

**Town of Watertown
School Building Committee
Three Elementary School Projects
Wednesday, April 20, 2022
via ZOOM 6:00p.m. – 7:00p.m.**

M I N U T E S

Committee Members Present: Mark Sideris (chair), John Portz (vice-chair), Deanne Galdston, Lindsay Mosca, Heidi Perkins, Steve Magoon, Leo Patterson, Paul Anastasi, James Kane, Tom Tracy, and Vincent Piccirilli

Committee Members Absent: Kelly Kurlbaum

Others Present: Daren Sawyer, Andrew Cunneen, and Nate Williams (Ai3 Architects); Tom Finnegan. Mark Krikorian and Alana Forbes (OPM, Hill International); Kris Bradner (Traverse Landscape Architects); Christy Murphy (Compass Project Management)

1. Call to Order: Chairman Mark Sideris called the meeting to order at 6:00p.m. John Portz took a roll call of School Building Committee members present.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 16, 2022

Chairman Sideris made a motion to approve the Elementary Meeting Minutes for March 16, 2022. Vincent Piccirilli indicates that there are some discrepancies with the meeting minutes. There are (3) corrections that need to be made. The date of meeting on the top of document should state March 16, 2022, meeting minutes approval date #2 should state February 16, 2022 and last correction should state ending of Elementary school meeting as 6:23pm, not 7:08pm. Vincent Piccirilli motions to approve the Elementary school meeting minutes with the (3) corrections. Steve Magoon seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

3. Review / Approval of Elementary Schools Monthly Invoices and Change Order No.12

Thomas Finnegan presented and reviewed the Elementary school monthly March invoices and Change Order No. 12.

March 2022 invoices are as follows w/total at \$2,397,173.61:

- Hill International – \$90,210.00
- Ai3 Architects (Basic Services) –\$27,094.17
- Ai3 Architects (Extra Services) – \$14,910.00
- Ai3 Architects – (Reimbursables Services) - \$4,138.38
- Brait Builders (Payment Req # 22) – \$1,529,190.47
- CTA Construction Managers (Payment Req # 1) - \$496,608.41
- FF&E Invoices - \$235,022.18

Chairman Mark Sideris made a motion to approve the Elementary School projects invoices as presented. Vincent Piccirilli motions to approve the Elementary school project invoices totally \$2,397,173.61. Steve Magoon seconded. All were in favor on a roll call vote.

Change Order No. 12

Thomas Finnegan presented and reviewed Change Order No. 12 for both Cunniff Elementary School (CES) and Hosmer Elementary School (HES). A brief description for CES Change Order #12 consist of DPW requests at Southern property line, additional fencing and plantings for work for the neighbors, elevator operator costs for the installation of the oil water separator, provide mixing valve at the eye wash station, adding (2) Voice Lift Systems in Media Center #301, provide ACT soffit in gym lobby to hide electrical conduits above toilet room entrances and install access panel in wood slat ceiling in the administration area for HVAC service. The sub-total for CES Change Order No.12 to \$74,650.54. A brief description for some of HES Change Order #12 consist of adding some access control points around the building after review with staff, site grading and drainage modifications at South elevation, remove all turf and replace with poured-in-place playground surfacing, camera inspection of the site drainage piping, provide locking devices on area drain covers and vinyl wall graphic modifications. The sub-total for HES Change Order is \$196,441.17. This brings Change Order No.12 to a total of \$271,091.71.

Mark Sideris made a motion to approve Change Order No.12. Vincent Piccirilli moves with Steve Magoon seconded; all were in favor on a roll call vote.

4. Executive Summary

Thomas Finnegan reviewed and presented the big milestones of April 2022 Executive Summary for Hosmer and Lowell Elementary school projects.

