

SOMERVILLE NEW SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECT
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Virtual Meeting

Monday, August 3, 2026

Via Zoom

4:30pm

Members (15) – Present in bold:

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

Guests Present:

Khin Mar (CoS)

Ralph Henry (CoS)

Meekerley Sanon (CoS)

Darryl Nash (SPS)

Danielle Barry (SPS)

Sean Burke (PMA)

Nick Masse (PMA)

Lisa Pecora (PE)

Dan Arons (PE)

Robert Bell (PE)

- **Call to Order – 4:31pm**
 - The Chair called the meeting to order
 - Roll call attendance was had.
- **Meeting Minutes**
 - Approve meeting minutes from July 6, 2026.
 - Rich Raiche motions to approve as presented. Mayor Jake Wilson seconds the motion.
 - Discussion: none.
 - VOTE (roll call): 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 3 not present
 - Yes: Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Mayor Jake Wilson, Rich Raiche, Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Ed Bean, Daniel Grayton, Eric Weisman, Andre Green, Suraj Rajbanshi, Courtney Koslow, Rich Heidebrecht
 - No:
 - Abstain:
 - Not Present: Chris Ames, Kathleen Seward, Jesse Clingan
- **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 have a few weeks remaining until the preferred schematic report is scheduled to be submitted to the MSBA
 - PE presented a summary of the estimate narratives, which was the guide that assisted in having the estimates completed.
 - Today's goal is to select the preferred option, and on August 17th is to propose approval of the PSR submission.
- **New Business**
 - Programming Updates
 - PE presented some refinements that were completed based off the MSBA's review of the PDP submission. This is standard with MSBA's process to confirm how the School will operate and ensure programming was thoroughly completed.
 - Committee member asked if this educational program is ready for public issuance. PE responded to satisfaction.
 - PE presented the space summary refinements as collaborated with the MSBA, through the PDP submission review comments. Many of these items are standard in the review of what the MSBA performs, where the project team will discuss reasonings with the MSBA.
 - PE presented the organizational diagram which graphically shows the ideal spatial relationships proposed for the buildings.
 - PE presented building mass graphics that show where the grades are proposed and where each grade will be located within the building
 - Committee member asked why PE chose to stack 7th and 8th grade clusters above the PK/K-3rd grade clusters, and the 4th-6th grade clusters are separated. PE responded to satisfaction.
 - Add Alternate Review
 - PE presented the costs of the add alternates that were estimated by our 3rd party estimators.

- PSR Cost Estimate Review
 - PE presented the construction costs and total project costs of all 11 options that are apart of the PSR phase.
 - Committee member asked about cost per parking space of the parking garage and what that breakeven point is for the committee to believe it is too much. PE responded to satisfaction.
 - Committee member asked about future operational maintenance costs and if this is included in project costs, and PE responded that they are not, and that was done through the life cycle cost analysis.
 - Mayor Jake Wilson asked which of these options would receive MSBA funding and what options would be solely on the cost of the City. PMA responded that the code upgrade options would not meet your educational plan, and therefore MSBA would most likely not participate in the project. The remainder of the options would be partially MSBA funded.
 - Committee member asked where the costs came from, and PMA/PE noted that there were two independent 3rd party cost estimators, that the narratives were sent to for estimates, and then a 4-hour reconciliation meeting to ensure they are estimating the same specifications and assumptions. PE noted that these estimates include escalation.
- PSR Evaluation Matrix
 - PE noted that we received 10 committee members' evaluations of the eleven design options.
 - PE noted that the summary shows that the evaluators favored Options 2B, Option 4, Option 4.1 and Option 4.2, with 4.2 ranking the highest.
- Select Preferred Schematic Option
 - PE opened up the floor to the committee for discussion and potential vote if the committee is prepared.
 - Committee member asked if 4.1 and 4.2 were options to avoid the bedrock/ledge below ground, and PE responded in the affirmative.
 - Committee member asked how the decision between the 3 builds work with other options we're considering, and how the parking garage cost would coexist with the 3 options. PE responded that the parking garage cost is not much impacted between the options of 4, 4.1 and 4.2. Committee member then asked how large a truck can fit at loading dock, and PE responded they schedule this space based off a tractor trailer.
 - Committee member asked about site costs and MSBA reimbursement. PMA noted that the MSBA caps site costs, and this site is believed to go over the cap, which is regularly expected for MSBA projects.
 - Committee member noted that the cost differences between option 4 and option 4.1 is \$5 million which is 3%. He then noted that the investment is worth school operation and how the occupants and community uses the space. He noted that a 3% difference is worth the investment for the City, to allow School to use for best serving the student and community population.
 - Committee member mentioned he does not want to compromise the educational program and what's best for the students, and does not want the relatively small costs, in comparison, to impact our decision.
 - Chairwoman noted that she believes a major aspect of this is how the building will be used on the land, and how it fits on the site.
 - Mayor Jake Wilson notes that he likes Option 4, because he believes it is the best investment for the City.

- Committee member asked about traffic patterns and how they relate to each option. PE responded to satisfaction.
 - Superintendent Carmona spoke about environmental changes happening across the world, and asked if any underground structure needs to take account of different water patterns above and beyond what we currently experience. PE responded to satisfaction.
 - Vote to Select Preferred Schematic Option
 - Courtney Koslow motions to select Option 4 as the preferred option for the PSR phase. Andre Green seconds the motion.
 - VOTE (roll call): 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 2 not present
 - Yes: Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Mayor Jake Wilson, Rich Raiche, Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Ed Bean, Chris Ames, Daniel Grayton, Eric Weisman, Andre Green, Suraj Rajbanshi, Courtney Koslow, Rich Heidebrecht
 - No:
 - Abstain:
 - Not Present: Kathleen Seward, Jesse Clingan
 - PE noted they will complete their PSR package, and it will be distributed to the SBC and SC ahead of meeting on 8/17 to see if there is any questions and then vote to submit to the MSBA.
 - Committee member noted that the committee and project team should explain how the community is part of this process as well.
- **Public Comment**
 - The Chair opened it up to the public for any comments, and there were none.
 - **Adjournment**
 - Vote to Adjourn
 - Daniel Grayton motions to adjourn. Rich Raiche seconds the motion.
 - VOTE (roll call): 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 2 not present
 - Yes: Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Mayor Jake Wilson, Rich Raiche, Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Ed Bean, Chris Ames, Daniel Grayton, Eric Weisman, Andre Green, Suraj Rajbanshi, Courtney Koslow, Rich Heidebrecht
 - No:
 - Abstain:
 - Not Present: Kathleen Seward, Jesse Clingan

Minutes Signed by:

NAME: Nicholas Masse, PMA Consultants

DATE: 08/05/2026