SOMERVILLE NEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT

SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

Virtual Meeting — **Monday, July 6, 2026**

Via Zoom — **4:30pm**

<u>Members (15) – Present in bold:</u>

Emily Grandstaff-Rice (Chair)
Jake Wilson, Mayor
Rich Raiche
Ruben Carmona
Courtney Gosselin
Ed Bean
Chris Ames
Daniel Grayton
Eric Weisman
Andre Green
Kathleen Seward
Jesse Clingan
Suraj Rajbanshi
Courtney Koslow
Rich Heidebrecht

<u>Guests Present:</u>

Khin Mar (CoS)
Ralph Henry (CoS)
Darryl Nash (SPS)
Sean Burke (PMA)
Nick Masse (PMA)
Lisa Pecora (PE)
Robert Bell (PE)
Emily Ercolano (PE)
Joytika Bhargo (CMTA)

- **Call to Order – 4:32pm**
    - The Chair called the meeting to order
    - Roll call attendance was had.

- **Meeting Minutes**
    - Approve meeting minutes from June 8, 2026.
        - Rich Raiche motions to approve as presented. Daniel Grayton seconds the motion.
        - Discussion: none.
        - VOTE (roll call): 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 5 not present
            - Yes: Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Mayor Jake Wilson, Rich Raiche, Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Ed Bean, Daniel Grayton, Andre Green, Courtney Koslow, Rich Heidebrecht
            - No:
            - Abstain:
            - Not Present: Chris Ames, Eric Weisman, Kathleen Seward, Jesse Clingan, Suraj Rajbanshi

- **Review Project Schedule & Workplan**
    - PE did an overview of the project timeline and workplan, showing where the project is at and what is ahead of us. PE highlighted the milestones within the project schedule.
    - PE noted that we received the MSBA's comments to the PDP Submission last week, and we are required to provide responses by July 14th. We have already begun coordinating and drafting these responses. There is a section that asks about the educational program, which is typical, and we are going to meet and coordinate with SPS staff to note those responses.
    - We sent our PSR options to the cost estimators today, and we will be able to share those on August 3rd with the committee.
    - Project team plans to meet with the City's mobility team next week.
    - Permitting requirements are ongoing, as coordination is taking place with City staff, and working to understand what may be required.

- **Community Engagement Update**
    - PE gave an overview of the most recent community engagement events that the project team participated in, as well as what is ahead for events that the project team will be attending to further inform the community of the project's status and receive feedback.
    - PE presented a recap of the neurodiversity workshop that took place.
        - Spoke about the seven principles of universal design, which will be the basis of the design. We then specifically dug into Neurodiversity, which PE presented the qualities that were discussed to ensure neurodiversity is incorporated in many aspects of the design.
    - PE noted to the committee that we received some questions from the community and that we want to guide people to the project's website while also noting that we are creating an FAQ section on the website to which we will post the questions and our responses to those questions.

- **New Business**
    - Mechanical Systems: Life Cycle Cost Analysis
        - PE passed it over to their mechanical consultant, CMTA, to build upon what was presented to the committee on 6/8/26.
        - CMTA broke down the expected life cycle of the different options, and also how they match up and impact our sustainability goals. Across all three options, we are meeting LEED v4 Silver, which obtains additional MSBA reimbursement.

