

JOHN R. PIERCE SCHOOL – BROOKLINE, MA	MEETING MINUTES Approved 04/01/22
--	--

PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE		February 3, 2022
Location:		Online Zoom Meeting
Time:		4:00 PM
Name	Assoc.	Present
Bernard Greene	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, Select Board	Y
Helen Charlupski	Voting Member – Committee Co-Chair, School Committee	Y
Melvin Kleckner	Voting Member – Town Administrator	N
Andy Liu	Voting Member – School Committee	Y
Dr. Linus Guillory	Voting Member – Superintendent of Schools	Y
Charlie Simmons	Voting Member – Director of Public Buildings	Y
Daniel Bennett	Voting Member – Building Commissioner	N
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
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	N
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	N
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Will Spears	MDS Architects	Y
Amy Mackrell	MDS Architects	Y
Margaret Clark	MDS Architects	Y
Vinicius Gorgati	Sasaki	Y
Carla Ceruzzi	Sasaki	Y
Kate Tooke	Sasaki	Y
Jordan Pulling	Sasaki	N
Scott Thornton	Vanasse Associates, Inc – Traffic Engineering Consultant	Y
Todd Kirrane	Transportation Department	Y
Brian Kane	Transportation Board	Y
Erin Gallentine	DPW Commissioner	Y
Rob King	Director of Engineering and Transportation	Y
Alexandra Vecchio	Director of Parks and Open Spaces	Y
Scott Landgren	Town Senior Landscape Architect	Y
Jessie Waisnor	Town Landscape Architect	Y
Todd Cantor	Fire Department	Y

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

1. Announcements, Updates, and Comments - There were no Announcements, Updates, or Comments made at this time.
2. Project Approvals - **Helen Charlupski moved approval of the meeting minutes from the January 13, 2022 meeting. Nancy O'Connor seconded. The motion passed unanimously 10-0-1.**
3. MSBA Process Update – The MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (FAS) meeting was held on February 2nd and the project team along with the school principal presented the project to the MSBA. It was explained that the FAS is made up of members of the MSBA Board of Directors and includes people with backgrounds in education as well as architects/designers. One of the members of the board is a former Brookline School Committee member. Jamie Yadoff presented on how the building design reflects the Educational Plan, MDS and Sasaki presented the building and site design, and Leftfield presented on public process and estimated project costs. After the presentation, the FAS members asked questions around the plans and educational program and how the building interacts with the site.

Co-chair Charlupski added that she thought the meeting went very well and that the presentation was fantastic. Co-chair Greene noted that he felt the MSBA's questions were all answered well by the team and Town representatives. He added that he felt the MSBA was impressed by what has been accomplished on the project to date.

The next step is for the project go before the MSBA's full Board of Directors on March 2, 2022 to get their approval to officially move forward into Schematic Design.

Leftfield noted that the MSBA's comments on the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) were received by the project team on January 24th with the District and Project Team's responses due to the MSBA by February 7th. The project team has several clarifying questions into the MSBA are expect a response by the end of the week. Leftfield noted that the comments on the PSR were minimal and many were the MSBA's standard acknowledgements. The minimal comments combined with the outcome of the FAS meeting should mean the project is on target for an easy approval at the MSBA's Board of Directors meeting on March 2nd.

Leftfield will send the responses to the MSBA's comments (which include the MSBA's comments) along with the presentation from the FAS meeting out to the SBC ahead of the next meeting.

4. Budget Update – Leftfield presented on the remaining funds in the Feasibility Study. The original total budget for the Feasibility Study was \$2 million. Currently, with the Designer and OPM contracts and amendments committed to the budget, \$188,658 remains uncommitted. The project team anticipates the following uses of the remaining funds:

