is worthy of it's own item and should be independent of scale and massing.

Ms. Schieffer made a motion for the Building Committee to separate traffic from the current "neighborhood impact (traffic/scale/massing)" criteria and create a standalone criteria for "traffic" on the current list. Ms. Fox seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 17-0-5-0.

The Building Committee discussed what the "geographic location in Town" item meant to various members, and not formal action was taken.

Several BC members expressed concern that the view that both sites are neutral in terms of "delivery of education" is no longer accurate. Items noted included 2 stories at Bell versus 3 at Bud Orne, and the discussed Bus Orne issues including the proximity to neighbors, wetlands possibly causing outdoor play to shrink and general site congestion.

Ms. Perry made a motion to move the "delivery of education" criteria back onto the current list of criteria to be used for selection. Mr. Berman seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 17-0-5-0.

After further discussion about the "geographic location within Town" item, it was noted that the item would remain and that individual Building Committee members could choose if both sites were neutral and score them the same, or if they felt one was more favorable this could be reflected in their scoring.

Mr. Wallace and Mr. Weibust asked Mr. Saindon to explain his thoughts on the options on how and whether to weight the categories and use them to arrive at a preferred option. Mr. Saindon proceeded to outline three general options. Option A involved applying a weight to each criteria, and he noted that this was not preferred in previous discussions. Option B involved providing the criteria to the Committee then allowing individual members to score each individual one on a scale from 0-4.

Sub-option B.1 would tally the scores to determine the final decision, and sub-option B.2 would cast the selection criteria as a tool for each individual member to use by selecting which option was more advantageous criteria-by-criteria, revealing an option with more preferable tally of strengths and a single vote in favor of a particular option by each Building Committee member. Option C was to use these selection criteria as a general guide for each Committee member, to not assign numerical scoring values, and to then have a roll call vote.

After discussion, Mr. Berman made a motion to adopt Option C as the final means by which the Building Committee members would arrive at a preferred solution: the approved criteria from tonight's meeting will be distributed to the Building Committee and individual members can use them to aid in their determination of which option they will support in a roll call vote at a pending meeting. Mr. Weibust seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 17-0-5-0.

Mr. McGinn made a motion to approve the revised final 10 criteria to be used for selection of the preferred option as presented and amended tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Berman and approved unanimously by the members of the Building Committee present, 17-0-5-0.

Ms. Lipsitz made a motion to adjourn the School Committee meeting at 9:01. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tedford and approved unanimously by the members of the School Committee present, 4-0-1-0.

Mr. Wallace asked Mr. Saindon to provide an update for agenda item 5e, a schedule update and PSR nest steps. Mr. Saindon highlighted the following meetings and dates:

- April 2nd District PDP MSBA comments due
- April 5th Joint Building Committee and School Committee Meeting at 7PM
 Glover. Agenda Building Committee selects preferred option.
- April 12th Joint Building Committee and School Committee Meeting at 7PM – High School Library. Agenda - School Committee to vote on preferred option.
- May 3rd Joint Building Committee and School Committee Meeting at 7PM Glover. Agenda School and Building Committee's to approve PSR to be submitted to the MSBA.

May 9th – PSR due to the MSBA

6. PSR Update(s):

Covered above.

7. New Business

Mr. Berman asked when responses to previous BC questions can be provided and noted that the next meeting is when the preferred option is supposed to be selected. Mr. Zisson noted inclusion of the pending response to MSBA PDP comments. Mr. Weibust asked if an update can be provided to the BC after the meeting Ms. Perry indicated was scheduled with the MSBA on Friday.

Mr. Berman expressed his opinion that the proposed Bud Orne scheme should be changed to reflect neighborhood concerns with traffic egress onto fader Place. Mr. Schaeffner disagreed because the BC had already selected the schemes to consider for the purpose of selecting a site, noting any design modifications would have detrimental effects on other already challenging conditions on the Bud Orne scheme and any such modification would have negligible impact on the overall viability of this scheme. After further discussion, Mr. Saindon noted that the team would work to get the BC updates to the Bud Orne option based on comments tonight including not exiting onto Fader Place, access to handicapped parking, impact to outdoor play size, and the location of the outdoor garden in advance of the next meeting.

Mr. Saindon asked Mr. McGinn for an update regarding the follow-up to a comment about the Town Counsel's opinion on Article 97 applicability at Bud Orne. Mr. McGinn reported that he sent the letter questioning the opinion to Town Counsel and after consideration they stand by their original opinion as written.

8. <u>Community Outreach / Correspondence Received</u>

Mr. Lord noted that he received and passed on 12 emails to the Building Committee in the past few days.

9. Public Comment

Christy Hebert – Lafayette Street – Expressed concerned that the BC is talking about returning to an eliminated scheme at Bud Orne and noted that any last-minute consideration of major options seems irresponsible. She concluded that the BC must move forward with its responsibility to choose between one of the two remaining options.

Missy Fisher – 26 Sheppard Street – Noted she was an abutter to Bud Orne and spoke of traffic concerns all around the Bud Orne site and not just at Fader Place. She asked about considering the impact of ledge blasting and Mr. Wallace noted that

the project will very like encounter ledge and that pre-blast surveys including photo and video backup would be performed at all properties determined to be impacted.

Kim Day – 18 Liberty Road – Asked if the selection criteria could be shared, and Mr. Saindon read the final 10 approved items aloud.

Tim Wadlow – Warren Street – Thanked people for admitting there is an issue of traffic at Coffin School and hopes even though it's not the direct responsibility of the BC that the information and situation is followed up on.

Alastar Connor – 9 Cloutmans Lane – Suggested refinement of sidewalks and dropoff configurations at the Bell site. Mr. Raymond noted that the entry loop could be modified to have a bus-only lane to separate bus and parent traffic and that the lobby was accessible from both sides of the building, allowing for queuing space all around the site.

Stephanie Callahan – Intervale Road – Noted concern that the issue of student displacement during construction has not received enough attention. Mr. Weibust noted that it's one of the categories for judging the remaining two options against each other.

Erica Greggory – 4 Fader Place – Noted that he would like the Committee to consider the impact to the Bud Orne neighborhood in terms of ledge handling, drainage and stormwater run-off. Finished by noting there is no proximity to public transportation for faculty or staff at this location.

Erin Noonan – 15 Beverly Ave – Noted that the debate within the Building Committee is only a portion of the debate related to this project within the Town, that there could be no logical answer to why open park land would be taken away at an inferior location, and that this Committee will have failed if it chooses an option that is dead on arrival in terms of the Town vote. Finished by noting that the concept of neighborhood schools is a zero sum game.

Heather Konz – Fader Place – Asked about follow-up on the previous comment at a Committee meeting that \$350k was carried for the demolition of the Eveleth and site improvement costs but the Town recently identified a larger number than what was carried in the project. Mr. Saindon noted that he was mistaken when he previously answered a question and thought \$350k was carried. Mr. Saindon noted that after review, a value closer to \$750k, and much more in line with the value identified by the Town, was carried in the comparative cost estimates. Mr. Wallace agreed that what was carried by the project remains adequate.

Paul Baker – 42 Elm Street – Asked question of school committee, who was no longer in session. The next School Committee meeting was noted to be on April 12th.

10.Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Berman and seconded by Mr. Weibust. The motion was approved unanimously by those present, 17-0-5-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:43PM.