



**Consentino School Building Committee Meeting
Haverhill City Hall, Four Summer Street, Room 301
April 14, 2022**

I. Call to Order.

Mayor Fiorentini called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. A roll call was held and the results were the following:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Absent	Mr.	MacDonald	Absent
Mr.	Boucher	Present	Mr.	Pfifferling	Present
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Present	Dr.	Poor	Absent
Mr.	DiBurro	Present	Ms.	Sullivan	Present
Mr.	Dorrance	Present	Ms.	Wills	Present
Ms.	Heartquist	Present	Mr.	Wood	Absent
Ms.	Hernandez-Bailey	Absent	Mayor	Fiorentini	Present
Dr.	Marotta	Present			

Also present were:

Melinda	Barrett, City Council Member
Craig	DiCarlo, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, MCPPO Project Manager ~ Colliers Project Leaders
Jason	Boone ALEP, Assoc. AIA, MCPPO Dore+Whittier
Michele	Barbaro-Rogers, AIA, MCPPO Dore+Whittier
Donald	Walter, AIA, MCPPO Dore+Whittier

**Agenda
(continued)**

- III. **OPM Report**
 - a. Project Budget
 - b. Project Schedule
- IV. **Design Team Report**
 - a. Review of Public Commentary from 4/13 Presentation
 - b. Review of Final Evaluation Criteria and Scoring of Alternatives
- V. **Next Steps**
 - a. SBC meeting 4/28/22
 - b. Preferred Schematic Report, proposed 4/29/22

Mayor Fiorentini stated that neighbors would oppose the debt exclusion on the Consentino School project. He spoke with a teacher who lives in the neighborhood who would not support the exclusion.

Ms. Sullivan expected concerns with the project because of the disruption in the area.

Councilor Barrett related those neighbors supported taking less of the hill.

Both Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Boucher commented that there needed to be equity in the city's education.

Mr. Walter noted that the preferred option was less invasive to the property.

Dr. Marotta commented that neighbors had been invited to the meeting.



**Consentino School Building Committee Meeting
Haverhill City Hall, Four Summer Street, Room 301
April 14, 2022**

Councilor Barrett indicated that those opposed would keep their opinions to themselves.

Mr. Boucher reported that his organization would advocate for the new school since trust had been built among immigrants and non-immigrants.

Ms. Sullivan asked if there were additional city monies available towards the project.

The mayor noted that the plan would be for proceeding without the debt exclusion.

Mr. Walter reviewed the options with the school building committee outlining the pros and cons of the options:

- AR.985-C1, 4 stories
- AR.1080-C.1 4 stories
- N.985-A.1 4 stories
- N.1080-A 4 stories
- N.985-A.2, 4 stories
- N.1080-A.2 4 stories
- N.985-A.3 3 stories
- N.1080-A.3 3 stories

In response to solar, Mr. Walter responded that the project would have a solar-ready building.

Mr. Dorrance related that there had been conversations with National Grid in regards to this prospect.

Mr. Walter continued with the review of the evaluation criteria:

25%	Education	How well does the alternative meet the educational needs of the Consentino student population and overall educational goals of Haverhill?
8%	Site / Traffic	How well does the alternative maximize on-site parking, allow for efficient and effective pick-up/drop-off circulation, and maximize green space?
5%	Community – Green Space	To what extent does the alternative create usable green space for extracurricular activities and exterior teaching modalities?
11%	Enrollment	How well does the alternative meet the current and projected student population requirements? To what extent does the option allow the district to improve facility challenges associated with enrollment in other buildings throughout the district?
8%	Construction Logistics (Site)	How disruptive will the alternative be to site access, on-site parking, and efficient and effective pick-up/drop-off site circulation during construction?



Consentino School Building Committee Meeting
Haverhill City Hall, Four Summer Street, Room 301
April 14, 2022

8%	Student Impact (Building)	How disruptive will the alternative be to the learning environment, student life, and the experience of all those who use the building/campus during construction?
20%	Total Project Costs	How well does the total project cost align with the City's desire to fund the project without a debt exclusion?
5%	Daylighting & Views	How well does the alternative provide direct access to natural daylight and exterior views?
5%	Impact to Abutting Properties	How well does the alternative manage potential negative impacts to abutting properties (views of new building, site lighting, noise from play areas and basketball)?
5%	Overall Experience (Relationship to Washington Street, Silver Hill ES, and Abutting Properties)	How well does the massing and positioning of the alternative create a welcoming, safe, and functional experience?

Mr. Boone asked if the criteria was correct and which option would make the most sense.

Mr. Boucher recommended N.1080-A.2.

Mr. Walter stated that N.1080-A.2 was the most preferred option at last night's meeting.

Mr. Dorrance noted that value engineering needed to take place in the project.

Mr. Boucher supported the best design for the school.

Ms. Sullivan asked about cross spaces when students are moving within the building and the visibility.

Mr. Boone offered that the art room and school resource officer's office would have "eyes" on students and there was strategic office placement, i.e., assistant principals' offices.

Ms. Sullivan pointed out the importance of student safety and was very concerned with these areas.

Mr. Boucher stressed the significance of open spaces for students to minimize the potential for disruptions and potential violence.

Mr. Boone asked for any other selections that should be preferred besides the 1080-A.2 option.

Mr. Grannemann asked about the differences and the potential growth capacity.

Mr. Boone responded that MSBA had established constraints on size.

Dr. Grannemann noted that gateway cities growth came from migration and not births.

In response to Mayor Fiorentini's inquiry about light green space, Mr. Boone responded that it was open space.

Mr. Boone stated that the MSBA recommended only two lunches.



**Consentino School Building Committee Meeting
Haverhill City Hall, Four Summer Street, Room 301
April 14, 2022**

Councilor Barrett inquired about the longer corridors that were not included in other options.

Mr. Walter reported the lack of outside light and was a down-side to this option.

Dr. Marotta noted that the enclosed office space was not a preferred scenario from teachers. She further related that if students needed to be spaced 6 feet apart there would not be enough space for the students in the building.

Assistant Superintendent Pfifferling left the meeting at 10:04 am.

The mayor recommended the trees be put back into the project.

In response to Dr. Grannemann’s question on educational component, Dr. Marotta agreed that 1080 enrollment was the best choice.

Ms. Sullivan cautioned about the 25% education criteria.

In regards to Dr. Grannemann’s remarks, Dr. Marotta clarified that the building cost should be tabulated as the total building cost divided by student population.

Mr. Boone explained that the preferred option would be decided on April 28.

Regarding Mr. DiBurro’s question on total reimbursement cost, Mr. DiCarlo related it was uncertain at this time.

Ms. Wills recommended a list of potential options prior to final selection.

Mr. DiBurro emphasized the importance of reimbursable expenses.

Ms. Sullivan highlighted the growth in student population by having a welcoming community.

Mr. Boone stated that the revisions would include the abutters’ impact.

Dr. Marotta suggested student experience.

A motion was made by Ms. Sullivan to adjourn the meeting (10:14 am). Mr. DiBurro seconded the motion. A roll call vote was held:

Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Dr.	Marotta	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Ms.	Sullivan	Yes
Mr.	DiBurro	Yes	Ms.	Wills	Yes
Mr.	Dorrance	Yes	Mayor	Fiorentini	Present
Ms.	Heartquist	Yes			