

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	Christopher Bowen
Nicholas Rystrom	Carl Svendsen
Brian Dakin	Linda Liporto
Lynn Stapleton	Robert Bell
Dawn Guarriello	Mark McCarthy
Rachel Whitmore	John Laperle
Tim Ericson	Chris Hamel

Meeting Minutes for January 3, 2024

A meeting of the High School Building Committee was held on January 3, 2024 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		
Joanne McKenna		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
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: RevereTV, Ed Terrell, Claudia Correa, Michelle Kelley, Anthony Zambuto, Anthony Parziale, Joe Lewin, Tina Conlon, Agnes Svendsen, Penelope Kalliavas, Angela Guarino-Sawaya, Rainhan Ahmed, John Kingston, John Stamatopoulos
Susan Gravellese called meeting to order at 5:30pm.

2-Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 13, 2023

Deferred to next meeting.

3-Preferred Schematic Report Update & Discussion

Leftfield (Brian Dakin), Perkins Eastman (Dawn Guarriello) and Consigli (Jim Hervol, Kristy Lyons) presented.

- A. Upcoming Meetings and Process Summary-the team briefly summarized the upcoming meetings and process summary.
- B. Existing Site Options Summary-the team discussed the existing site options summary. The three options on the existing site are “Courtyard-4-Story”, “Triangle 5-Story” and “Triangle 6-Story”. The total project costs for each option were listed as: Courtyard 4-Story-\$550,295,868, the Triangle 5-Story-\$554,840,581 and the Triangle 6-Story-\$557,093,098. The team is mention that the 5-story option is a hybrid of the 4-story and 6-story. The team discussed logistics for each site. The team discussed the Pros and Cons of the current site. Phase 1: Construction-pros are less disruption to students, cons are major impact to onsite parking, difficult site access (potential restrictions with DOT from Rt. 60), fields are offline, major neighborhood impacts and potential culvert impact. The team mentioned there will be a schedule impact due to crane usage, i.e. the site can only use 1 crane vs use of 2 cranes at Wonderland. The team also emphasized the need for busing of people for the current site during construction. The schedule with 2 cranes was estimated at 6 months added, the current site with 1 crane would add an estimated 9 months or more.

Patrick Keefe-You mentioned the fields and this may be lower on the priority scale, within the five year project for construction are we looking at seven years for field usage? The team responded it potentially take a year to abate and demo the existing building, once we are done building the new. We will be starting to erect the new fields the following summer, so potentially 6-7 years total. It also has not been determined if we need to erect new fields, elsewhere during the construction process, that is determined by Article 97. The other advantage or disadvantage are the geothermal wells for the existing site; complicates the site, looking at the space they will have to go under the new building or in Ambrose Park, which adds time to the schedule.

The team discussed construction cost comparison; construction only cost. The 4-story scheme (\$419,953,527 Cost/SqFt): more efficient exterior wall to floor area ratio and larger footprint, therefore more foundation and roof cost. The 5-story (\$424,281,825 Cost/SqFt) and 6-story

(\$426,427,079 Cost/SqFt) schemes have more stairs and elevator stops and are less efficient exterior wall to floor area ratios.

The team discussed Existing Site Options Cost Comparison. Courtyard 4 Scheme total project cost \$550,295,868, cost to Revere \$310,833,936. Triangle 5 scheme total project \$554,840,581, cost to Revere \$315,330,106. Triangle 6 scheme total project \$557,093,098, cost to Revere \$317,558,445. The team noted Ambrose field will be used as temporary parking and is required to build on the existing site. There is an allowance for potential permanent and/or temporary culvert work is required to be authorized in tandem with a project on the existing site. The \$5mil value for replacement administrative offices represents an order-of-magnitude cost to replace that facility off-site at an existing to-be-determined location.

The team discussed the Existing Site Options Schedule Summary. The noted all existing site options are projected to have the same schedule.

Dianne Kelly-I have a question about the geothermal wells. I know part of the close out is we get a greater percentage if we have a building that considered environmentally adequate and forward thinking in that regard. My understanding is that it is tens of millions of dollars of reimbursement do you have any information on that, about how much of that money the city would be giving up?

