

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

PIERCE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE		February 17, 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	N
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	Y
Carol Levin	Voting Member – Advisory Finance Committee	Y
Steve Heikin	Voting Member – Planning Board	N
Aaron Williams	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	Y
Nurit Zuker	Voting Member – Pierce School Parent	N
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	N
Lynn Stapleton	LEFTFIELD	N
Jen Carlson	LEFTFIELD	Y
Will Spears	MDS Architects	Y
Amy Mackrell	MDS Architects	N
Margaret Clark	MDS Architects	Y
Vinicius Gorgati	Sasaki	Y
Carla Ceruzzi	Sasaki	Y
Kate Tooke	Sasaki	Y
Jordan Pulling	Sasaki	Y
Scott Thornton	Vanasse Associates, Inc – Traffic Engineering Consultant	N
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 – The SBC decided to approve the February 3, 2022 meeting minutes at the next meeting.

3. Pedestrian Bridge Discussion – This discussion is a continuation of a discussion that began during the February 3, 2022 SBC meeting. Leftfield reviewed the opportunities and challenges that were heard during the last meeting.

Benefits of including a pedestrian bridge in the design include:

- Separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- Opportunities for public art or signage on the bridge structure;
- Opportunity for direct connection from 2nd level of Pierce School to the Park if the bridge is connected to the school;
- OR - Opportunity to build as a separate Town project for public use after Pierce School is constructed (ramps, stairs, no elevator).

Challenges of including a pedestrian bridge in the design include:

- Physical impact on park program and/or school open space.
- Article 97 process triggered (+ min. of 8 months to schedule, + additional cost, + cost to relocate park function elsewhere in Town);
- LWCF Federal review process by NPS triggered (schedule impact unknown);
- OR - Eminent Domain process needed (+ min. of 1 year to schedule, + cost of property, relocation, and legal fees);
- MSBA will NOT participate in funding the bridge, but will require that the bridge is open to the elements, or will require approximately 1,000sf be taken out of the school program in order to enclose;
- Increase in transition time during recess, takes away from free play time;
- A maintenance plan would be needed for the open-air bridge and elevator;
- If open to the public during non-school hours, there is a perceived inconvenience of navigating significant grade change plus perceived safety concerns about crossing a long bridge – this could result in limited use outside of school hours;
- High cost relative to use and redundancy with at-grade crossing.

A member of the committee noted that while a pedestrian bridge would separate students from vehicular access, weighing that against everything else that would slow the project down and hold it back does not make the bridge an attractive option for this project. He added that without a bridge, it is of the utmost importance that the new design create the safest at-grade crossing possible.

Helen Charlupski made a motion to not proceed with the design of a pedestrian bridge for the Pierce School project. Aaron Williams seconded the motion.

Discussion: Co-chair Charlupski noted that it was important to have the discussion and that the issue was looked at very closely by the project team and the SBC. She noted that while the

pedestrian bridge would have been nice to have in the project, the hurdles that would need to be overcome to include the bridge would have affected the rest of the project negatively.

A member of the committee thanked the project team for the clear and thoughtful analysis of the issues. She encouraged that keeping the analysis in mind as the project moves forward will be important. She asked if there had been follow up regarding how Brimmer and May navigate operating on two sides of a street. Leftfield explained that after taking a look at the crossing, it was clear that the street is much narrower, less traveled than School Street, and that the sight lines from the crossing in both directions were much better than exist at School Street. It was felt that the Brimmer and May example was not comparable to the Pierce School condition.

Deputy Fire Chief Todd Cantor noted that using the park as an emergency gathering location would need to be looked at if there is no pedestrian bridge. Co-chair Charlupski noted that there is a traffic study underway to understand what the conditions at School Street should be during school hours. Leftfield added, and the school principal confirmed, that the students currently do not cross School Street during emergency egress situations.

Roll was called. The motion passed with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Leftfield added that two voting members that could not attend today's meeting had sent emails expressing that they felt strongly that the design of a bridge should not be pursued by the project at this time.