John R. Pierce School - Brookline, MA										January 31, 2022
Total Project Budget Status Report										
ProPay Code	Description	Total Project Budget	Authorized Changes	Revised Total Budget	Total Committed	% Cmtd to Date	Actual Spent to Date	% Spent to Date	Balance To Spend	Comments
FEASIBILITY STUDY AGREEMENT										
0001-0000	OPM Feasibility Study/Schematic Design	\$ 100,000	\$ 245,884	\$ 345,884	\$ 345,884	100%	\$ 262,904	76%	\$ 82,980	*FSA 1, 4, 5
0002-0000	A&E Feasibility Study/Schematic Design	\$ 950,000	\$ 507,266	\$ 1,457,266	\$ 1,457,266	100%	\$ 680,127	47%	\$ 777,139	*FSA 1, 2, 3, 5
0003-0000	Environmental & Site	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 8,192	5%	\$ 8,192	5%	\$ 141,808	
0004-0000	Other	\$ 800,000	\$ (753,150)	\$ 46,850	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 46,850	*FSA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,811,342	91%	\$ 951,223	48%	\$ 1,048,777	

Anticipated Uses:

Brookline Bldg Dept. Admin	\$47,636	To Date
Brookline Bldg Dept. Admin	\$52,364	Projected
Property Due Diligence	\$15,000	Town Counsel conducting research
Additional Site Survey	\$15,230	only req'd if internal block property lines not established
CM Precon/SD Estimate	\$60,000	

Total Anticipated \$190,230
Remaining Budget \$188,658
Delta -\$1,572

The yellow highlighted cells indicate costs that were identified and have been accounted for but not committed. It was also noted that the cost listed under property line due diligence may be allocated to available Town Counsel funds, that has yet to be determined.

Leftfield explained that Town Counsel is researching the deed for the parcel of land that the school is on. The MSBA requires a deed on file before entering into a funding agreement with the Town to ensure the Town has clear title to the property. The deed has been a little difficult to track down on this project because the land transfer dates back to at least the 1800s.

- CM at Risk Update – Leftfield noted that the application to the Inspector General’s Office will be submitted in the coming weeks and that the RFQ process will begin shortly thereafter. The next step for this project is to identify a CM at Risk Selection Committee to review the qualifications and proposals that will be submitted by interested firms, and also to attend interviews for the firms.

The selection committee should be comprised of one member of the OPM team, one member of the Design team, one member of the Select Board, one member of the School Committee, and one member of the Building Commission. It was decided that Helen Charlupski would be the representative for the School Committee and Bernard Greene would be the representative from the Select Board. The team will ask the Building Commission at their upcoming meeting to propose one of their members for the committee. Once the third person has been named, a memo will be sent to the Select Board to officially appoint these individuals to the CMR Selection Committee.

Co-chair Charlupski noted that the interviews for the CM at Risk are public and that any members of the SBC interested in attending and providing feedback to the CMR Selection Committee are welcome to do so. Co-chair Greene noted that the candidates must be asked

about minority hiring practices and that the questions should be vetted by this group beforehand to make sure the right questions are being asked. Leftfield noted that there was one question included in the designer interviews that can be re-circulated for comment prior to being added to the interview questions. Others added that geothermal should be an important question added to the interviews as well.

6. Pedestrian Bridge Discussion – Leftfield framed the discussion by explaining that while there is a possible vote offered on the agenda, the group could opt to vote at the next meeting. Leftfield explained that a vote not to proceed with the design of a pedestrian bridge will allow the team to move forward without a pedestrian bridge in the project. A vote to proceed with the design of a pedestrian bridge only means that the project move forward into a required regulatory process that may stop the bridge from being added to the project at any number of steps along the way. It was emphasized again that a vote to proceed with the pedestrian bridge may not result in a pedestrian bridge being included in the project.

Leftfield noted that the initial pedestrian bridge concepts that are being presented tonight have been reviewed with Parks and Open Spaces, DPW, Transportation, and Building Departments as well as the School, Police, and Fire.

If the bridge lands within the footprint of the park across School Street, Article 97 would be triggered. This would require the following steps:

- Municipal Conservation Commission must vote that the land is surplus to its needs (Unanimous Vote Required)
- Municipal Park Commission must then vote that the land is surplus to its needs (Unanimous Vote Required)
- The Select Board must also vote to remove the land from protected status (a 2/3 vote required)
- Municipality must file an Environmental Notification Form with EOEEA's MEPA Unit
- The disposition request must pass by a 2/3 vote of the Massachusetts Legislature and be signed by the Governor. (a 2/3 roll call vote of both Houses of the State Legislature required)
- The converted land must be replaced with land of equal monetary value and recreational or conservation utility

The project would also be subject to review by the National Park Service because federal funding was received for the park. More information for the timing of this process would be needed to understand if the Article 97 and NPS processes could occur concurrently.

