

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

Acting Mayor Patrick Keefe- Chair	Susan Gravellese-Vice Chair
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	Donald Ciaramella
Michael Piccardi	Joanne McKenna
Richard Viscay	Jerry Visconti
James Riefstahl	Jim Rogers
Daniel Colli	Joe Drown
Leah Schroeder	Jim Hervol
Dave Gorman	Kristy Lyons
	Dianne Kelly
	Nicholas Rystrom
	Brian Dakin
	Lynn Stapleton
	Dawn Guarriello
	Rachel Whitemore
	Tim Ericson
	Christopher Bowen
	Carl Svendsen
	Linda Liporto
	Robert Bell
	Mark McCarthy
	John Laperle
	Chris Hamel

Meeting Minutes for November 15, 2023

A meeting of the High School Building Committee was held on November 15, 2023 at 5:30 pm, online via Zoom Meeting format. Committee members and attendees present were:

<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X		
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X		
Donald Ciaramella	X		
Susan Gravellese	X		
Dianne Kelly	X		
Christopher Bowen	X		Arrived at 5:36p
Joanne McKenna	X		
Michael Piccardi	X		Left at 5:50p
Nicholas Rystrom	X		
Carl Svendsen		X	
Richard Viscay	X		Arrived at 5:35p
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
Nasra Nimaga	X		Perkins Eastman
Mark McCarthy	X		Perkins Eastman-NY Branch
Leah Schroeder	X		Perkins Eastman-Boston Branch
Ti Johnson		X	Warner Larson-Associate Principal
Sameer Bhoite		X	Warner Larson-Design Director
David Warner		X	Warner Larson-Owner

Jim Hervol	X		Consigli Project Executive
Rachel Whitermore		X	Consigli Senior Project Manager
John Laperle		X	Consigli General Superintendent
Dave Gorman		X	Consigli Senior Superintendent
Kristy Lyons		X	Senior Pre-Construction Manager
Tim Ericson		X	Chief Estimator
Chris Hamel, LEED AP		X	Senior M/E/P Manager

Attendees: Jessica Vaverchak-Perkins Eastman
Susan Gravellese called meeting to order at 5:32pm.

2–Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 7, 2023 and October 12, 2023

The vote to approve meeting minutes from September 7, 2023 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>Abstain</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella	X			
Susan Gravellese	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
Christopher Bowen			X	
Joanne McKenna	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen			X	
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

The vote to approve meeting minutes from October 12, 2023 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>Abstain</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella	X			
Susan Gravellese	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
Christopher Bowen	X			
Joanne McKenna	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen			X	
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

3-Vote to Approve October Invoices for Processing

Motion to approve October 2023 services invoice 33 for Leftfield LLC in the amount of \$21,000.00 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>Abstain</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella	X			
Susan Gravellese	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
Christopher Bowen	X			
Joanne McKenna	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen			X	
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

Motion to approve October 2023 services invoice 87970.00.0-32 for Perkins Eastman in the amount of \$119,261.48 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>Abstain</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella	X			
Susan Gravellese	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
Christopher Bowen	X			
Joanne McKenna	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			
Carl Svendsen			X	
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

Motion to approve October 2023 services invoice 10 for Consigli Construction Co, Inc. in the amount of \$25,440.00 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>Abstain</u>
Patrick Keefe-Chair	X			
Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo	X			
Donald Ciaramella	X			
Susan Gravellese	X			
Dianne Kelly	X			
Christopher Bowen	X			
Joanne McKenna	X			
Michael Piccardi	X			
Nicholas Rystrom	X			

Carl Svendsen			X	
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

4-Preferred Schematic Report Options Discussion

Leftfield (Brian Dakin) presented. The team summarized the last meeting. The culvert was the focus and the updated quote for replacement is \$32mil.

Joanne McKenna-We have been meeting since May, and the culvert was never talked about. We always talked about how it wouldn't impact building the high school because it's 30 feet away. What has changed in the last month?

Don Ciaramella-Councilor McKenna that is incorrect. I tried to communicate it on two different occasions to the council but was not allowed to speak. The presentation was prepared, I was going to explain the hurdles of working on that site but on two separate occasions I intentionally was not allowed to speak. The presentation was prepared but I was not allowed to give it. I was going to explain this culvert actually drains a vast area of Revere, a lot of water flows through it. The culvert was installed incorrectly, it's not adequate of size, it cannot handle the amount of water that it does. It runs uphill instead of downhill, looking back up stream you actually see water and when you look down stream it's high and dry, so pipe kind of goes up hill. There is also a 2 foot hydraulic jump on School Street that we have known about for many years, we did a study about it and I was prepared to offer that study to the council. It's were the old drainage of Revere ties into the culvert [72" corrugated metal pipe] at the high school. The original drainage is 2 feet lower than the pipe, so we call it a 2 foot hydraulic jump, so basically this holds up all of the water. This culvert is a huge obstacle and we knew we had to address it, we're in the middle of a consent decree with the federal government, so we are not prepared to deal with financially, because of the consent decree we had to deal with the sewage issues first, it was not a project we prepared logistically and financially to tackle. I was all prepared, and there were two separate occasion where Mr. Dakin was prepared to present with me and I was not allowed to present.

Joanne McKenna-Thank you Donny, I respect your expertise but I wasn't talking about the council, and I'm sorry you were not able to present. I am talking about since May, the last six months of design, schematic design. The culvert was not talked about, what was talked about was we would build thirty feet away and it wouldn't be compromised. Why wasn't it addressed in the last six months and it was just brought up two weeks ago?

