Present: Chair Sharon Gray, Vice Chair Thomas Ulfelder, Jane Andrews, Virginia Ferko, Marjorie Freiman, Steve Gagosian, Joubin Hassanein, Meghan Jop, Matt Kelley, David Lussier, Cynthia Mahr; Ellen Quirk, Heather Sawitsky, Jose Soliva, FMD Project Manager Kevin Kennedy; Alex Pitkin of SMMA; Kristen Olsen of SMMA, Martene Dion of SMMA, Bill Maclay of Maclay Architects; Tim Bonfatti of Compass Project Management and Jeff D’Amico of Compass Project Management. Absent: Ryan Hutchins, Matt King, Charlene Cook, Jeffery Dees.

Ms. Gray opened the meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. She announced that the meeting was being aired live by Wellesley Media and is being recorded for later viewing.

Citizen Speak
Elizabeth Lange, Pembroke Road spoke on behalf of herself and some other Hunnewell kindergarten parents in attendance to express support for an early Hunnewell. She said if the St. Paul’s option results in delay, she prefers other swing space options that would allow early Hunnewell.

Sue Mangiacotti, Leighton Road, Co-President of the Hunnewell PTO, asked the SBC to follow the lead of the educators in developing options for swing space and to consider the recent fire and the column that crumbled at Hunnewell and support Internal Swing Space and an early Hunnewell.

Amy McCarron, Lawrence Road, spoke in support of a late Hunnewell plan. She said the early plan does not provide adequate swing space or parking. Additionally she urged the members of the SC and BOS to vote to appoint Betsy Roberti to the SBC as the Advisory Committee’s representative despite the fact that Ms. Roberti has expressed an opinion on the HHU matter since, in her opinion, other members of the SBC have by their previous votes, expressed an opinion on HHU.

Niki Ofenloch, Sabrina Road, Co-President of the Hunnewell PTO spoke in favor of Internal Swing Space. She said even those Hunnewell parents who are not enthusiastic feel they can make it work.

Ashley Quates, Benvenue Street, expressed support for Internal Swing Space and the belief that Hunnewell parents will do what it takes to support an early Hunnewell given the condition of the building.

SBC Business

Approval of Minutes
Mr. Soliva suggested an amendment to page 6 of the draft April 25, 2019 minutes to expand his comments concerning Option A/A1 revisions by adding the following language “and a desire to relocate the gym and cafeteria to the Brook side”.
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Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the minutes of April 4, 2019 and April 25, 2019, as amended. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried. Mr. Soliva abstained as he was absent on April 4.

Discussion: SBC Public Comment policy

Ms. Gray distributed a draft SBC Policy on Public Comment for review. Mr. Kelley said that School Committee and Board of Selectmen each have public comment policies. This draft is similar to those and based on a draft circulated by Town Counsel. Key features include:

- Comment period at or near beginning of the meeting;
- Comment limited to matters in the SBC’s purview;
- People who comment are asked to identify themselves;
- Comments to be directed to the chair and not for individual members to respond in the moment;
- Chair may limit comment period to 15 minutes total, 3 minutes per speaker;
- Prohibits disruptive or abusive comments or conduct.

Ms. Freiman asked if comments on agenda items should be heard at the beginning of a meeting or at the point in the meeting when they are discussed. Mr. Kelley said efficiency might dictate hearing all comments at the beginning.

Hardy/Upham Project

Discussion/Vote: Review and approve project Invoice
Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from Compass Project Management. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the project invoice CPM 74-02 in the amount of $12,888.00. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Hunnewell Project

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from Compass Project Management. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the project invoice CPM 69-10 in the amount of $26,178.00. Mr. Gagosian seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kennedy distributed a project invoice from SMMA. Mr. Ulfelder moved to approve the SMMA project invoice 50648 in the amount of $56,940.00. Mr. Hassanein seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Update Hunnewell Fire
Dr. Lussier and Ms. Quirk provided a brief update on the recent fire at Hunnewell. Dr. Lussier said strong indications are that the fire was electrical, originating in one of the fourth grade classrooms, damaging that classroom and an adjacent room. All building systems have been tested, as have surface and air quality. The school will re-open on Monday.
Public Forum Recap
Ms. Gray reported that the SBC has received and is taking into account emails and other feedback that has recently been received, including comments received at the May 9th public forum. She reported that following presentations by committee members and the project team there were comments and questions from members of the community. Speakers expressed a variety of disparate opinions concerning early and late Hunnewell and swing space options, sustainability and other issues.

