



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: 2/28/2023
 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	✓	Janet Bernardo	
✓	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	✓	Cherylann S	
	Andrew Lee	Asst. City Solicitor	✓	Steven Siegal	
✓	Stephanie Gilman WG	Dir. Planning, Project Mgt, &	✓	David Geffen	
	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
9.1	Call to Order: 6:02 pm meeting was called to order by J. Morse with 8 of 12 voting members in attendance.	Record
9.2	Approval of the January 17th, 2023, Meeting Minutes (Vote Expected): ➤ Will be approved at the next SBC meeting.	Record
9.3	Design Options Review: ➤ D. DiNisco goes over the schedule. Says they have submitted the PDP back in January and received it back from the MSBA last week. They have 2 weeks to return their review comments for March 7 th . MSBA has acknowledged 465 students is the preferred approach for further study. They will be working to submit the PSR to the MSBA for April 27 th . They are on track to submit the Schematic Design to MSBA for October 26 th . ➤ J. Bernardo introduces herself, then goes into the site logistics of the flood plain. Shows a FEMA flood insurance rate map included in the presentation. Outlines the shading of the map and what that corresponds to. After this she presents a flood profile that was developed for the 10, 50, 100, and 500-year flood plan. Proceeds to go over the flood plain regarding the existing school. Mentions that they are required to confirm the proposed development will provide equal or greater flood storage compared to the existing conditions. The state building code also requires the finish floor elevation to be equal to or higher than the 100-year flood elevation plus 1 foot. ➤ J. Morse asks if the building will sit above the 500-year flood plain. J. Bernardo responds saying yes right now the proposed elevation the building will sit at is 114' and the 500-year flood elevation is at 113.3'. ➤ D. Kalis asks if this will exceed state and federal requirements. J. Bernardo answers as of now they will meet it and possibly exceed it depending on where the final new site will sit. ➤ Cherylann S. asks when the FEMA guidelines were released. J. Bernardo answers saying the current one shown is from 2010. There is one from 2021 that hasn't been approved yet but is the same elevation. ➤ J. Bernardo goes over the map provided by the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) showing the 3 models illustrating the 100-year storm flood elevation anticipated in 2023, 2030, and 2070. ➤ V. Low goes over the site logistics, compares the approach 6 layout with the CRWA map. Then shows preliminary location options with the school footprint on the map.	Record

- D. DiNisco goes over the preliminary floor plans for the three story school. Mentions how the layout provides a level of flexibility with the classroom wings.
- V. Low goes over the next option, approach 6B. This is a bar design on the north side of the site. The first floor would be at elevation 114'. Shows the floor plans for the 6B option.
- V. Low then shows the L-shaped option in a different spot on the site, which is approach 6C. This option places a bit of the building inside the 100-foot buffer for the wetland. Then shows approach 6D which is the bar building and is put on the west side of the site. Which is not ideal, a good portion of the building is inside the 100 foot wetland buffer. This also places the play area in a public area.
- V. Low then shows the Preliminary Criteria Matrix which evaluates the options shown. D. DiNisco follows saying the criteria hasn't changed since the last time they went over this.
- D. Kalis asks about if kids can get around in option 6A. D. DiNisco responds saying it isn't too small and is 75,000 SF. With the L-shape the corridors are smaller but still plenty of room. V. Low follows by saying it's the same footprint as the bar shape option.
- C. Oliver comments about the softball field saying they are giving a big amount of space for it when it is used sparingly. She has concerns about the storm management plan, with ice forming on the parking lot. Then mentions the playground being used all the time, wonders if there is an issue with the three-story building overshadowing the playground. J. Morse says they can invite parks and rec to talk more about the softball field. V. Low says the playground is facing south, they will not have issue with daylighting for the playground. A. Valcarce says they will likely use pervious paving, which the icing problem is eliminated since water drains down.
- L. Zinner asks about parking spaces for the staff. D. DiNisco responds saying they recognize there is a need for larger parking and there will be a balance against the rest of the site amenities. Notes this is at the beginning stages and will need to develop a parking plan. J. Morse follows saying they need to figure out how much blue zone they need, if they are showing too much, they could expand parking there if possible. Notes there will be a parking plan for the whole staff.
- S. Siegel asks about the criteria matrix for the future growth of the school. D. DiNisco responds saying MSBA requires them to look at future growth. They can accommodate 2-4 classrooms to the north of the diagram.
- S. Siegel asks a follow up question about the criteria matrix and what types of considerations will help make one option stronger than the other. V. Low responds saying as part of the PSR they will be putting together pricing options for each approach. On the criteria matrix there

	<p>is a section for building volume within the 100-year flood elevation and says this will help narrow it down as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ S. Kuo asks about option 6C and moving it away from the wetland buffer. V. Low responds saying it will make the site smaller and compress together. D. DiNisco said they previously looked at that and they also lose a lot of the play area as well. ➤ L. Reibstein asks about water mitigation strategies. J. Bernardo responds saying they will be using various practices including the pervious pavement that was mentioned earlier. They will also be providing the flood storage necessary for the site. L. Reibstein follows asking about the balls from the softball field going over to the playground. V. Low says it is a regulation size softball field and is far away from the playground. ➤ L. Reibstien asks about the additional buses from NSHS softball for parking. J. Morse responds saying they will be developing a parking management plan and can bring in the parks and rec department as well. 	
9.4	<p>Schedule Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Morse says there will be a community forum meeting on March 9th at 6:00PM, will send an invite. 	Record
9.5	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
9.6	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SBC No. 10 – Tuesday, March 28th 6:00 PM on Zoom. 	Record
9.7	<p>Adjourn: 7:12 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.