Hosmer Elementary school the Z section asbestos abatement has been completed. This was completed the end of March. Currently, we are getting all the utilities disconnected and signed off. The demolition permit is in the works with demolition to begin in late April. Notification has gone out to the neighbors. April or May during demolition then during the summer finishing the site work. The road in front of the Hosmer school and the whole area up to Chauncey Street will be all redeveloped. A preconstruction meeting was held regarding the ballfields. Hopefully the piles of dirt will start disappearing sooner than later. The loom will be screened, amended, and treated as needed. All the other fills will be used once the building is demoed and the foundation is demoed. The low areas will be filled to bring grade up. Hopefully by the beginning of summer, we can see a change in the ballfield area with the piles gone. Both areas will be developed over the summer. Sod will be laid down in the ballfields by September 15th. This is our milestones to reach for this year.

Lowell Elementary School, the contractor has mobilized, the construction fence and screening has been erected. The building has been cleaned from top to bottom. Removal of lighting and existing ceilings has been done. To start construction, a permit is needed. This is going through the special services department for approval. Trailers are scheduled for next week and a Groundbreaking Ceremony will be held on April 27th at 4:30pm and all are welcome.

5. Elementary Schools Project Updates

Hosmer Elementary School - Approval of Photovoltaic Design to Proceed

Tom Finnegan presented the Photovoltaic design update. In past meetings, it was asked to look at relocating a couple of the PV sections from along Hancock Street and move it into the playground area. The design team has started some work on the Photovoltaic designs and has some preliminary schematic

proposals. Kris Bradner of Traverse Landscape Architects spoke in detail regarding the Photovoltaic designs. The 1st slide showed the (2) northern most PV panels closet to Hancock Street. This is in the contract documents to date. There has been a request to consider moving those (2) more internal to the site. In order to do that we took the (2) panels exactly as they are sized and moved them to north of the playground but south of the sport court then 2nd one is south of the playground. Slide (2) shows the next plan view of the change. As an interim discussion of what may need to happen, we considered some existing trees that are along the Z building that hasn't come down yet. You can see at the lower part of the slide; it was noted existing tree removal. These are the existing trees that will need to come down to put the PV ground mounted panel there. Above, the northern most panel if were to be moved that some trees would have to be moved. The PV panels would be tilted to maximize the solar panels, there is a bubble around the play equipment. Not just the safety zone that you see in the dash line around each of the pieces. The dash line also encompasses the bubble around the pieces vertically. We want to make sure there wasn't any issue the way the PV panel sloped down to ten feet above grade at the lowest end and the bubble around the play equipment. We had to adjust play equipment in this area. The (3rd) slide shows this change with the (2) PV panels moved south of the sport court, so those piers or support structures landed in landscape areas and not in paved circulation areas. The southern ones are more in the landscape. Proposed trees were moved to other locations order to not impede on the solar panel in the future as well as those existing trees were removed. The next slide shows the view looking East towards the street and the neighbors from the school side basically looking through the existing building that is there today. The next slide shows the PV panels in pan view which is a close-up looking East. The next slide shows the PVs view looking West which is in the opposite direction looking from the street back towards the school. The last slide shows the view closeup looking West from the sports court. The PVs was spaced apart according to the constraints that were given. Trees and play equipment were moved around and did not change circulation nor add any trees or equipment.

6. Elementary School Questions / Comments

Question 1 – Steve Magoon asked when do something become the Architects responsibility, the contractor's responsibility and when does something becomes a change order? Where are we in terms of contingencies we had, assuming we have plenty of little room there.

Response – Tom Finnegan stated that all is different. There is an ongoing spreadsheet where we assign responsibility whether it is in error or omission on the designer end, owners request, additional scope of work or 3rd party request like Eversource Electric is marked on spreadsheet. These are broken down and captured on spreadsheet. Each PCO is broken down and is vented by both the Architect and designers as well as the OPM. It is a process, but it is vented. Regarding contingencies, we can look at the Executive Summary when we get to that slide.

Question 2 – John Portz asked how does this compare to previous Change Orders?

Response – Tom Finnegan stated that overall, this project is at 3% and 1% is related to the PVs at Hosmer, the battery storage. We are right at 2%. A standard of care of any architectural firm is from 2% -5%. We are on the low end and good end of things.