Eminent domain was brought up by a committee member as another possibility to allow the project to avoid the Article 97 process. Leftfield outlined the timeline from another project from a city nearby. In that project the following steps would be required:

- Mar 2022 Law Department and Relocation Services Specialist to Meet with Owner of the Property Considered for Eminent Domain
- Apr 2022 School Committee Vote to Request that Select Board Vote for Eminent Domain of the Prop
- Apr 2022 Appraisals of the Property by Two Independent Appraisers to Begin

- Jun 2022 Submit Schematic Design Report including Project Cost Information to MSBA
- Aug 2022 MSBA Board Approval of a Project Scope and Budget Agreement
- Sept 2022 Town Meeting for John R. Pierce School Project
- Sept 2022 Certification of Debt Exclusion Vote Provided to MSBA by this Date
- Sept 2022 Select Board Meeting to Vote for Eminent Domain of the Property and to Issue the Notice of Intent of Property Taking
- Sept 2022 Notice of Intent of Property Taking to be Sent to Property Owner
- Oct 2022 Pro Tanto Payment
- Oct 2022 File Order of Takings
- Nov 2022 Town to Begin Relocation Services
- Nov 2022 Payment Complete
- Dec 2022 Properties Vacated
- Dec 2022 MSBA to Provide Project Funding Agreement to Town
- Dec 2022 Town to Execute and Return Project Funding Agreement to MSBA by this Date (extension required beyond Oct 15, 2022)

Leftfield emphasized that the process would need to start immediately, and would likely drag on beyond the October 15, 2022 deadline by when the Town would need to execute the Project Funding Agreement with the MSBA. An extension to that date can be requested, but no reimbursement will be received from the MSBA until that agreement is executed.

In order to execute the agreement, clear ownership of all properties involved in the project need to be demonstrated. Members of the committee noted that the timeline shown above would be very conservative for a process like this to unfold in Brookline and that a year or more would be more likely.

A member of the committee noted that there was one project in town that recently undertook eminent domain, but she noted that it is still under litigation. She asked if the MSBA considers the bridge ineligible for reimbursement, if they would still need to include the bridge as part of the funding agreement. Leftfield explained that the MSBA needs to know all costs associated with the project and will require clear title be demonstrated for all property involved in the project before entering into the Project Funding Agreement (PFA).

Leftfield explained that because the bridge would be built over School Street and place a height restriction on the street, it would need to go through the Transportation Board approval process as well, though this process could happen concurrently with either the Article 97 or Eminent Domain process.

Leftfield and MDS reached out to the MSBA to determine what the MSBA would require if a bridge was included in the project. The MSBA would either require that the bridge be open to the elements, or would require that the square footage of the bridge be included in the net to gross calculations if the bridge is enclosed. This would mean that if the bridge is enclosed, the project would need to eliminate the same amount of circulation space elsewhere in the building to maintain the 1.50 grossing factor maximum they require for new construction. The project is currently exactly at a 1.50 grossing factor for the new construction portion of the building.

It was added that perhaps enclosure of the bridge could be an alternate or added at the end of the project if funds remained available. The bridge could also become its own separate project to be built after the Pierce School project is complete.

A member of the committee noted that while the Eminent Domain and Article 97 processes are daunting, the possibility of requesting a special permit if it allows the bridge to stay off of park land would likely have no issue passing given the Dover Amendment applies to the school project.

Leftfield added that the Eminent Domain and Article 97 timelines do not align well with the MSBA's schedule to get to a PFA by October 15, 2022. It was added that both processes would extend the timeline and create cost uncertainty for the project, and both would result in additional cost to the project.

The Pierce School principal noted that the bridge is currently open to the elements and as a result becomes a safety concern and creates maintenance issues. She added that an open air bridge would not be an ideal solution for the new school design. She noted that if a bridge is installed at the proposed location within the school, transition time for students heading to recess is doubled and takes away from students' free play time. She said that a wide, raised crosswalk at grade with flashers and a crossing guard during peak hours would be preferred as it would offer the most direct path from the school to the park, therefore limiting transition times.