Dr. Lussier said that two points require clarification to the public:

- The Upham/Hardy project is going as fast as it can through the MSBA process and is not related to the Hunnewell project.
- Feasibility studies are about bringing options forward that may later be ruled out.

He said that it is his responsibility to push for an early Hunnewell to best support children.

Mr. Hassanein said there has been distortion of information about Internal Swing Space and how it would work. More details should be communicated.

Ms. Andrews said she was pleased by the engagement of the community and Mr. Ulfelder said emails and comments present an opportunity to better communicate and to improve the process.

Discussion: Parking
Christopher Heep from Town Counsel’s office provide a brief overview of the Dover Amendment and how it might apply to a school building project. Mr. Heep explained that a state statutory provision known as the Dover Amendment offers some flexibility with respect to application of the dimensional requirements of the zoning bylaw if compliance would unreasonably restrict an educational use of a property. A particular dimensional regulation could be found to be unreasonable if its application substantially diminishes or detracts from the usefulness of a proposed educational structure, or impairs the character of the institution’s campus without appreciably advancing the municipality’s legitimate concerns, or if it will impose excessive costs on the educational use without significant gains to the municipality.

The Zoning Board of Appeal (ZBA) could be asked to engage in a fact based analysis to determine if specific dimensional requirements of the Zoning Bylaw are reasonable as applied to this school use. Factors that might pertain to that analysis include educational program requirements or environmental constraints of the site. Also considered could be the burden on the educational use to comply. The ZBA’s analysis would be guided by a large body of case law.

For the Hunnewell project, the analysis would include whether exceeding lot coverage requirements by a small amount, approximately 5%, due to the need to provide parking on site, is reasonable. Ms. Jop was of the opinion that a solid argument to the ZBA could be made in support of this determination, which would be requested during the permitting phase.

Mr. Pitkin reviewed the existing parking areas on the Cameron lot and the Library driveway noting that the school currently uses 25 spaces there. The school administration has predicted a need for a total of 65 spaces, requiring 40 spaces on the Hunnewell site. He showed a comparison of a potential layout of
40 spaces for both building options resulting in lot coverage estimates of 28.9% for the Addition/Renovation option and 29.5% for New Construction, both higher than the 25% lot coverage zoning requirement. Mr. Pitkin noted that there will be refinements of these numbers during the design phase.

Ms. Lanza, representing the Library Trustees noted that the total number of spaces is not much more than currently available and asked if the pickup line would be addressed. In response to this question and one by Ms. Ferko, Mr. Pitkin said that parent parking and pickup would be further analyzed in the design phase. Ms. Quirk said she would need to manage the drop-off and pick-up for the expanded school population.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that Mr. Pitkin has shown that there is capacity with both the design options to park a sufficient number of vehicles on the site to meet the building needs, and Town Counsel has provided information that allows us to go forward with confidence that either of the design options could be permitted.

**Discussion: Energy modeling cost analysis**

Ms. Dion reviewed the preliminary energy modeling for the New Construction and Addition/Renovation options that was previously presented to the committee in detail. She said that Bill Mcclay and his team analyzed the financial impact of proceeding with a plan for a net zero ready building.

Mr. Mcclay presented a comparative analysis of the 30-year cumulative capital, maintenance, energy and finance costs with solar (PV) for the New Construction and Addition/Renovation options if the project is either:

- Stretch Code compliant (current);
- Net Zero Ready;
- Partial Net Zero (40-60%, based on projected PV on the roof); or
- Net Zero (assumes additional structure or ground mounted PV).

Mr. Mcclay said the cost and EIU associated with the Addition/Renovation option were slightly higher than the New Construction option.

