

High School Building Committee  
 Revere High School Committee Room  
 101 School Street  
 Revere, MA 02151

Mayor Brian Arrigo- Chair	Susan Gravellese-Vice Chair		
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	Donald Ciramella	Jennifer Hayes	Patrick Keefe
Dianne Kelly	John Perella	Michael Piccardi	Nicholas Rystrom
Carl Svendsen	Richard Viscay	Jerry Visconti	Brian Dakin
Linda Liporto	James Riefstahl	Jim Rogers	Lynn Stapleton
Robert Bell	Daniel Colli	Joe Drown	Dawn Guarriello

**Meeting Minutes for October 21, 2021**

A scheduled meeting of the High School Building Committee was held on October 21, 2021 at 5:30pm, online via Zoom Meeting format. Committee members and attendees present were:

<b><u>Voting Member</u></b>	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Notes</u></b>
Brian Arrigo-Chair	X		Arrived at 5:57pm
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X		
Donald Ciramella		X	
Susan Gravellese	X		
Jennifer Hayes	X		
Patrick Keefe	X		Left at 5:44pm
Dianne Kelly	X		
John Perella	X		
Michael Piccardi	X		
Nicholas Rystrom	X		
Carl Svendsen	X		
Richard Viscay	X		
Gerry Visconti		X	
<b><u>Project Team Members</u></b>			
Brian Dakin	X		Leftfield-Project Manager
Linda Liporto	X		Leftfield-Project Manager
James Riefstahl			Leftfield - Project Director
Jim Rogers	X		Leftfield Owner
Lynn Stapleton	X		Leftfield-Project Executive
Robert Bell	X		Perkins Eastman-Principal-Educational Programming
Daniel Colli	X		Perkins Eastman-Principal-Project Manager
Joe Drown			Perkins Eastman-Principal In Charge
Dawn Guarriello	X		Perkins Eastman-Associate Principal-Designer
Ti Johnson	X		Warner Larson-Associate Principal
Sameer Bhoite	X		Warner Larson-Design Director
David Warner	X		Warner Larson-Owner

Attendees: Joseph Lewin.

Meeting was called to order by Susan Gravellese at 5:37pm.

## **2– Vote to Approve Meeting Minutes**

The vote to approve minutes for the meeting held on October 7, 2021 was approved. Motion was made by Patrick Keefe, Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

Roll Call:

<b><u>Voting Member</u></b>	<b><u>In Favor</u></b>	<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Abstained</u></b>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciramella			X	
Susan Gravellese	X			
Jennifer Hayes	X			
Patrick Keefe	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
John Perella	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen	X			
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti			X	

## **3-Vote to Approve Invoices to Move Forward for Processing**

The vote to approve invoices for September invoices for Leftfield-\$21,000.00 and Perkins Eastman-42,210.00 was approved. The motion was made by Richard Viscay, Susan Gravellese/Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.

Roll Call:

<b><u>Voting Member</u></b>	<b><u>In Favor</u></b>	<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Abstained</u></b>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciramella			X	
Susan Gravellese	X			
Jennifer Hayes	X			
Patrick Keefe	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
John Perella	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen	X			
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti			X	

## **4– General Project & Schedule Update**

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) presented. Leftfield updated the committee in regards to the RHA sites and the RHA vote for allowing the project access to the RHA land. The RHA made a few motions to prevent the new high school from going on the RHA site.

Dianne Kelly-shared thoughts in regards to this decision. She noted the meeting was shockingly fast, with no shared information with the school building committee. Unfortunately this site is out of the running, but it narrows the scope and will make the plan going forward progress more quickly.

Patrick Keefe-noted he was not as surprised as quickly they made their recommendation. It would make sense to move on, and Wonderland should still be an option, but the financial feasibility from a cost stand point might not work. I recommend is Wonderland feasible from a cost stand point and possibly rule this out? We can then place focus on one site. I am not in favor of taking of properties but could we focus on looking for houses/properties that are for sale currently and possibly turn those into parking lots or whatever the project needs.

