

An act relative to extending certain COVID-19 measures adopted during the state of emergency was signed by Governor Baker and allows for remote meetings and hearings by public bodies through July 15, 2022.

I. Call to Order.

Ms. Sullivan, Chairperson Pro Tem called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. A roll call was held and the results were the following:

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

Also present were:

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

II. Review and Approve Previous Meeting Minutes: February 3, 2022

A motion was made by Mr. Pfifferling to approve the Consentino School Remote Meeting Minutes of February 3, 2022. Dr. Poor seconded the motion. A roll call vote was requested with the following results:

Mr.	Bevilacqua	Yes	Mr.	Pfifferling	Yes
Mr.	Boucher	Yes	Dr.	Poor	Yes
Mr.	Bucuzzo	Yes	Ms.	Sullivan	Yes
Mr.	DiBurro	Yes	Ms.	Wills	Yes
Mr.	Dorrance	Yes			

I. OPM Report.

- a. Project Budget: Mr. DiCarlo reported that the project continued to be on budget, invoices are being submitted and processed. He related that the MSBA had recently approved Budget Revision Request #1 which allows for movement of monies within categories.
- b. Project Schedule: Mr. DiCarlo indicated that the project was in the PSR phase which would reduce the seven (7) preferred options into one (1) selected option by the end of April 2022. He reviewed with the committee the MSBA in its review of the PDP submission from January 6, 2022, had submitted several questions (15 pages) to the district for response which will be submitted later today or tomorrow. Mr. DiCarlo noted that the MSBA is committed to a detailed and transparent process, even though the submission was a high quality and well done PDP submission. He explained that it was a technical and comprehensive response.

Mrs. McGillicuddy noted the attendance of Angel Wills, the new CFO for the city who is the newest member of the school building committee.



Mr. Bevilacqua acknowledged his attendance.

IV. Design Team Report. Mr. Walter began a review of their update and thanked the OPM and the school department for their assistance with the PDP response. He referenced that at present the project is at the mid-point in the PSR phase 2022-03-03 School Building Committee-FINAL.pdf

- Programming Update (refinement)
- Recent Meetings
 - Site Amenities
 - Safety and Security
 - Student Focus Group (a highlight of the project)
- Design Progress. He reviewed the submission student enrollment information with a focus on the 1080 and reduction of the square footage for the project.
 - 715 student enrollment = grades 5-8 (current configuration) 158K SF;
 - 985 student enrollment = grades 5-8 with Tilton Upper remaining in service 212K reduced to 186K SF;
 - 1080 student enrollment = grades 5-8 with Tilton Upper remaining in service 222K reduced incrementally from 222K then to 195K and finally to 189K;

Mr. Boone clarified that the 715 student enrollment had not changed since the focus had been on the larger enrollments.

In response to Ms. Sullivan's question on what reductions had been made that resulted in the lower square footage, Mr. Boone answered that there were duplications in spacing needs and general classroom size was reduced 25 square feet per classroom without impact on education delivery. He noted there was a fine tuning of the space requirements.

Ms. Sullivan asked about reduction in class size capacity. Mr. Boone related that the current classroom size was mostly 825 square feet, however there were classes that ranged from 650 to 750 square feet. He emphasized that with the revised space it would be 875 square feet (originally 900 square feet in PDP submission). Mr. Boone noted that the science classroom space would be proposed at 1200 square feet in alignment with MSBA guidelines.

Mr. Walter stressed that education would not be affected by the change in square footage.

Mr. Walter continued with the On-Going Planning Meetings which included:

- Site Features
 - Separate Vehicles and Pedestrians
 - Separate Parens, Buses and Vans
 - Separate Consentino and Silver Hill Traffic (potential for sharing during events)
 - Maximize fields and green space (increasing student outdoor activities along with educational opportunities)
 - Full Emergency Vehicle Access (360 degree access)
 - Use of Zoning Regulations as Parking Targets (daily staff and visitor numbers along with proper setbacks, building mass and height)
 - Variety of recess experiences (greenhouse, benches and ample space)
- Safety and Security
 - Full Emergency Vehicle Access



- Site Circulation Management
- Compartmentalize Building (safety in case of intruder)
- See and Be Seen Philosophy (deterrent to promote security)
- Warm and Inviting Atmosphere (materials and natural light)
- Security Technologies that are unobtrusive (lockdown devices, security cameras, key fobs)
- Follow-up conversations about specific alternatives (with school officials and public safety)
- Materials (goal to build a 50-year school building)
 - Durable
 - o Easily Cleanable
 - Low Maintenance
 - Cost Effective

Mr. Walter announced another site visit to the Gates School in Scituate, Massachusetts on March 9, 2022.

MONDAY, MARCH 7TH?

