

**Town of Swampscott
School Building Committee
Hadley Elementary School Project
Tuesday, October 13, 2020
6:35 p.m. – 10:02 p.m.
Meeting Held via Zoom**

M I N U T E S

Committee Members Present: Suzanne Wright, Martha Sybert, Robert Bell, Pamela Angelakis, Max Kasper, Ilana Bebchick, Martha Raymond, Michael McClung, Tim Cooper, Kevin Breen, Jose Alvarado, Eric Stewart, A.Randall Hughes, David Zucker, Lytania Mackey Knowles, Scott Burke, Catie Porter-Roberts, Kathleen Huntley, Matt Kirschner, Christina Collela

Committee Members Absent: Sean Fitzgerald

Others Present: Paul Kalous (OPM, Hill International), Vivian Varbedian (OPM, Hill International), Adam Tabbert (OPM, Hill International), Leigh Sherwood (Architect, Lavallee Brensinger Architects), David Harris (Architect, Lavallee Brensinger Architects)

Call to Order: Chairperson Suzanne Wright made a motion to call the meeting in order, seconded by Michael McClung. The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

1. Minutes from prior meeting:

A motion was made by Michael McClung to approve the previous meeting minutes from September 3, 2020, and September 29, 2020. The motion was seconded by Kevin Breen. A unanimous vote was received to approve the 9.3.2020 minutes and 9.29.2020 minutes.

2. Public comments

Suzanne Wright gave instructions on how to sign up to make a public comment in several ways including; texting, email, and zoom.

3. Schedule Update:

Recent Activity

David Harris gave an update on recent activity including; community engagement, traffic analysis, financials, and sustainable design. Community engagement included; analyzing the survey results and the joint meeting between the SBC and town committees on September 29, 2020. The traffic analysis included a bussing study for grades k-8 in the entire district. Financials included a PSR estimate review and a town financial analysis.

Sustainable Design includes a meeting with National Grid and Slipstream on October 15, 2020, and Drafting the LEED Scorecard for the team's review. David indicated a traffic study was performed analyzing the impacts of student density, vehicular volumes, and safety.

Two-Week Look-Ahead

David Harris gave a two-week look-ahead on items including; community engagement, preferred schematic report submittal, and sustainable design. Community engagement involves a community meeting to select the preferred solution on October 20, 2020. Preferred schematic report submittal includes; educational program update, curriculum change approval, and ongoing submittal assembly. Sustainable design includes a project update meeting with National Grid and Slipstream on October 15, 2020.

Three-month overview

David Harris gave a three-month overview. November includes the preferred schematic report submittal on November 6, 2020, responding to the MSBA review comments on PSR, and an MSBA conference call. December includes an MSBA facilities assessment subcommittee meeting on December 2, 2020, and an MSBA board of directors meeting (approval for SD). January includes the beginning of the schematic design phase. Vivian Varbedian recapped the project schedule with a linear timeline graphic.

4. Goals

Tonight's Goals

V. Varbedian gave three goals that are to be achieved tonight. The goals include; selecting a sustainable design rating system, selecting a preferred option for the PSR submittal, and authorizing the PSR submittal to the MSBA.

Community Project Goals

V. Varbedian indicated the four main pillars that have helped guide the team have the entire Swampscott community in mind. These project goals include; education, site & traffic, sustainability, and community.

Educational Goals

V. Varbedian indicated the educational goals motto was "Equity, Inclusion, and Excellence". The goals include; aligning grades district-wide, improving student placement, creating small learning neighborhoods, reducing class sizes in primary grades, improving scheduling and resource efficiency, and supporting faculty collaboration.