Mr. Mcclay then presented a cost and EIU comparison of the existing Hunnewell building at 36,000 sf (with and without enclosure replacement) to the new Construction option at 76,000 sf (2020 Stretch Code and Net Zero Ready all electric). The energy costs associated with the old small building are approximately the same as costs for the substantially larger new building. EIU for a new stretch code compliant building would be only about half of the EUI of the existing building. EUI for a Net Zero Ready building is dramatically lower, at about a quarter of the EUI of the existing building.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that the difference in construction cost for the Net Zero Ready vs. Stretch Code compliant building is estimated to be $490,000, adding just 1% to the cost of the building. He also noted that conversion to all-electric energy at a later point would be costly.
Discussion/Vote: Hunnewell Building Option

Mr. Pitkin briefly reviewed the design elements in the Educational Plan:

- Neighborhood learning communities/flexible space
- Indoor/Outdoor Connectivity
- Safety and Security
- Sustainability
- Community Use and Access
- Compact Design

Mr. Pitkin then showed slides depicting the site and floor plans and characteristics of the Addition Renovation Option:

- Save only the most valued (front) portion of the 1938 building (option not dependent upon attempt to preserve the Oak tree)
- Classroom neighborhood learning commons configuration less optimal
- Core educational environment at the quiet side of the site less optimal
- Cafetorium & Gym link to outdoor play environments
- Maximize outdoor play area at back of site
- Access to community uses less optimal
- Main entrance(identity)
- Safety & Security

Mr. Pitkin then briefly showed slides depicting the site and floor plans and characteristics of the New Construction option:

- Classroom neighborhood learning commons configuration
  - Compact closely organized “community” of spaces
  - Locate core educational environment at quiet side of site
- Orient building entrance to face the neighborhood
- Cafetorium & Gym link to outdoor play environments
- Maximize outdoor play area at back of site
- Access to community uses
- Service areas less optimal
- Main entrance(identity)
- Safety & Security

Mr. Soliva referenced the Wellesley Historical Commission’s request for modifications to the Addition/Renovation option and asked if there was opportunity for SMMA to provide a design iteration that includes these modifications for review.

Mr. Gagosian and Mr. Ulfelder noted that the current Addition/Renovation option is the solution SMMA presented as the best way to incorporate the 1938 building and meet educational program demands. Mr. Pitkin said that he thinks the plan for the Addition/ Renovation option could be tightened a bit, but
he does not think that the modifications suggested by the WHC would fit on the site or meet the educators’ expressed concerns.

Dr. Lussier reiterated that there was unanimous reaction from the Hunnewell staff that the New Construction option would best meet the educational needs of the students going forward. Ms. Andrews and Ms Ferko expressed doubt that additional time to consider WHC’s proposed modifications to the Addition/Renovation option would be useful.

Mr. Hassanein said that our charge is to meet the educational needs of the students. The educators have made a case for the option that best meets those needs and to spend time trying to mold the Addition/Renovation option into a close enough compromise would be fruitless.

Ms Gray said that the SBC appreciates the WHC’s work to advocate for buildings they deem historic and their efforts to push the feasibility study to find an equivalent option that preserves the 1938 portion of the building. While the town has successfully preserved many of its historic buildings, it can be difficult to reuse an old school building in a new school design, particularly on a constrained site.

Mr. Gagosian acknowledged Mr. Pitkin’s efforts to make the historical portion of the building work and to create a visually appealing solution, but said it did not achieve what building users need. He said we need to put forward the best solution for the users and the taxpayers.

Mr. Soliva acknowledged that educators are the primary stakeholders here but noted that there are other stakeholders whose interests should be considered as we decide.

Mr. Ulfelder moved that the School Building Committee recommend the New Construction option for the Hunnewell School including the sustainability package and parking options as shown and proposed. Mr. Kelley seconded. The motion carried 11-1.