Sasaki presented high level conceptual studies that explore a pedestrian bridge that crosses School Street. It was noted that the existing pedestrian bridge, which connects the 1970s portion of the school building to the park across the street, is the only mid-block connection across School Street as there is not currently a crosswalk at that location. The existing bridge is not ADA accessible, is only 6 feet wide, and only allows 16'4" at road clearance which does not meet current codes to allow firetrucks to pass underneath. The existing bridge is not accessible during non-school hours.

A new pedestrian crossing would require 18' clearance above the street. The stairs and head house would need to include a ramp to be considered accessible to the public, an elevator/lift could be an option, but its maintenance would need to be considered. Sasaki noted that keeping the existing bridge is not an option based on the lack of accessibility, the fact that it does not allow the 18' clearance required, and it would not align with any of the proposed floors of the building to allow a smooth connection.

Sasaki reviewed the constraints on the plan including setbacks from the properties adjacent to the basketball courts. The existing head house for the bridge does not comply with the setback requirements, though as a member of the committee noted earlier, a special permit to avoid the setback requirement could be granted through the planning board process. Sasaki noted that if the headhouse lands on any portion of the existing park, Article 97 process would be triggered as noted previously.

Sasaki presented studies that explored how the bridge could connect to the park, including three studies that looked at the space required for ramping or stairs. An elevator would be included at the headhouse for the options with only stairs. Another option explored creating a connector bridge that connects the top of the site near the Historic Building to the park. This would restrict the green space being considered between the school and the library in a location where the green space is already restricted quite a bit.

Another option that was presented showed an at-grade street crossing with the road depressed to allow for 18' clearance. This option would require a 20' retaining wall and sloping from at minimum of 150' in either direction from the crossing. This would result in a loss of access to the loading dock that is shared by the school and library, and loss of parking access to local residences and commercial properties.

Sasaki showed how the bridge could become more sculptural and showed how various real world ramps would land on the site to explore scale. Cost for these options was also shown escalated to 2022 prices, it was noted that the cost would need to be escalated further to represent when the project would actually be constructed.

Vanasse Associates, Inc (VAI) presented the proposed condition for the at-grade street level crossing. Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB) are installed at crossings and rely on a push button for activation. Through Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) studies, it was determined that RRFBs by themselves improve motorist yielding compliance by 82-96% and reduce pedestrian crashes by 47%. RRFBs are typical in Brookline.

VAI showed information on increased safety provided by raised crosswalks. According to FHWA studies, on their own they can reduce pedestrian crashes by 45%. At an installation at Bigelow Avenue in Watertown, MA, which was installed in 2016, the raised crosswalk resulted in a reduction of speeds to 21-24 mph average along Bigelow Avenue in a posted 30 mph zone while speeds at the raised crosswalk itself were reduced to 15.5 – 16.3 mph average.

A member of the committee asked if the RRFBs by themselves show a reduction in pedestrian crashes of 47%, and the raised crossing by itself shows a reduction of 45%, there are still incidents occurring at these locations. The committee member asked if these numbers are considered successful. VAI explained that the studies do not give absolute numbers, just percentages, so there is a chance that the number of crashes before installation was low to begin with. As part of the traffic study VAI is conducting with regards to School Street conditions, the data collected to date indicates that there are no recorded crashes along the stretch of School Street under consideration, so it is important to consider that if the starting point is zero crashes, safety improvement may need to be measured by the number of near-misses that are avoided, and that data is unavailable as near-misses are not recorded incidents.

VAI presented information on increased safety provided by “road diets” or the narrowing of streets. Narrowing roadways does reduce travel speeds and reduces the number of total crashes (vehicular and pedestrian) by 29%. FHWA studies show that there is a significant reduction in pedestrian crashes when the number of lanes being crossed is reduced.

VAI explained that the proposed solution for an at-grade crossing at School Street (if the street remains open) includes RRFBs, a raised crosswalk and a road diet. There are no studies through FHWA that examine the percentage of improvement from combining these three safety measures, but it is assumed that it would be a higher percentage than any of the measures on their own.

Sasaki summarized their presentation with a list of opportunities and challenges a pedestrian bridge provides.

