

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 Ciaramella	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 January 6, 2022

A scheduled meeting of the High School Building Committee was held on January 6, 2022 at 5:30pm, online via Zoom Meeting format. Committee members and attendees present were:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Brian Arrigo-Chair		X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X		
Donald Ciaramella		X	
Susan Gravellese	X		
Jennifer Hayes		X	
Patrick Keefe	X		Left 5:58p
Dianne Kelly	X		
John Perella		X	
Michael Piccardi	X		
Nicholas Rystrom	X		Arrived 5:42p
Carl Svendsen	X		
Richard Viscay	X		
Gerry Visconti	X		Left at 6:57p
<u>Project Team Members</u>			
Brian Dakin	X		Leftfield-Project Manager
Linda Liporto	X		Leftfield-Project Manager
James Riefstahl	X		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		X	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, Amber Dakin, John Kingston, Anthony Cogliandro.

Meeting was called to order by Susan Gravellese at 5:38pm.

2– Vote to Approve Meeting Minutes

The vote to approve minutes for the meeting held on December 16, 2021 was approved. Motion was made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Susan Gravellese 2nd the motion.

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Abstained</u>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella			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 November Invoices to Move Forward for Processing

The vote to approve invoices to move forward for processing, Leftfield LLC for \$21,000.00, invoice 14, for December 2021 services.

Motion was made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Susan Gravellese 2nd the motion.

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Abstained</u>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella			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			

The vote to approve invoices to move forward for processing, Perkins Eastman for \$21,105.00, invoice 87970.00.0-10, for December 2021 services.

Motion was made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Susan Gravellese 2nd the motion.

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Abstained</u>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella			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-Recap of December 21, 2022 Presentation to the School Committee

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) presented. Leftfield briefly spoke about the School Committee meeting. They received questions as a result of that meeting and have included the answers in the updated presentation.

5-Review Updated Project Presentation for City Council

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) presented. They are requesting input from the committee to help with the City Council presentation for the Monday, January 10, 2022 meeting. The slides shown were presented at both the building committee and the school committee meetings with a few updated slides. Leftfield referenced the slide labeled **Study 1A.B-New H.S. W/Athletics at Gut-Renovated Fieldhouse**, emphasizing the new high school will be without an athletics venue and fields for multiple years if this is chosen.

Dianne Kelly-In this design we would not have athletic fields for a couple of years while the new building is being built and then we would not have a fieldhouse or gym for a couple of years after that, how many years total are we talking about?

Leftfield responded the MP Field/Multi-Use field could come with the building, the western part of the site would not be available, and it would take 1-2 years for the other fields and the fieldhouse to be available. Please note there would still be site work happening on some of the fields.

Dianne Kelly-Athletics would be impacted significantly for the first 2 years and we would have physical education impacted significantly during the gut/renovation phase of the existing building? Leftfield responded yes that is correct. That would essentially be in the summer of 2026. The project will have to get the staff/students out of the current building and into the new building in 2026. The fieldhouse will not be available until possible 2027. Perkins Eastman clarified the second year and half PE will be impacted but not as extensively.

Leftfield then spoke about the Wonderland option. Leftfield noted the advantage of Wonderland is everything would be constructed and done by 2026. There is not follow up phase and no waiting for fields or the field house to be done.

Susan Gravellese-Have we gotten any concrete price on purchasing Wonderland and has anyone gotten information from the owner that they would be in the market to sell to us?

Leftfield responded there would need to be 2 appraisals for eminent domain. Eminent domain starts in December of next year if we chose this site. Please note it could be friendly agree-to-price eminent domain or disagree-about-price eminent domain. The eminent domain process would start the end of next year, after the full site project is approved, after the city has agreed to borrow and it would take until the end of 2023 to go through the eminent domain process whether the owner agree or not. 30

million is the quoted price with the current appraisal. Eminent domain will happen and they do not have to agree, in the spring the mayor will need to outreach to the owner to start the “friendly” eminent domain, but if the process is “not friendly” eminent domain then it would take a court to decide but the City would have deed in hand, this means the risk for the city is higher.

Dianne Kelly-I will note that Rich Viscay, the Mayor, and I had a meeting on Tuesday and what was emphasized was it is always easier to go with the friendly agreement, but that doesn’t happen we will still take site control when the city makes their final offer even when it is not friendly.

