

MEETING MINUTES

Project: Newton Countryside Elementary School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
 Location: Zoom Conference Call
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: 22-0123
 Meeting Date: 1/17/2023
 Time: 6:00 PM
 Prepared By: Aidan Place

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
	Jonathan Yeo* WG	Chief Operating Officer	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
	Ruthann Fuller	Mayor		Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Emily Prenner* WG	School Committee		Mike Cox	DWMP
	Bill Humphrey	City Council	✓	Aidan Place	DWMP
	Kathy Smith	Superintendent of Schools		Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Josh Morse* WG	Commissioner of Public Buildings	✓	Steve Brown	DWMP
✓	Beth Herlihy* WG	Principal Countryside E.S.	✓	Donna DiNisco	DiNisco
	Ayesha Farag*	Asst. Superintendent of Elementary		Jim Shuttleworth	DiNisco
	Maureen Lemieux*	Chief Financial Officer	✓	Vivian Low	DiNisco
	Nick Read	Chief Procurement Officer	✓	Anne Davis Woodacre	DiNisco
✓	Tom Gloria	DRC			
✓	Ellen Light	DRC			
	Tamika Olszewski	School Committee (Chair)		Carol Schein	
✓	Cove Davis*	School Committee		Christina Oliver	
✓	Stacy Klickstein*	Resident	✓	Adam Bernstien	
✓	Liam Hurley* WG	Asst. Superintendent/ Chief Fin. &	✓	Melissa Monokroussos	
✓	Andreae Downs* WG	City Council	✓	Amy MacKrell	
✓	David Kalis*	City Council	✓	Sing-Ning Kuo	
✓	Lori Zinner*	Resident			
	Andrew Lee	Asst. City Solicitor			
✓	Stephanie Gilman WG	Dir. Planning, Project Mgt, &			
	David Stickney	Director of Facilities			
✓	Alex Valcarce WG	Deputy Commissioner			
	Adam Lipson	Resident			
	Maura Tynes WG	Director of Elementary Special Ed.			
✓	Lisa Reibstein	Public			
	Brian Hunter	Public			

* SBC Voting Member | WG Working Group

Item No.	Description	Action
8.1	Call to Order: 6:02 pm meeting was called to order by J. Morse with 8 of 12 voting members in attendance.	Record
8.2	<p>Approval of the December 20th, 2022, Meeting Minutes (Vote Expected):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to approve the 12/20/2022 meeting minutes as submitted made by D. Kalis and seconded by E. Prenner. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: Roll Call Vote: E. Prenner. – Yes L. Hurley – Yes J. Morse – Yes - B. Herlihy – Yes – A. Downs – Yes D. Kalis - Yes L. Zinner – Yes – C. Davis – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, Minutes approved. 	Record
8.3	<p>Design Approach Criteria Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. DiNisco starts by saying the PDP was uploaded last week for everyone to review. Goes over how the educational program drives the design of the school. Then highlights the Educational Visioning Sessions and lists some of the goals that came out of them such as Student-Centered Learning, Special Education Support, and Project-Based Learning. D. DiNisco then highlights the spatial relationships & adjacencies aspect. Highlighting that it was important that kindergarten was on the first floor. ➤ D. DiNisco then goes over both enrollment options of 340 students and 465 students. Uses these enrollment numbers to go over the Space Summary for each enrollment option. ➤ D. Kalis asks if its normal for some areas to be over the MSBA requirement while others are under the requirement. D. DiNisco responds saying this is normal. Some spaces MSBA won't reimburse if over such as PE/Gym. D. Kalis notes that Dining was lower than the MSBA standard and was concerned. D. DiNisco says they usually come in a little lower than the MSBA requirement. ➤ D. DiNisco talks about looking at the 141 city properties across Newton, then narrowing it down to 8 in the countryside district. Notes that most properties were not feasible which led them to choosing the existing site as the best option. ➤ D. DiNisco then talks about how the entire school was in the 100-year flood plan. Says they would need to raise the existing building by 3 feet to avoid the flood zone if they were to use a portion of the existing building, notes this is not physically possible in construction. ➤ D. DiNisco goes over the various approaches that were created, in total there are six. Notes that approach 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were considered but rejected due to not being feasible. Notes that approach 6 is the preferred approach to further study. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. DiNisco goes over the cost comparisons. Approach 3 grand total project costs are estimated between \$56,000,000 and \$66,000,000. Approach 6 grand total project costs are estimated between \$60,000,000 and \$72,000,000. ➤ D. DiNisco then goes over the Criteria Matrix that has been showed before. It has been filled out, notes that option 1, 2, 4, and 5 did not meet the MA flood regulations. Approach 3 had a score of 31 while Approach 6 had a score of 42. 	
8.4	<p>Review & Approval of Preliminary Design Program Submittal (Vote Expected):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to authorize OPM Dore & Whittier Management Partners to submit the Preliminary Design Program on behalf of the City of Newton to the Massachusetts School Building Authority made by A. Downs and seconded by D. Kalis. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: E. Prenner. – Yes L. Hurley – Yes J. Morse – Yes - B. Herlihy – Yes – A. Downs – Yes D. Kalis - Yes L. Zinner – Yes – C. Davis – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, PDP approved. 	Record
8.5	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
8.6	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SBC No. 09 – Tuesday, February 21st 6:00 PM on Zoom. 	Record
8.7	<p>Adjourn: 6:46 pm A motion to adjourn was made by J. Morse. Discussion: None.</p>	Record

Sincerely,
DORE + WHITTIER
 Aidan Place
 Assistant Project Manager
 Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.