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, Catherine Martin, Richard Matthews, John McGinn, Maryann Perry, Elizabeth Rudzinski, Sean Satterfield, Cindy Schieffer, Aimee Sheppard, Ben Szalewicz, Ralph Wallace, Erik Weibust, Donna Zaeske and Jim Zisson.

Building Committee Members Absent: Jeremy Pollender, Bob Schaeffner (non-voting).

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

School Committee Members Absent: None.

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

1. Call to order

Mr. Harris called the Building Committee ("BC") meeting to order at 7:04PM. He noted his appreciation of the progress the BC made while he was away during the prior meetings and noted the various goals of tonight's meeting including some PDP response updates, a new variation of the Bud Orne option, and most importantly site and preferred option selection. He noted that the BC has been provided with evaluation sheets to help guide members decisions but that no formal record of these evaluations will be used to vote for the final selection. This, he explained, would be completed via a roll call vote later in the meeting.

Ms. Tedford called the School Committee ("SC") meeting to order at 7:06PM.

2. Approval of Minutes from 03/27/18 Joint Bldg. and School Committee Meeting

Mr. Saindon noted that draft minutes for the 3/27 meeting were sent to the BC and that edits have been received and incorporated into updated minutes which were circulated earlier in the day. Mr. Dakin noted that one final edit to the minutes which was not included in the distribution earlier today was re-phrasing a passage which read that on April 12 the SC will "approve" the preferred option to saying the SC will "vote on" the preferred option.

A BC motion to approve the updated minutes from the 03/27/18 meeting was made by Ms. Schieffer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Martin and passed unanimously by those BC members present tonight and at the March 27th meeting, 16-0-1-5. (Yes/No/Absent/Abstained).

Ms. D'Amour, Mr. Harris, Ms. Lyons, Ms. Martin and Mr. Matthews abstained, as they were absent at the March 27^{th} meeting.

Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee and the Marblehead School Committee Meeting Minutes April 5, 2018

Glover School Cafeteria- 9 Maple Street - 7:00PM

3. Approval of Building Committee Invoices and Commitments

Mr. Saindon and Mr. Raymond noted that there were no invoices or commitments required for discussion or approval tonight.

4. Chairman Update(s):

Mr. Harris turned the floor over to Ms. Tedford as the chair of the SC. Ms. Tedford noted that this is the second consecutive joint meeting of the SC and BC and that the BC is invited to a scheduled April 12th meeting where the SC will vote on the decision made later tonight by the BC. She indicated that the SC's reason for having these joint meetings was not only to be fully informed of all project information and decision-making that lead to the April 12 vote, but also to show support of the decisions of the BC that have been made to date. She noted that the SC has been supportive of all BC conclusions throughout this process and that she is looking forward for the opportunity for both Committees to come together and support the selected preferred option.

MSBA PDP Meeting Update

Ms. Perry requested that Mr. Robert Bellucci sit with both Committees as the School Department's Director of Special Education to help cover this topic, Mr. Harris agreed and noted that himself, Ms. Perry, Mr. Bellucci, Mr. Lord, Mr. Saindon and Mr. Raymond participated in a discussion with the MSBA regarding gross square footage ("GSF") that was noted to the BC and SC at the last meeting. Ms. Perry encouraged any participants of that conversation to join tonight's discussion and continued by reminding the Committees that the Preliminary Design Program ("PDP") submission to MSBA always, by process, comes back with MSBA comments. One such comment which was briefly discussed at the previous joint meeting was the mention of a 340enrollment scenario, and Ms. Perry indicated discussion of this point was the purpose of the meeting with the MSBA. She indicated that the MSBA asked good questions and that she felt the discussion was a positive one. The 340-enrollment scenario was based on the MSBA's thinking that the District's plan was to empty/move some Special Education classes at the Glover School into the new facility, thereby freeing up additional Glover space for non-SPED students. She indicated to the MSBA, and to the Committees, that this assumption was not the District's intent, that the plan is not to move any Special Education services or children out of the Glover as a result of the new facility. She continued by explaining that 5-year projections of students requiring Special Education services shows that there is a population for the new facility that does not draw from the Glover School population. She noted that Special Education delivery in Marblehead is unique, including some classes that are capped at 5 or 6 students, and that after discussion the MSBA seemed to understand this explanation. Mr. Bellucci agreed and expanded on Ms. Perry's comments, explaining that even the existing Special Education services at Glover are taxed for space, noting integrated Pre-K sessions leave no