- Sustainability
 - LEED Certified plus 20% above energy code (required to get MSBA's 2% incentive points)
- Student Focus Group (excellent group of students who expressed interest in natural light and an art focused building)
 - Student Dining
 - Outdoor Learning and Recess
 - Lockers

Variety and Choice

Mr. Boone noted the students reported that they did not use the lockers and suggested the possibility of installing lockers similar to a ski lodge style.

Mr. Boone reported on:

- Student Focus Group Dining recommendations:
 - Variety of food lines
 - Variety of environments
 - Variety of seating types (including student renderings)
 - Variety of group sizes
 - Outdoor dining
 - View and Daylight
 - Connected to library
- Student Focus Group ~ Outdoor
 - Lavers of activity
 - Variety of activities
 - Games (4-square, checkers, chess, etc.)
 - Climbing Structure(s)
 - Quiet Area(s) for conversation with friends



- Basketball
- Variety of Shelter (pavillon protection from sun or inclement weather)
- More Space (cramped environment)

Mr. Boone also noted the students requested a coffee bar.

Mr. Boone continued with the Design Process and noted the last design team meeting was prior to February school recess. He was sharing these illustrations with the building committee first in order to receive feedback, comments and suggestions.

In response to Councilor Barrett's question, Mr. Boone answered that the fields had been created where the existing school building was and were similar in size to the existing fields.

Mr. Boone summarized pages 18-27 with design plans of several options.

Councilor Barrett asked about availability of performance areas in the school.

Mr. Boone responded that MSBA would not support a designated middle school auditorium but the space could be used for instruction during the day and other performance events in the evening (making it a multi-purpose space).

- Mr. Dorrance inquired about new construction to the rear of the school property.
- Mr. Boone referred to N.1080-A.1 and N.1080-A.2 as examples.

Mr. Walter emphasized the efforts to minimize phasing and disruption to school operations. He continued by referring to N.1080-A.1 (56 foot four-story bar option) with three teams per floor with many variations for grade levels which simplifies construction. He noted that Silver Hill was a 53 foot pitched roof school building.

Mr. Dorrance appreciated the thoughtfulness to design in reducing the overall construction cost.

Mr. Bevilacqua questioned the use of a flat roof in New England and wondered about a potential rendering.

Mr. Walter replied that flat roofs were a misnomer and were actually pitched to allow for proper drainage. He was comfortable with a membrane roof.

In response to Mr. Bevilacqua's question on solar panels, Mr. Walter answered that it would be a solar ready building, however, the only reason not to install immediately would be a cost prohibition.

Councilor Barrett asked for confirmation of solar readiness.

Mr. Walter reported that there would ballisting on the roof to allow for solar panels.

Councilor Barrett asked for a price differential between a pitch or flat roof.

Mr. Boone related that MSBA had requested the creation of illustrations relative to the height of the building and its impact on nearby hills and neighbors' homes.



Mr. Walter noted that due to the setback of the school building would minimize the impact of the four-story building.

- Ms. Sullivan asked about the cost of solar panels and its impact on the project.
- Mr. Walter reported a cost-benefit analysis would be conducted on this option.
- Mr. Boone related that discussions with the working group would be held over the next week.
- Mr. Bevilacqua urged pursuing sustainability and reducing utility costs in terms of this project.
- Mr. Boone asked for input on the upcoming public meetings on March 9th and proposed April 13th.

There was general consensus that all available information be presented including the design progress illustrations.

Mr. Boone outlined the format for each of the proposed public meeting(s):

- March 9, 2022
 - o MSBA Process
 - Report out on PDP outcomes
 - Design Progress
 - Questions, Feedback and input
- April 13, 2022
 - MSBA Process
 - Design Process
 - Cost Estimates
 - Questions and Preferences

Ms. Sullivan asked about the notification for the March 9th meeting.

Mr. DiCarlo noted that invitations for March 9th had gone out to the public. He would send the flyer to Mrs. McGillicuddy for distribution to the building committee.

Next Steps:

- 3.17.22 Design Progress to Cost Estimators
- 4.22 Develop Evaluation Criteria
- 4.13.22 Public Meeting (tentative)
- 4.28.22 School Building Committee to vote to identify preferred alternative
- 4.29.22 Submission of PSR to MSBA
- 5.02.22 Begin Schematic Design

Mr. Walter noted that there were placeholders on the following dates for SBC meetings 4.7.22, 4.14.22, and 4.28.22.

Mr. DiCarlo concluded with three placeholder meetings for April which were similar to the PDP process. He noted that reminders would be sent to the committee. Mr. DiCarlo would also work with Mrs. McGillicuddy to notify MSBA of Angel Wills appointment to the CSBC.



A motion was made by Mr. Bevilacqua to adjourn the meeting (10:23 am). Dr. Poor seconded the motion.