Sustainability Goals

David Harris indicated the sustainability goals including; energy efficiency, open space and site resources, interior-environment and wellness, operation, maintenance & life cycle. Energy efficiency includes; meeting the EUI target between 20-30, utility incentives, high-performance envelope (balanced with first costs), and maximizing renewable energy resources. Open space and site resources include; preserving open space (increasing if possible), creating high-quality open space, preserving and restoring trees, promoting storm water infiltration, and using native plantings. Interior-environment and wellness include; healthy and durable interior materials, great daylighting and acoustics, and excellent indoor air quality. The operation, maintenance, and life-cycle includes; economical and reliable building systems that are practical, low operating costs, life cycle analysis, simple to operate, easily maintained building resiliency, and operational continuity.

5. Sustainable Design Rating System

David Harris indicated the differences between CHPS and LEED comparison. CHPS is built around schools while LEED is more general with school modifications. CHPS has a greater number of prerequisites documentation required than LEED. AEC project teams are most familiar with LEED and allow a more streamlined process. The majority of recent MSBA projects are using LEED. It is important to the town, CHPS credit could be pursued under LEED as an innovation credit. Both systems meet MSBA requirements and support town goals. It was indicated CHPS would be a good selection for higher achievement and challenge level specific to the School. It was indicated LEED is a good selection for a simpler and more straightforward approach. LEED also has brand name recognition.

Max Kasper on behalf of the Sustainability Subcommittee's recommendation made a motion to approve LEED as the sustainable design rating system for the project. The motion was seconded by Kevin Breen. A roll call vote was performed by V. Varbedian and all were in favor.

6. Public Comments

Lisa Julian Hayes indicated her support for the k-4 at the Stanley site.

Sara Munoz indicated gratitude towards the educational considerations the project team has taken.

Gale Brock indicated she sent a petition to the SBC. Gale indicated she is not in favor of Stanley-site option due to traffic, wetlands, and the church property.

S. Wright indicated the SBC has received the petition.

There were people from the public who indicated he is in favor of the Stanley site option.

Taryn indicated she sent a petition to the SBC. She is not in favor of a district 3-5 at Hadley and has traffic concerns.

S. Wright indicated the SBC has received the petition.

A woman indicated she has heard a school in the neighborhood could negatively affect their home values.

Laurie indicated she is opposed to a school in the Hadley area due to traffic.

7. Summary of options

Leigh Sherwood began to provide an overview of the four options.

New Option 1

Option 2: New 3-story school at Hadley. (Grades k-4, 390 students)

It was indicated this option has 35 of 50 parking spaces and 16,000 SF plus Linscott Park as a play area (41 SF/student).

Advantages include; a 3-story school with urban character/scale, shared central spaces, small learning neighborhoods, connects to Linscott Park, and a good educational layout. Limitations included; not meeting district goals, limited on-site queuing, limited parking, limited play area, demolition of Hadley would cause disruption resulting in temporary classroom costs, and Stanley/ Clarke would receive no improvements. A rendering displayed the height of the building in 3D.

New Option 2

Option 1: New 4-story school at Hadley. (Grades 3-5, 540 students)

Hadley site, 3-5 (540 students), 4 stories, 71-83m.

It was indicated this option has 35 of 70 parking spaces and 16,000 SF plus Linscott Park as a play area (29 SF/ student).

Advantages included; a 4-story school with urban character/scale, meeting many district goals, shared central spaces, small learning neighborhoods, connecting to Linscott park, and a good educational layout. Limitations included; limited on-site queuing, limited parking, limited play area, demolition of Hadley would cause disruption resulting in temporary classroom costs, and Stanley/ Clarke would receive no improvements. A rendering displayed the height of the building in 3D.

Leigh indicated if this was the selected option a sister school would have to be built in the future for k-2.

New Option 3

Option 1: New 3-story school at Stanley. (Grades k-4, 900 students)

Stanley site, k-4 (900 students), 3 stories, 97-114m (based on PDP phase estimates)

It was indicated this option has 90 of 120 parking spaces and 62,000 SF plus Ewing Woods as a play area (68 SF/ student).

Advantages include; a 3-story school along the woods, good distance from neighbors, good side entry, good views and fit, loop road exit at Whitman to UU parking lot, safe play, safe pedestrian paths, good educational layout, good solar orientation. Limitations included; limited on-site queuing adds to street traffic, demolition of Hadley would cause disruption resulting in temporary classroom costs.