Dianne Kelly- added it is important to look at the land acquisition cost of Wonderland and is requesting a comprehensive traffic study for the Wonderland site and the roads surrounding Wonderland. How would this impact that area with 2500+ students and 250+ staff arriving at same time, this would include walkers? What would we need to do to mitigate, what kind of costs would be included with that mitigation? Understanding those highways to be state property, not municipal property, does it mean in order for us to have any pedestrian mediation, does this mean we are in the same situation as the Housing Authority where we are at the behest others over whom we have no control?

Leftfield responded they will be focusing on redistributing horse power to other areas. The area of focus is a narrower now, and we are down to 3 sites.

Richard Viscay-to piggyback off of Dr. Kelly's comment is the only way the Wonderland option would work is to portion off part of it and only buy a section of the property vs. purchasing the whole property. That trade off would be the cost of acquiring the portion of Wonderland vs. the cost eminent domain on homes at Erricola Park. Is there are any large variables we need to consider at either area in regards to the construction itself? What are the large cost variances effecting each option?

Leftfield responded those are the main cost drivers: what is the cost of land acquisition at the current site versus purchasing approximately 60% at the Wonderland site. The other high level driver is building on an occupied site or not.

Richard Viscay-if building was to be on Erricola Park is there an option to have the construction vehicles enter and exit on Route 60 versus disrupting the current residents and flow of traffic in those neighborhoods?

Leftfield responded yes, part of the construction manager's process will be getting the logistics in line while working with the project and their ideas.

Joseph Lewin-The tax revenue issue with the Wonderland property.

Leftfield responded the analysis will be folded in what value we need to take vs. what value is left.

John Perella-there is an instructional cost, with construction on site and a multi-year design, we need to consider and quantify how this will affect the Middle School and High School.

Dianne Kelly-added the eminent domain question at the current site is going to be a tricky one. We really should thoroughly look at options that do not include eminent domain on the current site. If we do land on building on the current site is there anything we can do with the aqua duct so we can build over it?

Perkins Eastman responded it can be moved or rerouted but it will always need to return the "knot on the bow tie", so it always returns to that spot, but it could potentially be moved, just at a cost. Leftfield questioned could we get a better building position if the pipe went North instead of East?

Carl Svendsen-noted we built multiple schools and we had to deal with eminent domain. The committee is not eminent domain happy but the people we really should be hearing from is the people in

the houses under consideration for eminent domain for the project. We need to reach out to the eminent domain houses and see how the resident's feel about it.

Patrick Keefe-Carl that is what I was referencing early, perhaps there is a house for sale that we could purchase for parking or outdoor atrium. We understand no one wants their home taken. If we take their home where do those residences go even of the amount of money offered? I agree with the survey being done for those residences.

Carl Svendsen-In the past projects we have done there was minimal resistance when the surveys were done, there really was only a few people resisting, and we followed the process we needed to perform. The only person that is really going to be affected by it is the actual person living at the property. It's not taking the property it's buying it. We are looking to find a solution that works for the neighborhood and us. We need to focus on the houses and get the opinion from the owner's and how they feel.

Dianne Kelly-I agree we have a lot more work to do in regards to this topic.

Michael Piccardi-in regards to the eminent domain, in regards to the Hill school we needed to put the parking lot and fields there otherwise there was no place to put the kids. Sometimes eminent domain is necessary even if there is a field going on that property.

Susan Gravellese-I agree we need to speak to residents but also I agree with Keefe's comment where are those residence's going? There is a single family home shortage nationwide, you may force those people into apartment buildings and multifamily homes.

Richard Viscay-is there potential opportunities to purchase empty properties to place those residences in single family homes elsewhere.

Leftfield responded there is something to the idea of moving those residences to the parcels that are city owned for replacement public housing could be looked at, is there a financial option for this?

Richard Viscay-for example perhaps there's 14 places down the beach that those resident's would like to move in to.