The team responded it will be more challenging at the current site, some will have to go under building and a lot of them end up under the triangular parking area. So it becomes another logistics issue with this very tight site. The wells would need to be installed before any construction trailer goes in. We cannot let this go, it would not benefit anyone if we let this go, the rebates in most cases make the system less expensive than a traditional system and the building codes are pushing most new construction in this direction.

C. Motion to Select A Single Option on the Existing Site-

Motion to select the 4-story courtyard as the single option for the existing site was made by Stacey Bronsdon-Rizzo, Dianne Kelly 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				Present
Richard Viscay	X			
Gerry Visconti	X			

D. Wonderland Option Summary & Comparison to Existing Options. The committee explained the reasoning to the revisit of Wonderland. The MSBA grant changed this year, the reimbursement calculator changed, and members of the committee requested we revisit the Wonderland site to compare cost for this option. The Wonderland 4-Story was discussed. The pros of the site are better site access, minimal residential impacts, onsite contractor parking and laydown, project is completed sooner (no demolition), no impact to existing sports fields, and better utility

coordination and there would be no impact to the students or staff. The cons are a higher water table. The construction cost comparison points are shorter overall construction duration, no abatement/demolition phase, no premium of general requirements due to complicated site logistics and construction costs estimate is \$412,006,854, which is lower than the existing site options. The cost comparison of the existing site (total project cost \$550,295,868, cost to Revere \$310,833,936) vs Wonderland site (total project cost \$493,217,901, cost to Revere \$259,100,545) shows a \$51,733,391 delta from the courtyard 4 scheme.

The team presented site comparisons between the Courtyard 4-Story and Wonderland sites. A few of the comparisons mentioned were both are located in a flood plain, the existing site the construction will have significant impact on the students and learning environment, the eastern county ditch at Wonderland would require permitting but Article 97 only applies to the existing site, and the culvert at the existing site is a significant hurdle and cost.

E. Motion to Send Update Communication to the School Committee and City Council
 Motion the School Building Committee send a communication to the School Committee and City Council summarizing the 4-Story option on the existing Revere High School site including schematic drawings, the cost and the reimbursement anticipated from the MSBA as well as the same information based on updated MSBA reimbursements at the Wonderland site was made by Dianne Kelly, 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-Public Comment

Jessica Simpson-24 Grand Ave-I would like to voice my concern with flooding in the neighborhood and now with the culvert, I am here to ask for information on what will happen or is expected to happen with this construction with the drainage and flooding and also what happens to our homes or what is expected to happen if the culvert fails? What do we expect when we already deal with flooding in our homes and I want to know for future events who do I call and who do I talk too about this? [Donald Ciaramella answered the question.] I would like to see for the future to keep the residents informed regarding the culvert.

Matthew Terrell-215 Crescent Ave-Chair of Revere High School Student Senate-I know this is beating a dead horse and we have known for a year plus I would like to refer to Brian and his analogy turning over every stone. What we see here is we are turning over every stone and the two stones we are turning

over; one has \$100, maybe \$150 with the new MSBA model, under it the other has a pile of dirt. When we look at this it's over \$51mil more expensive, and of that \$51mil we are spending \$4.2mil at least to destroy a park, pave over it, rip up the pavement, and make another park. More than that we see that expansion is going to be complicated, ripping off a roof, paying for it twice, we see that disruption is going to affect every single part of the city, whether it be the students, the parents, or the neighbors; just with transportation alone ripping up so many parking spots where students and staff are not going to be able to drive to school in a city where we already have a transportation crisis where we cannot adequately transport our students to school every day, not only with traffic is pick up and drop off going to be severely worse, we find we are going to run out of room. It's a fact, I feel like there is nowhere we can go with at the existing site where it isn't going to bit us eventually, and I just really can't.

Anthony Zambuto-High Street-The superintendent said it best, we need a high school. I need to be realistic and I need to be able to tell the tax payers we are going to be able to afford this school, we need the revenue from Wonderland to pay for this school. First of all, we are telling people it'll be cheaper to go to Wonderland, first of all we are in litigation, and I don't want to talk numbers but the acquisition is going to be at least \$100mil, that's just the acquisition. It's \$1.2bil off the tax roll. When you put that together we need a funding source for this high school, that's the reality. I know Consigli was talking it would be easier to build there, well it's easier to go into receivership to build something you can't afford, that's something I have to prevent as a city councilor. The reality is there is a lot of risks involved with the culvert but there are a lot of risks during the MEPA process that was brushed over as it's not Article 97. Article 97 is a lot easier to deal with than the MEPA process at Wonderland, you can gloss over a lot of things, there are a lot of problems at Wonderland and the biggest problem is taking money off the tax role. Where are going to come up with the funding? Where ever the high school goes we will need to build the culvert. It's not about politics, Wonderland is not the place for this high school to go fiscally.