Question 3 - Chairman Sideris stated in the Q&A that AnnMarie Cloonan who lives right there have not been notified or none of her neighbors have received notification. Chairman Sideris stated to please make sure that before Brait starts completely demoing that they notify the neighborhood when they chose the date.

Response – Tom Finnegan stated that he will make sure it happens. He guarantees it will happen. Also, another heads up for the demolition phase is that there will be a water shut down in the neighborhood. Neighbors should receive notification over the next week or two for the water shut down.

Question 4 – Chairman Sideris asked from the Q&A is how long will it take to take Hosmer down?

Response – Tom Finnegan stated that it will take (2) months. The building will come down quick, but the clean-up will take some time. It will take 3-4 weeks to get the building down and another month to clean it up and get rid of the foundation.

Question 5 – AnnMarie Cloonan asked when will the water shut-off happen?

Response – Tom Finnegan stated that it will happen some point next week and you will get a minimum of 48 hours' notice.

Question 6 – Chairman Sideris asked what are we shutting the water off for?

Response – Tom Finnegan states that we need to disconnect the water to the existing Hosmer Z section, and it is required to cut it back to the main. The main will be shut off which will disrupt a few neighbors in the neighborhood. A section of the pipe will be cut out then a new section of pipe will be put back in. The water will then be put back on. This work will happen late at night. It will be scheduled in the evening and water will be back on before the morning. We will try to minimize the disruption during the day. Chairman Sideris reiterated that the neighbors be notified.

Question 7 – Leo Patterson asked what are the dust control measures during the actual demolishing of the building?

Response – Tom Finnegan states that there will be mainly fire hoses, meter at the nearest fire hydrant and there will be hosing down the debris as the building comes down.

Question 8 – Chairman Sideris asked what constraints are you talking about? The Committee has not put any constraints other than they would like to look at a different option. Was any consideration given to move the playing areas further away from the solar arrays or you just left them where they were?

Response - Kris Bradner (Traverse Landscape Architects) stated that it was more about PV constraints from the PV consultant. There are certain constraints about how close together you can place PV panels. We were trying to accommodate the change of the PV panels within the existing conditions of the design. We left the play surfaces as is and rearranged the equipment within that space.

Question 9 – Vincent Piccirilli asked about the PV slide (Closeup looking West) how the high-end back end of the northern array hangs over the sports court. It makes sense to move that square sports court north towards Hancock Street, so the Southern part of the sports court aligns with the top edge of the PV array so its not actually underneath it. Is this possible?

Response – Kris Bradner (Traverse Landscape Architects) states this would need to be studied due to a grade change. Due to it sloping down from the sidewalk to a certain extent, we would want to understand what it entails and if it requires a steeper slope or wall. I would want to be able to give you that information before you made that decision. Daren Sawyer (Ai3 Architects) states that we can look at that. It doesn't look like it is much of a major move.

Question 10 – Steve Magoon asked if you move both playgrounds a little bit North, can you put both the PVs on the Southern side of the playground? If placed side by side obviously it would require other tree relocations but having one adjacent to the sports court. The more that we can discourage balls going into the PVs/structures, it would be better to not put it next to a ball court would be good.

Response – Daren Sawyer stated that he would look into this.

Question 11 – Lindsay Mosca stated that she agrees that the placements of the arrays surrounding the playground feels like an invitation for some non-appropriate use of PV panels and structures by kids using the playground. What is the elevation and the slope change of the whole Southern part that looks like an open field with a few trees in it? One of the views either East or West view looks pretty flat. Is that an actual representation of the slope or is it a hill? I find it really disappointing that were looking to break up or even talk about adding a second panel in this area because it is an open green space that has the usability feature for casual use by kids/neighbors. This doesn't seem like a

better solution from a neighborhood that values open green space. I feel like it is a poor use of open green space in an area that isn't a lot.