New Option 4

Option 2: New 2-story school at Stanley. (Grades k-4, 900 students)

Stanley site, k-4, 900 students, 2 stories, 97-114m (based on PDP phase estimates).

It was indicated this option has 90 of 120 parking spaces and 62,000 SF plus Ewing Woods as a play area (68 SF/ student).

Advantages included; 1-2 story entry side with 2-story classroom wings behind, better on-site queuing length, steps away from neighbors with good tree buffer, side entry, views and fit, loop road exit at Whitman to UU parking lot, safe play and pedestrian paths, educational layout, solar orientation, and maintains the use of Stanley throughout construction. One limitation identified was on-site queuing adding to the street traffic. Another limitation was the temporary classroom costs for students during the demolition of Stanley. A rendering displayed the height of the building in 3D.

C. Porter-Roberts indicated 1,373 responses were received in the town-wide survey. Out of those responses, 1059 were unique, meaning, respondents were able to post new responses as options were eliminated or modified.

8. Survey Findings

A pie chart displayed the surveys “education priority” findings: Hadley only: option 2 (17%), Hadley only: option 1 (6%), District-wide 3-5: option 2 (5%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (28%), district-wide k-4: option 2 (8%), district-wide k-4: option 1 (35%).

Katie indicated out of the 18 SBC responses, a unanimous decision was reached on the district-wide k-4: option 1 (100%).

A pie chart displayed the SBC survey “site & traffic priority” findings: (76.5%) were in favor of district-wide k-4: option 1, (11.8%) for Hadley only: option 2, and (11.8%) for district-wide 3-5: option 1.

A pie chart displayed the town surveys “site & traffic priority” findings: Hadley only: option 2 (18%), Hadley only: option 1 (7%), District-wide 3-5: option 2 (8%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (25%), district-wide k-4: option 2 (7%), district-wide k-4: option 1 (35%).

A pie chart displayed the SBC survey “sustainability priority” findings: (94.4%) were in favor of district-wide k-4: option 1 and (5.6%) for district-wide k-4: option 1.

A pie chart displayed the town surveys “sustainability priority” findings: Hadley only: option 2 (16%), Hadley only: option 1 (7%), District-wide 3-5: option 2 (5%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (26%), district-wide k-4: option 2 (8%), district-wide k-4: option 1 (38%).

A pie chart displayed the SBC surveys “community priority” findings: district-wide 3-5: option 1 (66.7%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (27.6%), and Hadley only: option 2 (5.7%).

A pie chart displayed the town surveys “community priority” findings: Hadley only: option 2 (17%), Hadley only: option 1 (7%), District-wide 3-5: option 2 (5%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (28%), district-wide k-4: option 2 (8%), district-wide k-4: option 1 (35%).

A pie chart displayed the SBC surveys “overall preference” findings: district-wide k-4: option 1 (88.3%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (11.1%), and Hadley only: option 2 (0.6%).

A pie chart displayed the town surveys “overall preference” findings: Hadley only: option 2 (17%), Hadley only: option 1 (7%), District-wide 3-5: option 2 (5%), district-wide 3-5: option 1 (27%), district-wide k-4: option 2 (8%), district-wide k-4: option 1 (36%).

9. Discussion

Superintendent Pam Angelakis indicated that the district-wide 3-5: option 1, does not meet the educational needs. Pam Angelakis also mentioned that both district-wide k-4 options do meet educational needs.

Robert Bell indicated the small school feel will not get lost in the district-wide k-4 options. R. Bell indicated the increasing size of schools due to consolidation is becoming more common across the state.

Martha Raymond indicated that the district-wide k-4 options both meet the diverse needs of students throughout the town.

Eric Stewart indicated he agreed that a district-wide k-4 delivers the best educational needs of students and staff. Eric Stewart indicated concern over traffic and the community site-survey results. It was indicated the community site-survey results are 50/50. David Zucker indicated that early public engagement is positive for passing the vote. David Zucker indicated his concern over the community's concern about the school's building size.