Opportunities:

- Pedestrian and vehicular separation
- Improves ADA accessibility over current conditions
- Direct connection from 2nd level of Pierce School to Pierce Playground and adds a point of egress from the building
- Opportunities for program, public art, or signage on the bridge structure

Challenges:

- Physical impact on park program (courts, fields)
- Additional procedures through Article 97
- Perceived inconvenience of navigating significant grade change could limit use
- Added transition times for students to get to recess
- High cost relative to use and redundancy with at-grade crossing
- Architectural impact on adjacent properties and experience of the neighborhood

Todd Kirrane, Transportation Administrator may involve Mass DOT if School Street is transformed into two dead ends. Mass DOT will be informed if School Street is closed, but may not require their formal approval if state funds are not used for the roadway work, and if streets entering or exiting their direct right of way are not affected. The Pierce project is an MSBA project that is receiving state funding, so that may trigger the need for Mass DOT approval.

Brian Kane, chair of the Transportation Board and Pierce parent, noted that whatever decision is made, it must be the safest for the most people, especially the children.

Mr. Kirrane added that one of the first requests through the Town-wide Safe Routes to Schools group was a safe at-grade crossing at School Street. Pierce parents have been requesting a safe at-grade crossing for years, so regardless of whether a pedestrian bridge is included in the project, an at-grade crossing will still be necessary. He added that RRFBs, raised crossings and road diets all provide significant increase in safety and they are even more effective when combined as is being proposed at School Street.

A member of the committee noted that he did not feel that at-grade crossings are the safest option. He added that there is a bridge now and there have not been any pedestrian crashes at School Street, but he wondered if increasing the number of pedestrians crossing throughout the day might increase the chances of a pedestrian crash.

Co-chair Greene reminded the committee that the school principal's comments earlier in the meeting emphasized the challenges that a pedestrian bridge would impose on planning and it would add transition time for students to get to recess. He added that the burden to move through the Article 97 process could still result in not having a bridge in the project. He noted that even with a road diet, cars are directed elsewhere, that traffic does not just disappear, so it is important to consider where those cars go to avoid unsafe conditions elsewhere in Town.

The Pierce School principal explained that one of her main concerns with a pedestrian bridge is a current concern with the existing bridge. She explained that the existing bridge is not open during non-school hours and therefore everyone trying to cross the street between the park and the school/civic campus during non-school hours crosses at-grade where there is no crosswalk or any other traffic calming measures. She noted that there are more days and more hours when the bridge is inaccessible than there are days when it is accessible. She would prefer to build something that is best for educational programming that decreases transition time during the one block where students have truly unstructured play time which is important to Brookline as a community. She said it is the most important to make a safe crossing that accommodates the most people during all hours. She added that it would be easiest for the school to station a crossing guard at the crossing during the busiest times of use, or potentially even for the full school day.

A member of the committee noted that the ramp is too much of a burden on the open space on the other side. She added that it would increase the distance between the school and the park as people do take the path of least resistance even now when the bridge is an option. She voiced support for a full street closure at School Street. She noted that she is not ready to vote on the bridge at this time.

A member of the committee asked for clarification on whether the basketball courts are part of the park that Article 97 applies to, the Director of Parks and Open Space confirmed that the basketball courts are part of the park. The committee member asked if the headhouse with the elevator and stair would still trigger the Article 97 process, the Director of Parks and Open Space confirmed that it would. The member of the committee voiced opposition to reintroducing a pedestrian bridge as it would not address the issues at the street level and would be as un-accessible to the public during non-school hours as the existing bridge. He noted support for the at-grade crossing with appropriate street calming measures.

Leftfield noted that the decision needs to be made on the bridge before the traffic study is complete in order to stay on schedule.

A member of the committee noted that she is not comfortable taking a vote at this meeting. She asked whether it is possible to create a partial raised bridge over a depressed street. The design team noted that they would provide a response at the next meeting.

A member of the committee noted that the most effective solution is to install a raised crosswalk, RRFs, and reduce the width of the street. A staff person or crossing guard should be stationed at the crosswalk to assist students with crossing. She added that on the school side of

the street, maybe there is a possibility to introduce more play space to minimize the number of students that need to cross to use the playground.

A member of the committee noted that the bridge is not the best option, but his concern is that an at-grade crossing is not 100% safe as it does not separate the children from traffic. He added that he is not ready to vote on the bridge today.