space for a full day program. He elaborated that for every 7 students another PreK classroom must be made and that there are 5 half-day sessions now. He noted that Ms. Perry was correct in that the MSBA thought the District's plan was to move classrooms from Glover to the new facility and reiterated her comments that such a scenario is not the case, adding that Special Education services will experience growth at a program level in the coming years. He noted that the MSBA asked for

some follow-up information regarding these Special Education enrollment projections and that they would be provided.

Mr. Saindon noted to the Committees that he was a participant in this MSBA meeting and that Ms. Perry and Mr. Bellucci provided great summaries. He noted that the District and project team will follow up with the MSBA via returned comments to the MSBA's PDP commentary and that the discussion of a revised Initial Space Summary ("ISS") to possibly reduce the 86k GSF program will be discussed as part of the upcoming Preferred Schematic Report ("PSR") phase and not as a component of the returned PDP comments. He continued, noting that the final GSF will not necessarily be locked down until the project submits the final Schematic Design package later in the year and even after that, there is a reasonable amount of fine tuning that will occur to the design's GSF. Mr. Harris added that any changes to the ISS would come through these Committees to be vetted and also noted that the PSR submission to the MSBA will result in a similar comments-and-response process. Mr. Weibust noted that a summary of this MSBA meeting/discussion was requested to be circulated to the BC prior to this meeting and asked what "fine tuning" of the design's GFS meant, noting this could impact a preference for site selection. He also indicated that he felt tonight's explanation was lacking in clarity and that it previously sounded like the project needed to cut down on Special Education space but that now everything was OK. Mr. Saindon explained that the facility's design was submitted via the PDP at 86k +/- GFS and that, as always projected, the MSBA template results in a base reimbursable GSF of only 71k +/-. The delta between those two square footages is, and has always has been, square footage that Marblehead needs to assume will be non-reimbursable and therefor 100% financially borne by the project. He continued, noting that the design will likely never be reduced all the way to the template-minimum of 71k GSF, but that he felt it could go as low as 81k after further vetting and deliberation by the School Department and BC. He noted that in his opinion such a change in GSF would not change the site plans or designs significantly enough to affect revisiting schemes that have been eliminated and added that such a change would not result in the project "fitting" on the Coffin site or "fitting well" on the Bud Orne site. Mr. Raymond agreed and added that he felt the theoretical 340 enrollment in the MSBA PDP comments was them thinking that there must be extra space being freed up at Glover and that the District was going to provide data to demonstrate this was not the case. Mr. Weibust noted that it sounds like the "fine tuning" might be targeted at around 5,000 square feet. Mr. Raymond agreed that was a generally accurate