Wilson-12 Sweeney Ave-I am a coach and the fields are very important to me, but when we talk about the tax payer money, I'd rather lose money than the education of kids. I am an immigrant and I was able to fit in this country because people care about my education. I look at the development at Suffolk Downs there are 2000-3000 units, I just ran quick math and compared what I pay tax for one unit and multiplied that number with the number of units at Suffolk Downs, and it comes out to \$15mil-\$25mil per year, that's enough to cover the high school cost in a very short time. Another point, we are looking to save money, what is going to happen in 5-10-15 years from now? We are having trouble at the Garfield with pipes bursting. I can see that happening more and more in the 5-10years. We need a central middle school, and if we don't find it within the next 10 years it will cost us \$1-2bill to find that space. We also discusses how much this city has grown with citizens, I understand you are looking at the numbers and you are being financially responsible but we also need to be socially responsible. I think we are by having a high school that can grow and we can save the taxpayers money in the long run. In a city of 60,000 we have only 2 fields, the surrounding cities that are smaller have more fields. Let's think about what's best for the city, not only for now but for the long run.

Mark Silvestri-501 Revere Beach Parkway-City Councilor-We've lost so much time on the process and we are almost in the same place. We have hired the best of the best in every field and they are telling us what we expect and what we thought we are going to hear. Then we put the brakes on it. I agree with Consigli and I think it's going to be easier. I grew up on Ambrose Park, and I cannot imagine having a

parking lot there, what are we going to do when we take away all the fields? What are we going to do with the children of this city when we take the fields? Is it a perfect idea to take it off the tax rolls, maybe not but we don't live in a perfect world? I believe, when people pitch future ideas on a site that are not in the best interest of us and the city, I begin to wonder where their intentions are, it is sad that we have people supporting land owners and not the children of Revere. I think the school needs to go to Wonderland.

Matthew Terrell-215 Crescent Ave-First, I feel you do not need to be an economist to know that Suffolk Downs site and the Wonderland site are not equal to each other. The Suffolk Downs site is located between two MBTA stops and it opens up directly to one drives up value. The Wonderland site, any transit access is disrupted by a highway and it's not feasible to speculate that is exact translation of value on acreage. Secondly, with what Wilson and Mark said, when looking at the future of the city you cannot disregard the future of the students, you cannot disregard we are not going to have any sports fields for 7-8 years, you cannot ignore the fact that when the school opens it will already be at its breaking point and it's not going to have room to expand. And furthermore, sure people have built on existing sites but have they built between two schools where there's an underground culvert in the middle? I'm just curious. [Leftfield responded]

Anthony Parziale-51 Arcadia Street-When you present Wonderland and the existing site to the city council and the school committee, if you can have all of the numbers? In the interest of a voter I feel like we are not being transparent enough. You should have the acquisition number as part of the Wonderland site and the culvert number as part of the existing site.

John Stramatopoulos-15 School Street-Proponent of the Wonderland site. Do I think it's the best site, no, but I think it's what we have left. We have tried for years to develop that land commercial unsuccessfully. If you are to look at that as a commercial development you put a pin down and look at the surrounding radius of it, half of that is ocean. What you could potentially put there is 5000-6000 more apartments, which the whole city seems to be against, so I encourage us, because we have sold every patch of land in this city and to develop apartments, for the sake of the kids do not with the one spec of land we have remaining. Let's put a school there for the benefit of the future of the kids. It's the only place that will us to build a world class school for our kids, with the resources they need without interruption to the home owners in the area and the students and their wellbeing. And for the families like myself, when we go 5-6 years without fields, because we are understaffed with the lack of fields it's also a tremendous financial and time burden on the families that have to bus their kids to other cities. I ask we do the right thing by these kids.

5-Other Business/Discussions

There is no other business at this time.

6-Vote to Adjourn Meeting

Motion to adjourn was made by Susan Gravellese, Patrick Keefe 2nd the motion.
All in favor.