Susan Gravellese-So we can start construction as scheduled even when it is not friendly. Leftfield responded yes that is correct. By January 2024 the city would have deed in hand.

Leftfield continued to briefly discuss the rest of the presentation. They pointed out a new slide labelled **Option 2A.B-New at Wonderland-Tax Revenue Consideration**. This slide demonstrates 4 different scenarios, “Baseline” Scenario, Potential Case 1, Potential Case 2, and Potential Case 3. The scenarios demonstrate the amount of potential tax revenue that could come back with Wonderland, they are referencing a combination of Class A commercial businesses and residential units. The next slide shows a potential scenario to collect tax revenue on the remaining 9.5 acres once developed.

Dianne Kelly-I would like to say this is much clearer with the new data. Leftfield then discussed the slide **Options-Budget Summaries**. They noted that there is approximately a \$7mil difference between Options 1C.B and 1A.B. due to the fact that it is cheaper to renovate than to build new.

Dianne Kelly-Why is the MSBA grant higher with the field house reno? Leftfield responded the MSBA’s budget spreadsheet is referred to as the 3011 Budget. We set up each choice into the 3011 spreadsheet to get specific reimbursement projections for each option.

Wonderland you are not getting any reimbursement for demo and abatement, this is why the wonderland option is less. The variation for the existing site is due to efficiencies with renovation. You get additional incentive points for renovations.

Michael Piccardi-Can you show the difference with the renovation of the fieldhouse and also how much will that take away from reimbursement for the gym at the new school at Erricola Park? Leftfield responded you are basically rewarded for both but you get more reimbursement with renovation. Does this answer your question?

Michael Piccardi-No, we can renovate the field house and the MSBA will reimbursement for that but if we built a field house the same size they would not reimburse us for that? Leftfield responded correct, you cannot build one the same size that you have. The scenario in 1C.B. the gym is 10,000 square feet smaller. There is 10,000 square feet less in athletic space but the MSBA will reimburse for it.

Michael Piccardi-Cost wise it’s more on the reno for getting reimbursed? Leftfield answered yes.

Michael Piccardi-And there would not be a gymnasium if we renovated the field house? Leftfield answered correct.

Gerry Visconti-How big is the current field house compared to what will be in the new building, how much square feet will we be losing? Perkins Eastman responded currently it is 28,000 square feet. MSBA has a maximum of 18,000 for a new gym, but what we have done is incorporate ROTC and open fitness space adjacent to it so we can still get the same number of courts and a track in there. 28,000 is existing, 18,000 is what is allowed, we are able to add 5,000 square feet for classroom space added.

Dianne Kelly-about 23,000 is added, I am always of the mind if we could keep the fieldhouse because it's such a treasure, but I also think about the dislocation to the new building, and to the athletic department for construction, I don't know if having that extra space is worth it. Disruption to the physical education program for 5 years is not worth it.

Leftfield responded by showing the difference between the all new on existing gym (slide **Option 1C.B-Floor Plans**) versus the renovation (slide-**Study 1A.B-New H.S. W/Athletics at Gut-Renovated Fieldhouse**). Perkins Eastman also reminded even though the MSBA gives a higher reimbursement for renovations they still have a cap of 18,000 square feet they will reimburse. Leftfield questioned if there were any other budget questions.

Joseph Lewin-In terms of cost reduction from previous estimates all of it was in soft cost.
Leftfield-yes

Joseph Lewin-So previously you were carrying a 25% plug, and then you did the built up number.

Leftfield-yes, exactly

Joseph Lewin-About what percentage did you come up with for soft costs?

Leftfield-high teens is about what it works out to be. This is a huge driver.

Leftfield (Lynn Stapleton) spoke about the **MSBA Changes to Caps for Eligibility and Reimbursement** slide. The new caps for Consultant services, Project Management and Designers is 3.5%, 10% and up to \$500/SF of construction costs. Owner's Contingency is set at 0.5%, Demolition and Abatement requires additional research and is not set, and the Construction cap is now at \$360/SF. These caps were implemented to ensure the MSBA can distribute their funds to as many projects they can. Leftfield did mention they retrieved data from the **MSBA School Construction Cost Trend** website.