assumption and that some Special Education and non-classroom areas would be tweaked down during the PSR and SD processes. He added an explanation that a 4-6k reduction in GSF, spread over 3 floors at the Bud Orne option, would only result in the building footprint being reduced by 1-2k square feet, which is only the size of a few rooms or parking spots. This, he explained, is the main reason why he and Leftfield agree that such adjustment should not create a scenario where options previously vetted and eliminated by the BC would need reconsideration. Mr. Weibust responded that this was the information and perspective he was looking for to be confident that the BC is properly considering all options. Mr. Saindon added that while it needs to be assumed that the MSBA will not participate in reimbursement for any GSF over 71k, there is a chance that the number will come up slightly depending on the MSBA's review of the usage of additional Special Education square footage. He noted that this won't be known until the completion of the PSR and SD processes. Mr. Berman requested confirmation that if the MSBA ultimately caps reimbursement at 71k, Marblehead is able to choose whether to build a facility up to 86k GSF but that any space over 71k would be paid for entirely by Marblehead, Mr. Saindon and Mr. Harris confirmed this was the case, Mr. Berman continued, noting that he felt like 73-80k GSF might ultimately be the range the BC will be looking at, so regardless there will be some amount that the Town will be funding 100%. He asked Ms. Perry and any School Department professionals what their comfort level was with possible reductions to the current/full 86k GSF, asking for clarity on "what would be missing or cut" in the scenarios where the GSF might be reduced into the discussed ranges. Ms. Perry noted that the Glover School included thousands of GSF above the MSBA guidelines, noting that this is common on school projects. Mr. Raymond referenced info contained in project documentation, noting that the MSBA allowable/reimbursable threshold was set at 67k GSF and that the Glover was built at 79k GSF, which is a similar overage to the current plan. Mr. Rogers noted that in the 81K+ GSF range, this project would be nearly proportional to Glover. Ms. Perry and Mr. Bellucci indicated that Special Education delivery at Glover is acceptable space-wise but if enrollment was 425 it would be crowded. Mr. Harris noted that the MSBA has a strong understanding of Marblehead's unique delivery of Special Education services.

OPM/Designer Update(s)Bud Orne Design Update(s)

Mr. Raymond recapped the existing Bud Orne option and presented an RDA analysis and test-fit of a new variation of the Bud Orne scheme that responded to prior Committee discussion and requests. He noted that his team put this new option through the same process of attempting to optimize it then objectively list it's benefits and challenges. He noted that the new option does not significantly change the layout of the site but brings traffic in from Sheppard (which would need to be widened on the school property with a turn-in lane so that stacking could begin on

the street, directs traffic flow vertically through the site and out onto West Shore Drive. Other site egress for this option would include a right turn from West Shore onto Evans followed by stacking and merging with incoming traffic from Sheppard, then exiting back out to West Shore Drive. Mr. Raymond noted that his team and the traffic engineer do not believe this scheme would be any better in terms of handling congestion and providing safe access, and if could in fact be worse. He reviewed site sections and shadow studies for the new option which showed close proximity to abutter and an even greater impact of shadows to nearby structures. Mr. Berman thanked Mr. Raymond and his team for creating this last-minute option to respond to Committee points of interest. He noted he felt it was very important that the Bud Orne option was looked at from every possible angle and that this additional analysis makes good on that goal. He concluded that the BC has tried every option to make Bud Orne work as best it could. Ms. Martin noted that for this option she is concerned with the lack of potential emergency access around the building. Mr. Saindon indicated agreement, and Mr. Raymond noted that despite there being appropriate turning radius for most equipment, this concern is valid and would need to be vetted with Public Safety officials. Ms. Tedford pointed out a typo on the handout provided to the Committees that listed the 450-M.1 option a "2 story" option when it's in fact 3 stories in the detailed noted and diagrams.

(continued next page)

Joint Meeting of the Gerry School Building Committee and the Marblehead School Committee Meeting Minutes April 5, 2018

Glover School Cafeteria- 9 Maple Street - 7:00PM

Selection of Preferred Option - Building Committee Motion/Vote

Mr. Harris noted that despite there being three options listed on the current Committee handout unless there was a motion to consider the new Bud Orne option then only two are technically on the table for final Committee consideration. There was no action taken by the BC to include the new option in the final vote between options 450-L.1 and 450-H.1.

Ms. Fox made a motion to conduct a roll call vote on the preferred option between the Bell 450-L.1 and Bud Orne 450-H.1 schemes. The motion was seconded by Mr. McGinn.

