

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 13, 2022

A scheduled meeting of the High School Building Committee was held on January 13, 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		
Dianne Kelly	X		Arrived 5:36p
John Perella	X		
Michael Piccardi	X		
Nicholas Rystrom	X		
Carl Svendsen	X		
Richard Viscay	X		
Gerry Visconti	X		
<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, Ralph DeCicco, Ed Terrell, Steve Morabito, Nasara Nimaga-Perkins Eastman, Michael Ferrante.

Meeting was called to order by Susan Gravellese at 5:34pm.

2– Vote to Approve Meeting Minutes

The vote to approve minutes for the meeting held on January 6, 2021 was approved. Motion was made by Patrick Keefe, Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo 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-Recap January 10, 2022 Presentation to the City Council and January 12, 2022 Community Forum

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) presented with brief updates from the City Council meeting.

Dianne Kelly-I just wanted to say that it was a great presentation and a tremendous job. I think that was evident through the questions from the council. I thank the City Councilors for their input.

Leftfield responded thank you.

4-Discussion and Review of Final Options

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) asked if there are any questions in regards to the options. The plan was not to run back through the slides for the options. Does anybody have any questions?

Gerry Visconti-I too wanted to thank you for the presentation, you did a great job. One of the concerns regarding the different sites, there was mention of scaling back the fields, we are not making a decision on that right now, the decision is just on the site correct?

Leftfield responded we are asking the committee to pick the site and select the preferred option at this time. On any of the picks, it doesn't mean we can't make changes to the design and other building options, etc. We are not making any design decisions tonight.

Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo-I would like to reiterate that it was a great presentation the other night. There was a lot of valuable information in the presentation. Don Ciaramella mentioned that culvert work will need to be done at the present site but also at the Wonderland site, can you clarify this? Leftfield responded we do know there is a drainage culvert, underground line, that isn't all underground. It is a lot less of a length and we would not have to change its path, but we are still dealing with water and drainage at Wonderland, and we know that it will be less cost to correct at Wonderland.

Patrick Keefe-I wanted to share my experience and point of view in regards to this selection. The last 27 meetings or so, we have gone through various scenarios and to have the outcome be the Wonderland site is feasible. The only con with this site is the current accessibility, it is not currently accessible from a walkability stand point. It is center to the city, it's a clean canvas, creates zero

disruption to the current learning environment, it will provide the ability and control for future growth to the city, for me this is a no-brainer. The disruption to the current site neighborhood is a major concern, so Wonderland is the preferred option for me.

Dianne Kelly-After those comments I think it would be a good idea to go around and share before we make the vote. It has been my honor and my privilege to work in the Revere Public Schools for the last 27 years. I am very proud of the work we have done in the district, and I am very proud of the opportunity that I have had to be part of the growth in the school department. When I look at the next 20-30 years from now, I'm still a Dorchester girl and I am from the City of Boston, and this is not about my legacy, this about where this building goes or what this turns out to be. 50 years from now people will be talking about who the mayor was, who were the city councilors, and who was on the school committee, they aren't going to remember who the superintendent was and we see that truth in the current high school. If you want my opinion as an educational professional, I too, am in support of the Wonderland site. If we really think down the road we are seeing nothing but growth in the city and we will need the current high school to repurpose as a central middle school in order to alleviate the overcrowding in our current middle schools and elementary schools.

Jennifer Hayes-I am a teacher at the high school and I too am leaning towards Wonderland. I cannot imagine another 8 years of disruption and construction. One of the cons is many of my students walk here and it's in close proximity to the middle and elementary schools for them to pick up their siblings. I am leaning towards Wonderland.

John Perella-I would like to agree with all of the statements from Dr. Kelly. I would like to reiterate that construction on site is very disruptive for students and staff. I would like to remind everyone that the biggest investment a city can make, is a school, I think we should go big and think big, so I would put my vote towards Wonderland.

Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo-In the beginning I originally wanted it to be centrally located. As we moved on, I looked at the city of a whole, and was comfortable knowing that each part of the city there is a bus route that goes to Wonderland. This is going to be the largest development that Revere is going to see for the next 50 years and we need to do it right, we need to make this building sustainable, and adaptable. When you look at the current site, it isn't very adaptable. We started this project as an educational experience and we have put the student's needs first, rather than the site. Then I looked at the traffic, look at the current site and the traffic they have to deal with on a daily basis, it will be the same at Wonderland. Also the resident's will need to deal construction at the current site, it is not an ideal situation. I think Wonderland is going to solve so many things.

Nicholas Rystrom-From strictly an engineering stand point there is pros and cons at both sites. There will need to be some work that will need to happen to the infrastructure in both cases. I would like to point out the difference between how construction will occur on the existing site and the Wonderland site. The shape of the existing lot and the congestion that exists there already is a big negative compared to the open canvas at the Wonderland. Building at the Wonderland would be easier to implement versus the location of the existing school. The apparent disruption at the existing site and the taking away of some of the sports program for years drove my decision. I think the Wonderland site is a better choice and that's where I'm leaning towards.

Susan Gravellese-First, I would like to agree with all of my fellow members. We started this project in January 2020, and if you asked me throughout the whole process, Wonderland would not have been my option, but when we got down to the nitty-gritty of what is actually involved and what is going on and the disruption to the educational learning, physical education, fields and to the parking, have lead me to be in favor of Wonderland as my preferred site.