Eric Stewart indicated a question about the length of time in a queue.

Rebecca Brown indicated the differences between a.m. and p.m. queuing impacts.

Scott Burke indicated a question of the likelihood of a current busing program with a similar 3 square-mile town. Scott Burke also wonders about the traffic density at both sites.

Rebecca Brown indicated that the majority of traffic mitigation for Stanley has been on-site. Rebecca Brown indicated Hadley's queuing area is limited and would have greater cost impacts than Stanley. Rebecca Brown indicated that bussing is successful when the towns encourage it. Jose Alvarado indicated he visited a school with a functional bussing method in place.

Neal Duffy initiated a discussion of the size and number of classrooms.

Scott Burke indicated a question on the limitations of Linscott Park. Burke indicated a question about "daylighting". Burke indicated a question regarding site-work when comparing the Stanley options. Pam Angelakis and I. Bebchick indicated that the area was currently being used for school activities.

Tim Cooper indicated a question regarding the footprint of Stanley's options. L.

Sherwood indicated orientation is crucial for daylighting. Sherwood indicated the MSBA appreciates a linear process that compares multiple options. Sherwood indicated that Stanley option 2 may require less site-work. L. Sherwood indicated neither Stanley's options are encroaching on wetlands. Sherwood indicated both Stanley options have to consider the disruption impacts of either, construction next door, and the relocation of faculty and staff. Harris indicated the MSBA requires a submittal regarding the amount of disruption. D. Zucker indicated a question over the use of recreational space and its ownership (existing Stanley). D. Harris indicated it is recreational/school property but they coordinate with each other's departments. It was indicated the property is not

subject to article-97. S. Wright indicated one of the open space committee requirements is to have no loss of Swampscott owned property. Sherwood indicated a smaller footprint leaves more surrounding land for develop. N. Duffy spoke about sustainability. Duffy indicated the EUI target is 30 or below. M. Kasper indicated one is more sustainable than the other. C. Collela indicated the benefits of having staff and students consolidated. K. Breen indicated a question regarding option 2 and if the estimates accounted for a temporary facility. Sherwood indicated how the conceptual estimates were derived. V. Varbedian indicated the cost estimates price reflects an additional 20-30% already applied for soft costs. A temporary facility is an example of one of these costs that would be covered under this. Varbedian indicated the conceptual estimates are on the conservative side. M. McClung indicated that educational, community and sustainability are the most important things to consider. McClung indicated there are financial considerations. McClung indicated that many topics and productive discussions took place at the joint meeting last week. McClung indicated it was productive because committees talked about combining both cost impacts and what best serves the students. McClung indicated that during the joint meeting a unanimous vote was received that a single school is the most financially prudent solution. McClung indicated he is happy to have personal discussions with anyone who needs further information. David Zucker indicated Stanley's support in the community is based on a distrust of what is going to happen to the site if it's not selected. D. Zucker indicated that the site not selected needs to be utilized in the right way. Neal Duffy mentioned that once the decision is made on which site to be used than the other one needs to begin planning for space. A.Randall Hughes voiced her support for consolidating K-4 and tonight's discussions have helped ease her concerns. Kevin Breen also felt that consolidating now saves money in the future.

10. Vote

Catie Porter Roberts motioned to vote on the preferred grade configuration, seconded by Scott Burke. Roll Call vote was performed and all were in favor to move forward with a Consolidated District Wide K-4 at the Stanley Site. A.Randall Hughes motioned to continue the conversation and the deliberation in the selection between option 1 and option 2 within the consolidated District wide K-4 at Stanley. Scott Burke seconded the motion. Roll call vote determined that all were in favor of continuing the selection process to a few more days. It was decided that a meeting will be held on Thursday, October 15, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. to select the preferred option for the Stanley site location

Adjournment

Eric Stewart made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:02 p.m. and was seconded by Kevin Breen. All in favor.