Comments made during the roll call vote are referenced and included below the roll call chart:

Member# Comment, Below	Bell 450L.1	BudOrne 450H.1	Absent	Abstained
Emily Barron	Х			
Jackie Belf-Becker (non-voting)				
Ben Berman	X			
Eileen D'Amour ¹	X			
Sarah Fox	X			
Dave Harris	X			
Ken Lord	X			
Kelly Lyons	Х			
Amanda Maniaci	Х			
Katherine Martin	Х			
Richard Matthews	Х			
John McGinn	Х			
Maryann Perry ²	Х			
Jeremy Pollender			Χ	
Elizabeth Rudzinski	Х			
Sean Satterfield	Х			
Bob Schaeffner (non-voting)				
Cindy Schieffer	Х			
Aimee Sheppard	Х			
Ben Szalewicz	X			
Ralph Wallace	X			
Erik Weibust ³	X			
Donna Zaeske	X			
Jim Zisson	X			
Totals	21	0	1	0

- Ms. D'Amour noted that while she is sad that this vote leaves the Coffin/Gerry area without a nearby school, she supports the Bell as the best option.
- Ms. Perry thanked the Community members who have participated throughout the process and noted that their voices have been heard. She continued that she badly wanted the Bud Orne option to work out and felt that the opportunity to join three school communities into one on a new site, all while keeping a school on the North side of Town, was of great appeal. She initially imagined a big, open campus but as analysis progressed serious constraints from wetlands, proximity and impact to neighbors and shadows made it clear and evident that the Bell option was the superior choice. She noted that the Bell's geographic location in Town was not a factor in its favor, but most other categories, including the delivery of education, show that it is clearly the best site.
- Mr. Weibust urged the SC and School Department to reconsider the presented plan to relocate students due to construction and find a more practical and educationally sound solution.

Mr. McGinn made a motion to recommend the preferred option and site selection of Bell 450L.1 to the School Committee for their consideration. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fox and approved unanimously by the members of the BC present, 21-0-1-0.

Schedule / PSR - Next Steps

Mr. Saindon noted the next item on the schedule is another joint meeting with the SC on April 12 at the High School Library at 7pm. Ms. Tedford clarified that the BC will be in the audience and called into session only for the vote on this decision so that any BC member present (in the event of a quorum) could speak. The BC discussed the schedule for upcoming meetings, noting there are days when there is a lot of local activity. A decision on meetings after the April 12th SC meeting will be established as other events are schedule.

6. PSR Update(s):

Covered above.

7. New Business

None.

8. Community Outreach / Correspondence Received

Mr. Lord noted that he has received and forwarded many emails from the Community to the Building Committee.

Ms. Schiefer noted support of Ms. Perry's thanks to those members of the Community who have participated in this process via email, BC meetings and various public forums.

9. Public Comment

Kim Day – 18 Liberty Road – Congratulated the Committee on this big accomplishment and noted there has been a lot of hard work. Noted that she felt a better articulated plan to house students during construction would help Community members understand the thinking that went into it. Mr. Harris noted that this plan hasn't been voted on by the SC yet.

Judith Black – Noted the amazing amount of work that has gone into this process, and recommended additional attention be given to issues of sustainable design and alternate energies. Mr. Harris and Mr. Saindon noted that this definitely would be part of the process moving forward, that the project would aim for a LEEDv4 silver rating and that sustainability measures would be discussed and analyzed in terms of cost to install versus return on the initial investments.

Alistair Connor – Thanked the Committees for their work and noted the possibility of a turning lane out of Bell. Vehicular, parent and bus flow assets and issues for the Bell site were discussed briefly, and Mr. Harris noted that this will be developed further in the coming weeks and month.

Bonne Carriage – Sheppard Street – Noted her belief in the importance of neighborhood schools.

10. Adjournment

A BC motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Berman and seconded by Ms. Fox. The motion was approved unanimously by those members of the BC present, 21-0-1-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:08PM.

A SC motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Lipsitz and seconded by Mr. Harris. The motion was approved unanimously by those members of the SC present, 5-0-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:08PM.