Dianne Kelly-One of the main reasons why this building committee rejected the existing site was because of the culvert and that's why we wanted to look elsewhere. When were directed by the city council to go back to the existing site, we hoped we could plan around the culvert, and that's why all of the designs in current schematic design has all of the buildings pushed to the side of the triangle, where the fields are. What we learned through working with CDM Smith (Brian correct me if I'm wrong), who are doing the studies Donny was just talking about, is that culvert is going to fail within 8-10 years and we are told we are insane if we put a half billion dollar building on the site when in 6-8 years we will have to tear up the whole front it to take care of the problem. The city needs to take care of it simultaneously.

Brian Dakin responded that is correct, the goal of our design process this summer/fall was to design a building that doesn't fall on top of the culvert and too keep that thirty feet on each side set back, that part was a success. What is new, CDM is reporting that it has to be replaced, a replacement is imminent and they were looking at our schedule, we would be coming on the back end of that or a few years after the project and we would have to rip up the road and stairs, it kind of cuts right through tens of millions of

dollars on the site work. The other point is the best route through that site once their study is done might not be under the road it might be under where the existing building is now. It has to be done, we don't want to rip up valuable site work, and the conclusion is it has to be done in parallel. It couldn't wait another ten years to do this work. At best you would be ripping the north entrance towards School Street, however if their conclusion for hydrology reasons is it really needs to cut diagonally across where the building is now and where there eventually will be two fields you would be ripping up those turf fields and having to patch them. Really, what is new is it has to happen, there is a strong desire to not have to rip up new site work to do it.

Susan Gravellese-Even at that time when we did the original feasibility study in 2020/2021 and we ruled out the existing site because of all the explanation that Donny did give us at that time, because it ran up stream and all the way to McKinley, etc. The challenges because of the culvert at that time in 2020/2021, we ruled out that site and we also did not have CDM Smith on board because we weren't going to that site, so we didn't have that information at that time that it had to be done parallel, because we didn't investigate that far. Is that correct?

Brian Dakin responded that is correct, just for clarity CDM Smith does not work for the project, they are not part of the project budget, they work directly for the city. Their study started up approximately a year after that. Their commitment to us is to have some kind of schematic idea on what they want to do on that site by December/January. What the path is, how deep it is, we could then sharpen the pencil on what's it cost and how it can happen.

Don Ciaramella-You also touched upon another subject that we need to talk about and what I am experiencing at that site and why we are having water breaks. It's not the water breaks that concern me, any pipe in the ground can be replaced. What worries me is constructing a new building and digging there. I have been involved with many projects and dig sites in Revere and no matter where we dig we find there is urban fill or dirty dirt. If you look at the maps, back in the 1600's, Revere was a bunch of islands or highlands, and in between was bunch of salt marshes, and we did what other towns did and filled in between the blanks. We know the high spots, we know the high school is a low spot. We had a water break in February this year and the only thing that came out of the ground was only urban fill, very thick mud. Most recently we had another water break in the back, completely different location, once again only urban fill came out. We also found bricks from old foundations and found the water main to be twelve feet deep, which means they installed the water main then built everything over it. Typically the water main is four feet deep, below the frost line. We did have a geotech person document what we will run into, but it was like digging an ancient dig. It is crazy what we are going to run into anytime we dig and my concern is amount of unsuitable material we are going to run into that site. That is a big concern. I think more money should be spent on borings before we build on that site. [Brian Dakin shared underground photos of the culvert.] The picture that shows the foundation is about twenty feet from the back of the high school, and that shows the site was not remediated before construction. This is a good example to show anywhere you are going to dig on the site will have urban fill.

Brian Dakin responded this kind of work will be costly and please keep in mind this is not eligible cost with the MSBA grant. Site work or dirty dirt are cost drivers.

Dianne Kelly-Is it a good summary to say, what we are left here tonight was not great news, but you need a little more time to explore it and the next meeting will be December 13th?

Brian Dakin responded yes that is correct.

Don Ciaramella-In my opinion we need to spend a little more money on analyzing the soil. I think we need to consider an intensive study on soil conditions, a vast amount of borings from one end the property to another, because that will be money really well spent and you'll get a good idea on what

you are in store for. We do it at many sites but that's held at a minimal amount of borings, that's minimal amount of information, and we always run into surprises. If you do a really intensive study on the site then you will get a really good window of what you're going to run into.

Dianne Kelly-Is that function of the fact we are not quite into schematic design yet?

Brian Dakin responded yes we can definitely do more, it might not be a massive field of borings, that's something you do in schematic design, but we are hoping to get someone out there in the coming weeks to get a few in some key spots. We then would bore the whole site once in schematic design.

Susan Gravellese-Then would we send the soil out for testing? To my knowledge testing takes quite a long time and if it is contaminated that process to remove it is quite lengthy as well.

Brian Dakin responded correct, it is a very heavily regulated process as it should be and we are carrying cost estimates on soil that will need to be exported because it's contaminated. It is a heavily regulated part of the process.

5-Public Comment

There is no public comment at this time.

6-Other Business/Discussions

There is no other business at this time.

7-Vote to Adjourn Meeting

Motion to adjourn was made by Dianne Kelly, Richard Viscay 2nd the motion.
All in favor.