Joseph Lewin-so once you have entered all of the data you need to, you are showing a \$650/SF hard cost?

Leftfield-that seems to be right

Joseph Lewin-then you have escalated it to some mid-point in the construction?

Leftfield-yes that is correct. The escalation is separate.

Leftfield spoke about the **Revere Breakdown of Costs Ineligible for Reimbursement** slide. It was noted that will of the caps in place the reimbursement rate for Revere will be dropped down to approximately 42%. The largest ineligible cost for the project is the construction cap cost. The amount estimated for this project that is ineligible is \$189,739.936.

Dianne Kelly-Is the actual cost to the City of Revere is \$189mil or is that part of the \$231mil, \$223mil, and \$224mil in the **Budget Summary** slide?

Leftfield responded \$189mil is included in the budget amount totals.

Gerry Visconti-Would it make sense to tie the previous number to the 224 & 223 to see the breakdown more thoroughly?

Leftfield responded yes we can do that. We will make a few tweaks to make sure this makes more sense.

Dianne Kelly-The first row is total cost, then MSBA grant on the second row and everything else falls to Revere and those together create the bottom line cost to Revere number.

Leftfield yes this shows on the budget screen on the previous slide. The numbers are the same.

Leftfield briefly discussed the **Advantage vs. Disadvantages for All Options** slide. It was mentioned that they should add to Option 1A.B. that students have to travel in and out of multiple buildings.

Dianne Kelly-especially for students with mobility issues.

Leftfield noted that walking from the classroom by the highway to the fieldhouse will take a lot of time for students and staff.

Leftfield discussed the last slide **Remaining Feasibility Study Look-Ahead**. The one date we are looking for a selection of a preferred option is on January 13th. If the selection does not make it through the School Committee and the City Council we will have to figure out where to go at that point.

Dianne Kelly-We had a conversation with the Mayor the other night. The Mayor wants to emphasize that he wants to build the building that can get built. Which means he is relying on the building committee to make their preference known and stand behind it and work toward it, granted the School Committee and the City Council need to approve it.

Richard Viscay-we want to put our best recommendation forward for up or down vote.

Michael Piccardi-when the School Committee and City Council votes are we looking for a majority or everyone on the same page?

Leftfield responded it does not need to be a unanimous decision, just a pass motion.

Michael Piccardi-we can't go forward is one votes no?

Leftfield responded that is correct. A lot of the towns we have worked in, it just comes down to a vote. What we are voting on here is site selection not schematic design and feasibility numbers. We will not have the final final budget until we bid the project.

6-Public Comment

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-If the school is built with the gymnasium attached to it and the 2 fields are there how many acres does that take up on the current School Street site?

Leftfield responded we do not have the number off the top of our heads, we will have to do a full survey of that site and we will have to recreate the park foot by foot.

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-My feeling from speaking to city councilors and they do not want to lose the Wonderland development, and I understand the numbers but the building at Wonderland is larger than the proposed one at Erricola Park?

Leftfield responded the all new and existing is the same as at Wonderland but the one where they keep the field house is technically a little smaller new building with the reno portion.

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-If you build a building at Erricola Park and you build one at Wonderland they are the same size?

Leftfield responded yes.

Dianne Kelly responded they may not be the same shape but they are the same total square footage.

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-I didn't think the high school site had 26 acres.

Dianne Kelly-It doesn't, the existing site will have less room around the building.

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-I'm trying to appease the city council. I prefer the Wonderland site, but if we used a smaller footprint at Wonderland it would increase the potential revenue. I want the building to be at Wonderland. I think putting the school at the Erricola Park will hurt that neighborhood and it will for many years.

Perkins Eastman responded there is 18.9 acres.

John Kingston-140 Winthrop Avenue-Use 7 less acres at Wonderland, is that what I really want but if it helps pass with city council. A Hybrid approach. I want to see the current high school up and the fieldhouse up. I'm not sure how contaminated the land at Erricola Park is, I would like to see it left alone. I would like to see the Hybrid approach considered.

7-Other Business/Discussions

There is no other business or discussion at this time.

8-Vote to Adjourn Meeting

Motion to adjourn made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Susan Gravellese 2nd the motion. Meeting adjourned 6:59pm.

Roll Call:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Abstained</u>
Brian Arrigo-Chair			X	
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella			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	