**Discussion: Swing Space**

Mr. Kennedy reviewed work that has been done to date to evaluate the St. Paul’s School and Parish Hall as a swing space option. He reported that SMMA studied the buildings and reported to the SBC in March 2018 that the buildings could reasonably support 280 students. Project cost estimates at that time presumed that the required work would be extensive enough to trigger ADA compliance and ranged from $4.7 million for repairs to $7.2 million for a major renovation. Mr. Kennedy presented a project timeline for work to lease and renovate St. Paul’s School as swing space based on the work SMMA proposed. Key dates on that timeline include a request for design funding at the 2020 Annual Town Meeting, a request for construction funding at the 2021 Annual Town Meeting and completion in July 2022 for use as swing space.

Mr. Kennedy reviewed variables and challenges associated with leasing and renovating St. Paul’s related to availability, timing, investment in a non-public asset, and required approvals.
Mr. Kennedy then outlined the next steps that would be involved in evaluating the St. Paul’s option which include confirming interest by the Archdiocese, developing a scope of work and amending SMMA’s contract to perform additional analysis, including a consideration of a limited scope of repair at a cost that does not trigger full ADA compliance requirements. Mr. Kennedy said that renovations costing more than $1.6 million would likely trigger ADA compliance requirements.

Mr. Bonfatti reported that a parish representative said there is active interest in the school by another party and it is not clear what lease term the Archdiocese would require if the property is available.

Mr. Ulfelder noted that pursuing a lower cost repair project would not compromise safety. In response to a question by Ms. Andrews, Mr. Gagosian said that the building would need to be made accessible at the primary entrance and an ADA bathroom installed on that floor, but that work would be minimal compared with the work required if full ADA compliance is triggered.

Dr Lussier noted that St. Pauls is an attractive option because it is a school building and is in the Hunnewell attendance zone, but a challenge is that it would delay an early Hunnewell by a year, although still allow that project to be complete 2 years faster than a late Hunnewell project.

Mr. Bonfatti reviewed other swing space options currently on the table. He reviewed issues with the full school of modular units at the Sprague parking lot that have been previously discussed and noted also that there remain buildability concerns related to the disruption of the existing storm water drainage system.

Mr. Gagosian agreed that there are sub-surface issues at the Sprague site and suggested the SBC pass on this option for now. Dr. Lussier agreed.

There was general discussion about the need for SBC to have a clear understanding of the late and early Hunnewell options on a side-by-side comparison.

The Internal Swing Space options was discussed and there was general agreement that SBC should continue to evaluate it as an option. Mr. Kelley said that the School Committee agreed to take this option off the table in light of overwhelmingly negative feedback but recent feedback has been positive, warranting reconsideration.

Mr. Hassanain said that having information about the option of an accelerated construction schedule would enhance our ability to fairly vet swing space options. Some options may be more acceptable if their duration were limited to a year or eighteen months.

Mr. Bonfatti said that next steps are a joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen and School Committee concerning the building option and at the following SBC meeting more detail on swing space would be presented.
Ms. Gray thanked Ms. Andrews for her thoughtful participation as Advisory Committee’s representative on the SBC and for her dedicated service to the Town in many ways over the years, including as a member of the School Committee. Ms. Andrews announced that she is moving to San Diego. She said that her service on Advisory and the SBC has been an incredible experience and she will miss the many people she has worked with on those committees. She particularly thanked David Lussier, Sharon Gray and Matt Kelley for their persistence and effort over many years on the school building projects.

**Adjournment**

At approximately 8:50 p.m., upon a motion by Mr. Ulfelder and second by Mr. Kelley, the Committee unanimously voted to adjourn

**Documents and Exhibits Used**

- Meeting Minutes of April 4, 2019 and April 25, 2019
- Draft Public Comment Policy (May 16, 2019)
- Project Invoice: Compass Project Management CPM 74-02 ($12,888.00)
- Project Invoice: Compass Project Management CPM 69-10 ($26,178.00)
- Project Invoice: SMMA 50648 ($56,940.00)
- Compass Project Management and SMMA Power Point Presentation to SBC 5/16/2019
- Maclay Architects 5/16 draft - 30 Year Cumulative Capital, Maintenance, Energy and Finance Costs with Solar
- St Paul’s School Timeline FMD Power Point Presentation to SBC 5/16/2019