

JOHN R. PIERCE SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA	MEETING MINUTES Approved 11/08/21
--	--

PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE		October 28, 2021
Location:		Online Zoom Meeting
Time:		4:00 PM
Name	Assoc.	Present
Bernard Greene	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, Select Board	N
Helen Charlupski	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, School Committee	Y
Melvin Kleckner	Voting Member – Town Administrator	Y
Andy Liu	Voting Member – School Committee	Y
Dr. Linus Guillory	Voting Member – Superintendent of Schools	Y
Charlie Simmons	Voting Member – Director of Public Buildings	N
Daniel Bennett	Voting Member – Building Commissioner	Y
Lesley Ryan-Miller	Voting Member – Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning	N
Carol Levin	Voting Member – Advisory Finance Committee	Y
Steve Heikin	Voting Member – Planning Board	Y
Ken Kaplan	Voting Member – Building Commission	Y
Aaron Williams	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	Y
Nurit Zuker	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	Y
Nancy O’Connor	Voting Member – Parks and Recreation Commission	Y
Sam Rippin	Voting Member – Assistant Superintendent of School Administration & Finance	Y
Jamie Yadoff	Voting Member – Pierce School Principal	Y
Melissa Goff	Non-Voting Member – Deputy Town Administrator	N
Michelle Herman	Non-Voting Member – Deputy Superintendent	N
Tony Guigli	Non-Voting Member – Building Department Project Manager	Y
Matt Gillis	Non-Voting Member – School Department Director of Operations	Y
Jim Rogers	LEFTFIELD	Y
Lynn Stapleton	LEFTFIELD	Y
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Will Spears	MDS Architects	Y
Amy Mackrell	MDS Architects	N
Margaret Clarke	MDS Architects	Y
Vinicius Gorgati	Sasaki	Y
Carla Ceruzzi	Sasaki	Y
Kate Tooke	Sasaki	Y
Tamar Warburg	Sasaki	Y

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Steve Heikin made a motion to approve meeting minutes from the October 14, 2021 SBAC Meetings. The motion was seconded by Aaron Williams. Roll was called and the motion passed 8-0-3.

Leftfield reviewed Budget Revision Requests (BRR) #1 through #4. The amendments and contracts associated with these Budget Revision Requests were approved previously by the Building Commission.

Leftfield explained each BRR to the SBC. BRR #1 dated February 9, 2021 is for Budget Transfers required to align MSBA FSA budget with approved OPM and Designer Contracts. BRR #2 dated August 10, 2021 is

for Budget Transfer required for Designer Amendment #1 for survey of interior slab. BRR #3 dated September 14, 2021 is for Budget Transfer required for Designer Amendment #2 for survey of existing garages. BRR #4 dated October 12, 2021 is for Budget Transfer required for OPM Amendment #1 for PSR and SD Cost Estimates.

Melvin Kleckner made a motion to approve Budget Revision Requests (BRR) #1 through #4. The motion was seconded by Nancy O'Connor. Roll was called and the motion passed 11-0-0.

The Public Forum on October 25, 2021 was reviewed, it was noted that there were 60 participants outside of the 20 or so members of the SBC. A member of the committee noted that a main topic of discussion was the idea of creating a safe crossing between the school and the playground across the street.

Another member of the committee noted that a closure of School Street would be a benefit to the community, but that a study should be conducted to determine the impacts of the surrounding streets and traffic. MDS added that the traffic engineer on the project is under contract to study a much more specific area around the site as a larger study was not referenced in the RFP. The Project Team will meet with Transportation Dept. staff to begin to understand the scope of a traffic study and impacts to the project. It was noted that VHB was the traffic engineer that is currently conducting a study of route 9.

A member of the committee suggested that a pedestrian overpass be considered to connect across School Street. She noted that it could be a wide bridge that creatively connects the green space on the site with the green space of the park. She noted that this might gain more traction with the community than closing School Street to vehicles. Another member of the committee noted that there is a pedestrian bridge connecting across the street currently, but children still choose to cross at street level out of convenience.

Leftfield noted that while the safety of those traveling to and through the site is a priority, it is part of a much larger discussion that will continue through Schematic Design. The topic is not a differentiator between the options on the table.

A member of the committee asked who would make the decision to close the street. It was noted that the next steps would be to meet with Transportation Department staff to determine the scope of a traffic study, then conduct a study, present the results of the study to the SBC, followed by a presentation to the Transportation Board with a recommendation from the SBC. The Transportation Board makes the final decision.

A member of the committee noted being impressed by the positivity and excitement around the project at the Public Forum. She echoed the concerns about safely crossing School Street, adding that it is important to consider the impacts of turning one lane of Route 9 into a bus only lane. This change will force more drivers into the neighborhood and will further impact School Street. She and others echoed an interest in a pedestrian overpass. She added that a comment made in the Public Forum that the school had been separated from the park was inaccurate, the school had never been connected to the park. Another committee member noted that the comment was meant to reflect that other schools in town do not have this condition that exists at Pierce.

A member of the committee noted that there seemed to be consensus from the public at the Public Forum about a confidence in the SBC to select an appropriate solution. She added that there was less confidence in how the School Street concerns will be addressed and echoed the need for a traffic study.

Discussion followed on whether a pedestrian overpass could be a solution to the crossing at School Street. A member of the committee noted that the footprint of a bridge and associated ramping may wind up eating into some available open space and could cause an issue for trucks passing underneath. Others noted that another pedestrian bridge in town recently cost approximately \$9 million. Leftfield noted that the cost of a pedestrian overpass had not been included in the cost studies as the emphasis to date had been placed on an at-grade crossing.

A member of the committee noted that there was no strong feeling one way or the other on whether the Historic Building should be included in the preferred option. It was noted that Pierce educational leadership will be meeting with the design team to walk through the plans for 3b and 3b-H to better understand the relationships between interior spaces.

A member of the community suggested that the feasibility of salvaging the exterior structure should be reviewed closer. Members of the SBC and project team noted that the existing 1970s building will not allow for the best layout of educational program. The existing building's exterior walls are load bearing and it would be difficult and expensive to make any alterations to the structure, and it would still result in an educationally inferior project.

Members of the committee noted that in the comparison of the sustainability of 3b vs. 3b-H, it needs to be clear that in both options, on a wider Town level, the Historic Building needs to be factored in. In 3b, the Historic Building will need to be renovated in the future and much like the costs for that renovation, the sustainability should be considered in this decision. Others on the committee agreed.

Aaron Williams made a motion to remove Options #1 and #2b from the decision process moving forward. The motion was seconded by Nancy O'Connor. Roll was called and the motion passed unanimously 11-0-0.

A member of the public noted that the embodied carbon of the new construction will need to be a priority of the team moving forward. It was noted that the team is looking at mass timber, green concrete, geothermal, and photovoltaics.

The Project Team will issue the comparison of the Options 3b and 3b-H and look for a vote at the next meeting. Leftfield will send out an email about scheduling the meeting for Monday, November 8th.

A member of the committee asked if the connection between a new building and the Historic Building could be designed to allow pedestrian traffic between to maintain permeability through the site. It was noted that the educational team would discuss this with the design team to see if this could be done without negatively affecting the educational program.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 PM.