Leftfield clarified that while the data on safety improvement the traffic calming measures were presented individually, but that the safety improvement expected for a combination of the RRFBs, the raised crosswalk and the road diet should be much higher.

Leftfield reiterated that the MSBA will not participate in the funding of the pedestrian bridge. It does not matter if the bridge is open air or if it's enclosed.

Leftfield explained that the timing is a factor in this decision because the MSBA needs to know all costs associated with the project when we submit the Schematic Design (SD) Report to them in late June. Backing out from that date, plans and related project documents need to be handed over to the estimators by May 9th to pull together the costs in time to submit the SD Report in late June. If a bridge is included in the project, MDS needs time to design the bridge and work through how it lands on the park side of the street before those documents are provided to the estimators on May 9th.

Leftfield explained that once the project costs are set at Schematic Design, that is the budget the project needs to live within. There is no chance to go back to the MSBA after the fact to ask for more money if the project waits to introduce a bridge later in the project. Given the costs of some of the examples shown earlier, there is no room for that kind of cost to be added to the project later.

The School Department project manger asked if there is a reason that people want the bridge, adding that it seems to be an expensive option that will be used by a limited number of people, will encroach on park land and require an additional lengthy process to have it approved. He added that the school principal did not find a bridge beneficial either.

A member of the committee noted that Brimmer and May in Chestnut Hill crosses the street during the day to access two school buildings.

A member of the committee suggested that the design team design the building to allow for a future bridge as a separate project.

Leftfield clarified that if the bridge is part of the overall project, while it would be deemed an ineligible cost that the MSBA would not participate in, the MSBA would need to know the cost of the bridge to move forward with a Project Funding Agreement. If the pedestrian bridge becomes a separate project, the MSBA would not need to be involved.

The Building Commissioner noted that while the SBC could vote to proceed with the design of a pedestrian bridge, there are a number of committees that would then need to weigh in and at

any point the bridge could be stopped by a committee that does not vote unanimously in favor of the project. He added that the Town has historically avoided Article 97 process as it is a daunting task with many unknowns. He added that with Eminent Domain the 111 Cypress property took over a year to resolve.

Co-chair Charlupski noted that her concerns are the costs associated with the addition of a bridge, and with the arduous process of Article 97 or Eminent Domain. She added that the timelines shown were just examples that could drag on far longer if the appropriate approvals were even obtained and then delay the project. She noted that the committee should wait to vote if some of the members are undecided and need a little extra time to digest the information shown tonight.

A member of the committee noted that while Article 97 would be triggered, it would be likely that the project would require approval at the federal level if federal funds were ever received for the park. The Director of Parks and Open Space confirmed that federal funds were received for the park. She explained that while she is on the Parks and Recreation Commission, she is unable to guess at whether a unanimous vote would be possible. She added that the big hurdle is that this bridge would take away park land that would need to be replaced elsewhere. She noted that the big local push will be whether or not to close School Street and create two dead ends.

A member of the committee suggested negotiating easements at the back of the properties abutting the park to accommodate a ramp. She added that the parking lot might be able to be used to replace the basketball courts if they are replaced through the Article 97 process. She asked if keeping the existing head house is an option that would avoid Article 97. MDS explained that the existing head house is not to code and would need to be upgraded to include appropriate stair and elevator and the footprint would need to be larger.

Alexandra Vecchio, Director of Parks and Open Space, explained that the basketball courts are the only set of lit basketball courts so they do get a lot of use outside of school hours. She noted that open space is at a premium in the Town and she would be surprised if this moved forward with a unanimous vote through the Parks and Recreation Commission as would be required by Article 97.

The next meeting was scheduled for February 17, 2022 from 4pm to 5pm and will be a continuation of the discussion on the pedestrian bridge.

7. Upcoming Meetings

- February 8, 2022 – Building Commission Meeting at 6:00pm
- February 17, 2022 – School Building Committee Meeting at 4:00pm

8. Old Business – There was no Old Business at this time.

9. New Business – A member of the committee noted that there is a request by the Pierce PTO to present on the project. Co-chair Charlupski suggested that a PTO meeting be combined with a

broader community meeting. The design team and OPM will be part of this meeting for a short presentation and to field questions.

10. Public Comment – There was no Public Comment at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.