    - Committee member asked about how the EUI relates to the envelope of the building. CMTA responded to satisfaction. Committee member also asked a clarification on the LEED obtaining resulting in additional MSBA reimbursement. CMTA responded to satisfaction.
    - CMTA further broke down the EUI performance incentives on the different options.
    - CMTA broke down the 30-year life cycle cost analysis and cost associated with it.
  - Geotechnical Engineer Findings at 115 Sycamore St.
    - PE presented the report from their completed investigative site work done at 115 Sycamore St.
    - PE provided profiles and elevations of how the site conditions match up to the proposed design options.
    - Committee member asked how the conditions discovered relate to geothermal buildings. PE, CMTA, and the Chairwoman responded to satisfaction. Committee member then asked when the committee makes that decision regarding geothermal, and PE responded those discussions take place in the beginning of Schematic Design.
  - Development of Options
    - PE presented continued development of the design options.
    - PE noted they will be submitting 11 options with pricing provided for each. The SBC originally chose options, which then the MSBA has asked us to include several other options for pricing comparison. This includes Base Repairs for both Sycamore and Willow sites. PE noted that we will comply with the MSBA's requests.
    - Committee member asked clarifying questions regarding MSBA process and requirement to include these designs. The Chairwoman, the City and PE responded to satisfaction.
    - PE focused on presenting the development of the committee's chosen options – Option 2A, Option 2B, and Option 4.
    - PE then presented their new options, based upon the geotechnical borings completed, proposed to the committee – which is options 4.1 (reduced footprint) and 4.2 (cafeteria below field). These will provide us good cost data to understand extent of excavation and removal of soil/rock.
      - Committee member thanked the design firm for considering different ideas of the design, as this widens the hallways in the school.
      - Committee member wants to echo their colleague, in thanking the work that was completed to maximize the space inside.
    - On August 3rd we will be sharing the costs, and on August 3rd asking the committee to select a preferred option. We would ask that the SBC complete this ahead of the August 3rd meeting. We would send this document out to everyone and ask to have it completed by July 27th. That date would be July 27th, to complete the evaluations.
    - Superintendent Carmona asked if we should discuss the evolution of the criteria, and what the criteria is asking. PE responded that they can provide better details of what is being asked.
    - Committee member asked a clarifying question about the sites for PSR options, and PE explained the MSBA's process and what we're being asked.
    - Committee member explained that he agreed that it's not right to have options like 20 and 12 story buildings, but also this shows the community that you can't build projects like this on this site.
    - Superintendent Carmona asked about one the new options' accessibility, security and public access.
    - PE lastly noted that there will be pricing alternatives for the evaluation criteria including but not limited to: mechanical system, mass timber, parking garage, PV canopy structure, building certifications, and project delivery method (CMR vs GC).

- **Public Comment**
  - The Chair opened it up to the public to ask any questions or make any comments.
    - Ian Neill: inquired what the scope of the Brown School base repair (option 6A) was. PE responded to satisfaction. Mr. Neill then asked about accessibility to the school on option 6A, which the design team responded to. The 2nd question was about the bedrock, and the impacts it would have depending on the type of rock, and how it impacts costs. PE responded that it may result in different structural design and varying site costs.
    - Ksenia Samokhvalova: noted that she has a 4th grader at Brown. She wants to support the Winter Hill Community in getting a new school and does not want to delay, but cannot support the repair of the Brown School and shutting down the Brown School. She mentioned she doesn't know when the estimates of the base repair of Brown School will come through. She noted the efforts she has made to communicate her concerns. She noted that the City should be figuring out the redistricting before the preferred option is selected. She believes that the project team should have a more robust conversation about the 690 student enrollment option. She noted that she contacted the MSBA and questioned if the project's process and the MSBA's process have been done correctly. She emphasized that the additions and new construction on Brown site does not make sense. She then noted geographical concerns that she has coming from West Side of the City. She believes that issues like these should be decided sooner rather than later. Thanked the committee for her opportunity to speak.

- **Adjournment**
  - Vote to Adjourn
    - Rich Raiche motions to adjourn. Rich Heidebrecht seconds the motion.
    - <u>VOTE (roll call):</u> 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present
      - <u>Yes:</u> Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Mayor Jake Wilson, Rich Raiche, Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Ed Bean, Daniel Grayton, Eric Weisman, Andre Green, Jesse Clingan, Courtney Koslow, Rich Heidebrecht
      - <u>No:</u>
      - <u>Abstain:</u>
      - <u>Not Present:</u> Chirs Ames, Kathleen Seward, Suraj Rajbanshi

Minutes Signed by:

<u>NAME:</u> Nicholas Masse, PMA Consultants

<u>DATE:</u> 07/10/2026