Response – Kris Bradner (Traverse Landscape Architects) states that it is relatively leveled in that area. You know that the slope coming from Concord to the South going down to the existing building, it's a bowl. It slopes down. We are catching up with that. In the view looking east image, the grade of the street on the right-hand side is higher. We also have proposed rain gardens on either side. We have low points there.

Question 12 - Deanne Galdston is curious as to whether or not the PV panels can be located somewhere else on the site other than the playground. For example, can they be put in between the Pre-school playground and the softball field or the parking lot by Boylston and Mount Auburn Street. Are there limitations in terms where they can go on the site? Is there flexibility somewhere else? Also, to follow-up on what Paul said, I could see if we had a structure that provided shade and you put the panels on top of it so it was multi-functional like Arsenal Park where you have a Gazebo structure where people have picnics; would this serve (2) purposes with one type of effort. Can they be located somewhere else?

Response – Daren Sawyer (Ai3 Architects) stated that we can look at different options. Seeing Dede's email about the parking area south of where the other ones (PVs) are over at Boylston Street, we did look at that briefly, but there is not enough room on the Westside of that parking lot between the parking lot and Boylston Street to squeeze them. Into the East, there is a bio-retention area and underground detention system just beneath that parking lot as well. The area that you are talking about by the softball field by the other playground, was not investigated. We were trying to locate these in an area that hasn't been developed yet to minimize the cost. Therefore, when we initially met last month. We went ahead and showed you that we probably can squeeze them into this area. We went ahead in producing these renderings and plans of what it would look like in this area (Image - View Looking East). We can go back and look and see if we can get them into the area between the softball area and the playground on the other side of the site.

Question 13 – John Portz asked with (image – View looking East) in an area where there would be children, it can be expected or required that the PVs be fenced off underneath it? What can take place underneath an array?

Response – Daren Sawyer (Ai3 Architects) stated the attempt here was to minimize any additional cost. The reason why we are showing the structures the way they are is because that structure steel has already been fabricated and is already on site for those arrays. If you want to scrape all that steel and go with something new, we can go ahead and design something, but it was not our intention to have a clean slate and redesign something from scratch. We were trying to relocate what we already had. The PV panels were already on site. As far as playing around these structures, we can add some landscaping to keep kids away from them. We could fence it, but it is no difference than what's happening on Boylston Street where we have the similar structures adjacent to the softball field in the parking area. We can come up with creative landscaping to hopefully keep kids away from trying to climb on these if possible.

Question 14 – Heidi Perkins asked about the array that is in between the (2) play areas. What would be the drainage, and would that make the play space that it dumps unto unusable? If it was terrestrial rain like yesterday and the kids was to go out and play, would that amount of water make that particular play space unusable and likewise in the spring or winter?

Response – Daren Sawyer (Ai3 Architects) stated that Heidi Perkins is correct. It would dump down there. If this was the direction we were moving, we would probably look at providing some type of gutter system to take any rainwater away and dump it either in the drainage system or pile retention

area/rain gardens Kris mentioned earlier.

Question 15 – Attendee Elodia Thomas reiterated what both Chairman Sideris and Leo Patterson both said. She believes it is a great idea of taking the smaller Southern panel and putting it in the center. She wonders if the entire recreation plan can be pushed down further south and then take the larger panel and move it further south.

Response – Daren Sawyer stated that they can look into this. He likes Leo's suggestions about continuing the panels in front and filling in that little space. If we can get it to work with the layout and adjust the layout slightly of that entry of the paver area out front, then take the bigger one and slide it south. We don't want to go too far south close to those trees because you don't want to cast shadows onto the solar panel. Even like Chairman Sideris said, bring it to the Southwest corner of the parcel of land out there right as Concord Road comes up and turns into Boylston.

Comment A – AnnMarie Cloonan states to please sync with the DPW so basements are not impacted.

Comment B - Paul Anastasi gave a different view to the conversation. He looks at it a lot different being that he is a survivor of Melanoma cancer which is cancer from the sun. We have seen from a lot of communities after a playground is up for a while, they put up steel post and stretch canvas across them to try to make shaded areas. I don't want to impede on the children's play space, but I am in favor of shade in the areas.

