



## **The Chairman opened the meeting at 4:00 PM**

Present: Superintendent Steve Stone, Dennis Piendak, Phil Thibault, Linda Trouville, Renee Young, Rob Sheppard, Marybeth Veilleux, Andrew Graham, Rebecca Duda, Dave Martin, Stefanie Fields, Nicholas Botelho

Absent: Mike LaCava

Present from Liro-Hill: Paul Kalous, John Abbott

Present from Mount Vernon Group: Frank Tedesco, Al Cuevas, Bill Peters, Dennis Grudkowski, Vanessa Rogers

## **Minutes**

Ms. Young made a motion to approve the minutes of February 5, 2025. Ms. Trouville seconded the motion. The motion carried with all noted as present voting in favor.

## **Present and Review Conceptual Design – Option 4D – PDR Package**

It was noted that the agenda sent out had mentioned motion and vote for the selection and design option. That was in error, an amended agenda was created. The purpose of this meeting is to present and review Option 4D, with a vote for selection of the preferred scheme on March 19. Mr. Cuevas quickly summarized the other options that have been previously presented and reviewed by the committee. He stated that the addition/renovation construction would take thirty-six months with the phasing. The new construction 4B with the long driveway concept and three levels, the 4C option with the Y shaped building and long driveway scheme would be in construction for approximately 24 months plus approximately six months for demolition of the old school and site improvements. Each of these add/reno options, the 4B and 4C options would have a long queue going out into the streets of Methuen and Bellevue. The 4D scheme was conceived to enable the long queue to be on site rather than on the public streets. 4D has the added benefit of a greater separation between construction and school operations. The new location of option 4D is located to avoid wetlands. The location of the wetlands have been flagged. There are two wetland crossing buffers however the replication will be less than option 4B and 4C. The impact on wet areas is the same or less with the 4D scheme. 4D also affords an off site opportunity for entry at the back, possibly using Lot 64. Superintendent Stone stated this has been the subject of a lot of conversation and he had reached out to the Town Manager to see if the Town owns this parcel. He also spoke with Alison Manugian who looked at this scheme as well. The project team recommends that the Town Counsel determine if this parcel is the Town's and how it may be used.

Mr. Sheppard made a motion to have Town Counsel research Parcel 64 as to ownership and all possible uses to support the school project and the roadways around Parcel 64. Ms. Young seconded the motion for discussion. There was discussion on a second egress and tying in sewer and water to the south. There was concern with the neighborhood and the parcel being part of a subdivision. Mr. Piendak discussed an act of legislature may be required to utilize this lot if it is public open space and replication of that area of open space may be needed. It may also need approval of the Board of Selectmen. There was talk of

reaching out to Colleen Garry and discussing the process of this. The motion moved to a vote with all members present voting in favor.

Mr. Thibault stated the decision should be made independent of the design. Mr. Graham stated the police and fire department would probably want to see another access to this area as well.

Mr. Tedesco stated that they would do an early site package and design and price out the site work ahead while building design is taking place, prior to bidding and construction of the building. This would save costs of the contractor carrying the subcontractors for six months while site work is done. This would result in a six-month site work duration and then approximately 24 months to construct the new school. This all could be completed without disruption to the students in the existing school.

Mr. Cuevas did a quick analysis of phasing for 4D and it would be four to five months for the site work if they do an early package and then about a twenty month construction. The new school would be completed in January and then they would demolish the old school as the last phase. There was a question on when the students would be moved from the old school to the new. Superintendent Stone stated that it would need to be worked out, but you may not move them in the middle of the year and just have the students from Campbell (not Greenmount students) in the school the first year. Superintendent Stone noted that there would be no impact on the students and asked if the construction was shorter. Option 4D could open five months faster.

Mr. Sheppard asked about the test pits that were taken and whether there would be more in the southern location. They would do more test pits during schematic design. This is looked at closely during schematic and there is also a seventy-foot elevation change on this site that could require more ledge removal.

Mr. Kalous presented the updated Option 4D cost estimates from PM & C and Fennessy Consulting, \$144,916,952 and \$139,224,892 respectively. These budgets have not been reconciled, and the values will be further fine-tuned for the next SBC meeting.

Mr. Kalous stated Option 4D was more advantageous with this scheme for queuing and separation of construction from ongoing school operations. Mr. Graham also noted the flexibility of the basketball and baseball areas once the old building is down.

## **Schedule**

Next meeting March 19, 2025 to vote selection of preferred scheme.

## **Public Comment**

No one was present for public comment.

## **Adjournment**

Ms. Trouville made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:48 p.m. Ms. Duda seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.