Brian Arrigo-Thank you to all of you for the tremendous work we have done to this point. This project is exactly what Dr. Kelly said it is which is a legacy project. This is going to be the largest investment we make as a city. To be part of this process, the twists and turns, it's been an amazing opportunity. The work and the questions and the expertise shared and shown by all of you, it makes me proud to be in this city and this position. If you would have asked me 2 years ago, Wonderland would not have been an option. At this point I cannot think of a higher or better use for the property than a state of the art, legacy high school for generations to come. There is a lot more work to be done, and there are interesting and innovative things that can be done to mitigate around walkability and access, we have the best team in the state or even the country to tackle what could be a challenge. I am for Wonderland and it is a crown jewel to our city, I cannot think of a better place to look at than a brand new place. I also disagree with Dr. Kelly's comment and we will remember the superintendent.

Richard Viscay-I think through the process I was quite skeptical of the Wonderland site and the loss of revenue if the site was chosen. As a resident, the land sits there vacant, what better way to spawn the development over there than to put a high school there, that will help get the other part of the site developed quicker. We will have to do massive traffic studies to figure out how the students get to school safely. I have been working behind the scenes to get forecasting done to see how we can make up the revenue and to see if we are going to be able to afford this school. There is validity for a high school campus and not disrupt the neighborhoods and the possibility of revenue along the highway where Erricola Park is. We might have a lot of work to do but I am getting behind the Wonderland site.

Michael Piccardi-I was very much a proponent of Erricola park/Revere High site for a very long time, probably the last couple of months have drawn me towards Wonderland. The blank slate, keep the current high school for a middle school in the future, how we have no land now/future and the traffic is going to be there no matter what. I look forward to this project, it's going to a beautiful project.

Gerry Visconti-I, too, would like to thank everyone, where is it only the beginning stages, and a lot of work has gone into up to this point. I drove by the site (Wonderland site) the other day and it's such a clean slate, and imagining a high school there. It definitely will be a legacy and I want it to be something we all are proud of. I am leaning towards Wonderland as well, but I want it to be done right. Make it something Revere is going to be proud of. I do not want it to be short sighted, and I agree "go big or go home". Our kids have gone through a lot already and a disruption of a construction site is not necessary. I'm looking forward to supporting the Wonderland site.

Don Ciaramella-To answer Stacey Rizzo's question, there are challenges to the drainage problems. There is a problem we can tackle a little easier versus the current location. There is a challenge with drainage because at that site [Wonderland], drains into an open ditch, effectively if that ditch is to become clogged with frag mite or high tide at the tide gate there is still going to be a problem evacuating that site of the storm water and it's not just addressing that site but downstream of that site and where it goes into the ocean. There needs to get a commitment from the city to make sure where that site is draining to is working always. From the meeting the other night I felt Wonderland was the best choice.

Carl Svendsen-I wanted to state we knew we were going to have challenges for both sites. I can say we have a great team. One of the bigger questions was can we afford it? I have faith in Rich Viscay and the rest of the team. With everyone working together, we came up with the answers to the tough questions and I am looking forward to the challenges we face in the future.

Leftfield-is there any more comments? No, let's go to public comment.

5-Public Comment

Steve Morabito-122 Suffolk Avenue-I wanted to thank the building committee for the due process and the school committee for making sure our school is at a top tier always. I have some concerns in regards to the Wonderland site, being a resident in that neighborhood I have some concerns. I'm concerned about public safety, I'm concerned about walkability, I'm concerned about yes this is a large investment but it will also be a large tax burden as well? Flood wise, in the next 30-40 years will the plans or building be able to handle the flooding? Those are my concerns.

Ralph DeCicco-49 Washington Street-I wanted to thank the building committee and the school committee for choosing the Wonderland site. It's been a pet peeve of mine, the wonderland site is the best site because the old high school site can be used for other uses, such as a middle school site. I don't see the transportation or walkability any different than the current site. If there is a commuter rail that comes to that site, we could potentially partner with them to buy the land and build a station there have some kind of revenue there.

6-Vote to Recommend Preferred Option to the School Committee and City Council

A motion to recommend selection of option 2A.B-All new construction at Wonderland, as preferred option for further study in schematic design to the School Committee and the City Council was made by Brian Arrigo, Susan Gravellese/Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo 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			

7-Discuss Schedule for Upcoming SBC Meetings

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) recommended the next meeting be 2 weeks from now. We will bring this decision to the School Committee next week and the City Council in 2 weeks, January 24, 2022. We can recap that on Thursday, January 27, 2022 and line up the next few months.

Richard Viscay-Can you give us an update on status of the first Wonderland appraisal?

Leftfield responded we are still using the same numbers, I don't think we have the full report yet. I think they are trying to come up with a narrative for the appraisal. We just need to get that done.

Richard Viscay- Right now, that is the most important piece after this vote, I think we really need to push on this and start to have a conversation in regards to this.

Leftfield responded that is heard.

Gerry Visconti-In terms of the council meeting for the 24th, do we need majority vote or unanimous vote?

Leftfield answered we believe majority vote is correct

Patrick Keefe-I believe it is a simple majority that is correct.

8-Other Business/Discussions

There is no other business or discussion at this time.

9-Vote to Adjourn Meeting

Motion to adjourn made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Susan Gravellese 2nd the motion. Meeting adjourned 6:43pm.

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			