Comment C – Steve Magoon thinks the reason the PVs should not go back to Hancock Street where they were is because they would make a fine ball return for the court, and they will get destroyed quickly. The original location was not a good idea.

Comment D – John Portz echoed a couple of comments made earlier to encourage the possibility of looking at other locations. Maybe the PVs don't have to go together. Hopefully we can explore this a little more. Also, could these be structured in a way to provide shade over a play area? Talking about moving them from Hancock to this area, he had the impression that might be one of the considerations. He thinks that might require a different structure than what you have here. I assume this would be similar structure like the Cunniff with parking or similar structure that is used at the Hosmer. I'm assuming that solar arrays can be designed in different ways. Is it possible to think about it in a different way that it could even be a roof/shelter? There could be benefits to that and kids can play there if it's raining.

Comment E - Leo Patterson said he will second what was said earlier about asking Ai3 to show us our options around the building site. It would be helpful if we can understand better about the bio-retention areas, the sub-terrariums that is happening on the other side specifically the eastside of the existing parking area that has the arrays currently in place. As far as slide 12, are views being preserved of this building specifically through that gap between the playground area and the lower bar of the Z shaped building? It occurs that if you had the PV panel structure that is the Northern one moved a little bit further to the plan North and the smaller one could potentially fit in the gap there between the two. Essentially you want to have a series of (3) in a row PV fins all across the parking area of this zone. I don't know the width of the framing structures but if the children and the teachers could transition easily through that pathway marked brown but have it friendly enough to have it transition and not a barrier that seems to be an option. As far as the larger one is concerned, I concur with Mr. Piccirilli where he says it seems like it is impacting the gaming area. Maybe there is another location around the site in another area where we can look for that one.

Comment F – Attendee Kendra Foley stated for both safety and usability reasons, please don't put PV panels in the playground and play space negatively impacting the outside space for thousands of students for decades.

Comment G – Attendee Amalia states has it been definitively decided that the PV panels will be moved from Hancock Street into the play space? It was my understanding this was a discussion as this sounds very final already.

Comment H – Attendee Gail Vassington states that she knows there are multiple neighbors and multiple streets but please keep in mind that moving panels further from one street makes them closer to another street. If possible, please try to keep some equal distancing in mind.

Comment I – Attendee AnnMarie Cloonan suggests placing the PVs on top of the new bathrooms.

Comment J - Chairman Sideris stated to Leo's point, if we moved the top one up, the bottom one down, put one in the middle and the one in the lower south corner moving the other one to that corner. Every possible option needs to be reviewed. He does not anticipate making any decisions this evening. We need to look at every single one of these including what will it do if we put some on the bathroom that hasn't been built yet. Sometimes we shouldn't be stuck because we purchased something. Sometimes we make mistakes, and we want to fix them. Looking at the option that Leo considered but looking at the Southwest corner of the picture maybe is another option.

Comment K – Attendee Brian Heibensen echoed from previous discussion that he felt like going through the process of looking at the idea that these panels were close to some neighbors and looking at moving them seems to be very quick. What he is looking for is more analysts in terms of what the impact on the neighbors really was. He does not remember seeing anything that really showed good images of what the view would really look like for the neighbors for these panels. Thinking about this, these panels are going to be across the street from these neighbors so there is quite a bit of distance from the panels across Hancock to the nearest house. While we are looking at alternatives, if people are talking about sliding things around, what about the option of leaving the panels where there are on Hancock Street but sliding them 5ft to 10 ft south and sliding the playground 5ft to 10 ft south as well to give a buffer to the neighbors on Hancock Street without having to redesign everything from scratch with a huge amount of expense. Also, if were talking about moving the panels so that they are like what Leo suggested along that side, if you tilt them in that direction unless you rebuild the structures you will be changing the efficiency. They will no longer be pointing in the same direction. People have to understand that you probably have to redesign the structure and there will be added expense as well.