4. CM at-Risk Update – Leftfield explained that a CM at-Risk Selection Committee is being appointed at the next Select Board meeting on February 22nd. The members appointed to that committee will be Helen Charlupski as a representative for the School Committee, Bernard Greene as a representative for the Select Board, Karen Breslawski as a representative for the Building Commission, Lynn Stapleton from Leftfield, and Margaret Clark from MDS.

A draft of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) will be circulated to the SBC for comments. Leftfield explained that the document is standard and was the same one used for the Driscoll School project. Changes made in the document that are unique to the Pierce project will be highlighted for ease of review. Comments are needed back by Wednesday, February 23rd at noon to allow for time to incorporate comments by Thursday, February 24th at 9am, when the document is set to go live.

A member of the committee asked about the benefits of the CM at-Risk at this stage in the project, and how this will be funded.

Leftfield explained that the benefits of bringing the CMR on during Schematic Design (SD) include having them weigh in on schedule, logistics, and cost before going to the Town for approval. The CMR will be responsible for conducting a cost estimate during SD, along with two other estimators. Including the cost of logistics, given the tight, difficult site conditions, will be very important at this stage as the MSBA requires that all cost be identified with the SD

submission to the MSBA. The budget submitted with the SD Report is what the project will be required to live within, so an increased level of cost certainty at this stage is important.

Leftfield explained that there are funds allocated within the Feasibility Study budget to bring on the CM at-Risk during the SD phase. The contract would then be amended to move the CMR into the next phase of the project once the project approval is received and the Project Funding Agreement (PFA) with the MSBA is executed.

Leftfield explained that the CMR RFQ is advertised in the Brookline Tab, COMMBUYS, and the Central Register. Leftfield and MDS will also be reaching out to firms they have successfully worked with in the past to make them aware of the opportunity to ensure a competitive number of CMRs submit qualifications packages.

Once CMRs submit responses to the RFQ, the Selection Committee meets publicly to determine which CMRs proceed into the next phase of the selection process. The firms deemed qualified to continue will then be sent the Request for Proposals (RFP). Once proposals are received, the firms that have submitted are invited to interview. Interviews will be held publicly with the CMR Selection Committee, then the committee will meet to rank the firms based on their proposals and interviews, only after that ranking is the committee allowed to review the price proposals for each firm. The committee then considers both the price and non-price proposals to rank firms a final time. The best ranked CMR then works to execute a contract with the Town. Leftfield noted that there was an in-depth review of the CM at-Risk selection process in the January SBC meeting minutes and recording for those interested.

It was noted that the interviews will be held publicly, and the SBC is encouraged to attend and provide the Selection Committee with feedback.

5. Upcoming Meetings – There is an MSBA Board of Directors meeting on March 2nd. The Pierce School project is on their agenda for approval into the next phase of the project, Schematic Design.

There is a building design review meeting with the Pierce PTO scheduled for Monday, March 7th at 7:00pm. The SBC is encouraged to join that meeting if they are available.

A member of the committee asked when the project will be ready to meet with the Capital Subcommittee of Advisory to discuss cost in greater detail. Leftfield explained that there will be information on cost available in June after the three cost estimates have been completed and reconciled. At that point, Leftfield will have also taken a pass at approximately how much the MSBA is likely to fund based on their guidelines and requirements for each space. The MSBA will let the project know after the SD Report is submitted, at the end of June, what their actual participation in the project will be. Their participation will be cemented through the Project Funding Agreement (PFA) which will be executed after Town approval of the project. Questions from Advisory's Capital Subcommittee will be sent along to the project team for response.

A member of the committee asked when the project is up for Town approval. It was noted that the process is underway to determine the best time for the Town. Leftfield added that the preliminary project schedules that have been shared with the group to date indicate a

September vote date which would keep the project on the right track to go out to bid at an advantageous time of the year. The team will be working to determine the timing of the vote.

6. Old Business – There was no Old Business to discuss.
7. New Business – There was no New Business to discuss.
8. Public Comment – There was no Public Comment at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.