Perkins Eastman (Robert Bell) presented. We would like to start where we left off. We are down to 4 options. What does it mean for not only the existing site but also the Wonderland as far as resiliency? There is around an 11 foot flood surge or saturation, which would affect the Wonderland site and the current site, which means depending on elevation the buildings would need to be raised the amount of feet, in regards to the 100 year flood plan. Perkins Eastman wanted to break down the site even more and show the real constraints for each property. The Erricola park option would have not space in between the programs, they would be right on top of one another and the core of school would have a daylight challenge and bringing that light in. Without any adjacent land, the run-off space or buffer zone for the fields would cause the plan to have smaller fields and could cause a safety issue.

Richard Viscay-I know we have eliminated 3 story buildings in lieu of 4 story buildings can we go up to a 5 story building?

Perkins Eastman responded at the 5 story point the project would be at the high rise construction and cost level, which was noted in previous meetings the committee did not want, there is also a fight to get rooms at the ground level and you end up chasing vertical rise accommodating those spaces.

Richard Viscay-I was just throwing that out there, I don't want to complicate it anymore.

Dianne Kelly-the limitations with having a 5 story building, is the higher you build the less accessible the building is. One of the high priorities is making sure the building is accessible to all our students.

Leftfield responded by noting the heart of the building is affected and the more you stack it the harder the accessibility is going to be. Maintenance will have more systems to deal with a taller building. Perkins Eastman noted we will have an educational disruption and limitations on what the contractors can and cannot do.

Dianne Kelly- noted we want to keep in mind that the construction rules will affect the Rumney Marsh Academy as well.

Perkins Eastman noted the Erricola Park-Expanded version allows more light into the space, moves 40 feet west and allows a buffer from Route 60. The fields have more room and we can get more surface parking. The visibility from the front door in this design is an improvement for safety measures.

Carl Svendsen-putting a building this close to the highway, it should have accessibility from the highway. One of my visions for this site could accept cars from all angles. The service area needs to be more accessible for 18 wheelers and maintenance and trash. We should be looking at different options for different sized vehicles access this property. We do not want to create a cut through but making all points of the building accessible for different buildings.

Leftfield requested clarification in regards to the highway, there will be a traffic light needed and studies will need to be done to verify this.

Perkins Eastman briefly covered the 2 Wonderland options. Leftfield clarified there is an appraisal in for the whole property and will be broken down to the 60% mark, this will include potential revenue intake for the city with the 2 options. Perkins Eastman explained the last slide noting the largest part of the decision will be the cost.

### **5-Public Comment**

Ralph DeCicco-49 Washington Street-would like to speak in regards to Patrick Keefe's comment on eminent domain. It's not the best situation for people around the school, yes you will be getting prime money for your home but you will be paying through the nose to getting something comparable. In regards to the Wonderland site, is anybody looking outside the box and reaching out to possibly the Kraft family again to have complexes and fields to be built and they could fund it. It would bring in the tax revenue to fund the school project.

Marie Gnerre-26 Hyde Street-Mother lives at 38 East Mountain Ave-I have spoken to the owners in the area and we all are against eminent domain. We will fight and do whatever we need to do to oppose this.

Lisa Micciulla-50 East Mountain Ave-I chose this street and this location to raise our children here. This is my home. Nothing compares to anywhere else. We have to see past this, we are a community here and a sense of safety. We will not get this anywhere else in the city.

Louis Albanesi-92 Cary Avenue-It been my home for 55 years. I recently put good money into the home to modernize it. I have spoken to some of the residents on Cary Ave have no intention in selling their home. I like the idea of an alternative site in the City that was made available to these residents I would be open to that, if not then I would be opposed to this.

### **6- Other Business/Discussions**

There is no other business at this time.

### **7-Vote to Adjourn Meeting**

Motion to adjourn made by Carl Svendsen, Richard Viscay 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. Meeting adjourned 6:57pm.

Roll Call:

<b><u>Voting Member</u></b>	<b><u>In Favor</u></b>	<b><u>Opposed</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Abstained</u></b>
Brian Arrigo-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciramella			X	
Susan Gravellese	X			
Jennifer Hayes	X			
Patrick Keefe			X	
Dianne Kelly	X			
John Perella	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen	X			
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti			X	