Comment L – Attendee Jack Dargon asked what are the smallest of the (7) streets that encompass the Hosmer campus? He has measured the solar arrays. The highest portion of the solar arrays come (22) feet off the ground. Twenty-two feet off the ground in front of his house goes to the overhang of his roof. He is (35) feet from where they propose on putting those solar arrays. He would call putting those solar arrays on Hancock Street irrational. He thinks you should take putting solar arrays on Hancock Street off the table. We should presume given the Architects has built us a \$175M school with several hundred children, the presumption should be that they going to build a safe play area. If they couldn't do that, they would tell us that. He thinks we should take the idea that it will be unsafe to put solar arrays in the play area off the table as well. He also agrees with Paul Anastasi comment concerning shade. He thinks relocating solar arrays over to the O'Connell school will present a problem in achieving Net-Zero. The solar arrays will face west if they were to go in the O'Connell play area. This will diminish the efficiency of the solar arrays. In a nutshell, there really is no such thing as a free lunch. The initial idea of relocating the solar arrays to the play area is to achieve some type of equity. If the solar arrays are in the middle of the play area where there shown, there will be distance between the neighborhoods that abut them. Our version of achieving what we want to happen over here, is to still end up with (4) massive solar arrays on our front doors. We are just trying to mitigate how close they are to our front doors.

Comment M – Attendee Elodia Thomas wants to agree with Jack Dargon. The song that comes to mind is that “You can’t always get what you want”. She thinks the neighbors have been so thoughtful in their comments, but they have lost a lot of green space in O’Connell Park. This is right on top of their homes and it’s a great little neighborhood. They endure a tremendous amount of traffic coming in that is yet to be resolved. She won’t go to the rat problem. Again, she thinks that we can be a little bit smarter. As Leo suggested, the smaller panel over between the others and as Vinny suggested moving the whole thing down a little further south even if you must keep that larger panel in the middle. It does offer shade as Paul pointed out as my own husband has had skin cancer. She thinks we have great ideas. We are all taxpayers. We are trying to do the right thing, but we all came here for a quality of life, and we need to consider the taxpayers in this community as well. We have to consider those issue prominently of the people that care about this community and have invested in this community for years. I am very passionate about this.

Comment N – Attendee Kathy Siranosian says thank you for considering the residents of Hancock Street.

Comment O – Attendee David Leon says the goal to achieve Net-Zero is commendable and supported by the community, however the need to site the large solar arrays presents a design challenge. There are many competing interests and may result in a compromise solution to accommodate the different needs and impacts. When striking a balance, we ask that the SBC be guided by equity and consider disproportionate impact on a particular group of residents or other interest group.

Comment P – Heidi Perkins (3) ideas are as follows:

- Regarding a shaded area, try thinking about not impeding on any green space. The arrays can possibly go over the Amphitheatre potentially at the same angle-like the one behind would be. There could be side by side, no green space lost and have nice shade area.
- Take one or two of the panels maybe you can figure the walkway to the right and put them in, so they look like steps, so it actually makes a shaded walkway with very little impact on the green area/green space taking anything away.
- If they were side by side along bottom of that area which does impede green space. If some of the trees were moved or removed, a lovely shade garden that the kids can learn at would create shaded space and not just be panels but an actual useable educational space.

Comment Q – Leo Patterson states that the existing arrays are out on Boylston Street face (2) directions, East and West. He does not know how the performance is different between the two of them. To Brian’s point, if the community would be open to putting smaller array in the gap between the northern and southern most panels. You could possibly get the two back-to-back and common gutter to control the water. That transition zone is preserved in terms of controlling the water running down into that space.

Comment R – Attendee AnnMarie Cloonan stated good thoughts Heidi.

Comment S – Attendee Kendra Foley states we need to consider the needs of both the residents and children. She would appreciate the SBC looking at other options.

End of Elementary School Project Business Meeting

Chairman Sideris ended the Elementary School Project Business meeting at 7:14 pm.