



MEETING MINUTES

Project: Fox Hill Elementary School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
 Location: Webex Conference Call
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No:
 Meeting Date: 01/30/2024
 Time: 6:00 PM
 Prepared By: A. O'Toole

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
	Amanda Hanafin	SBC Member		Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Anne Hill	SBC Member		Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Bob Cunha*	Director of		Mike Cox	DWMP
	Christine Monaco*	SBC Member	✓	Steve Brown	DWMP
✓	David Rosenblatt*	Fox Hill Principal	✓	Andrea O'Toole	DWMP
✓	Dennis Villano*	SBC Member		Jason Boone	DWMP
	Ed Parsons	SBC Member	✓	Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
✓	Eric Conti*	Superintendent	✓	Vivian Low	DiNisco Design
✓	George Papayannis	SBC Member	✓	Neil Harrigan	DiNisco Design
✓	Jennifer Priest*	SBC Member		David Daley	
✓	Jeremy Brooks*	SBC Member		Chris Campbell	
✓	John Danizio*	SBC Member		Melissa Ulliani	
✓	John Lyons*	Pine Glen Principal		John Iler	
✓	Katherine Bond*	Vice Chair of SBC		Elizabeth Melo	
	Kristen Downie	Secretary		Eileen Sickler	
✓	Margo Bunker*	SBC Member		Nicci Kadilak	
✓	Martha Simon*	SBC Member		Adam Senesi	
	Melissa Gilberg	SBC Member		Sarah Visocchi	
✓	Melissa Massardo*	SBC Chair		Terry Orfanos	
	Nichole Coscia*	Business Manager		Elizabeth Clancy	
✓	Paul Sagarino*	SBC Member		Bill Boivin	
✓	Roger Riggs	SBC Member		Krystal Anderson	
✓	Tara Carroll	SBC Member	✓	Meghan Nawolchik	
	* SBC Voting Member				

Item No.	Call to Order & Intro: 6:00 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair Melissa Massardo with 12 of 15 voting members in attendance.	Record
1.	<p>Approval of January 9, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</p> <p>A motion to approve the 12/18/2023 meeting minutes as submitted made by M, Massardo and seconded by K. Bond. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes – E. Conti – Yes – P. Sagarino -Yes- B. Cunha – Yes – J. Lyons - Yes – D. Villano - Yes - M. Bunker - Yes – K. Bond – Yes- D. Rosenblatt – Yes – M. Massardo – Yes. Abstention: J. Danizio, Jennifer Priest. Motion passes, minutes approved, 10-0-2</p>	Record
2.	<p>Previous Public Comment Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 11/20/2023: Jason Brooks Comment: Ward 6 Resident concerned the project does not currently have any playing fields going in at Fox Hill. Existing fields are currently being used during and after school. If there are no designated playing fields do these open spaces become off limits to the students at Fox Hill? There is a currently a lack of fields for recreational youth sports. Requests to maximize this space with the addition of fields to be used by the schools and youth sports. ➤ 12/18/2023 C. Dell Angelo; This comment is still in review and will be addressed at the upcoming January meeting. ➤ No decisions on fields have been finalized at this point. The project team will be holding future meetings with the school department and Parks and Recreation beginning in February to determine appropriate field use and layout based on school and town needs. No decisions or layouts have been determined so far, other than maximizing open space now that the building location has been finalized. There are plenty of opportunities for play fields and recreational use for both the school and community. 	Record
3.	<p>Public Comment (15 Minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None 	Open
4.	<p>Summary of Recent Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (1/17/24) was impressed with the project’s preliminary efficient and simplistic design and Educational Plan. The FAS members had some constructive comments about what to continue thinking about as the design progresses. ➤ We have received the MSBA Review Comments for the PSR. Overall, the PSR was well received with only minor comments for the team to 	

	<p>respond to. The MSBA had no further comments on the program spaces (indicating they have accepted them all) with the exception of requesting additional clarification of the STE space. The MSBA has also accepted adding the additional 1,000 square feet gymnasium, to be funded by the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Planning Board (1/28/24) A project overview was shared. The Board reviewed and asked to be included in upcoming meetings to provide insight as Schematic Design progresses. ➤ Sustainability (1/25/24) A group met to discuss the project's sustainability goals, sustainable strategies and precedents, HVAC Review, LEED scorecard status. The project is currently on track to receive a LEED Gold certification. M. Simon is very impressed with the highly qualified team DiNisco has assembled. M. Massardo inquired if there was an ability to hit LEED Platinum certification. D. DiNisco stated that due to the building not being accessible by public transportation and some other criteria this would not be possible. ➤ Data Sheet Reviews (Jan. 12, 18, 19, 26) the team met with each department and grade level staff to review the program of their individual spaces. Preferred infrastructure, furniture, equipment, layout, and usages were noted and will be further explored by DiNisco. 	
5.	<p>Design Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DiNisco presentation of the original Preferred Schematic Report (PSR). The PSR versus the new Schematic Design plan is reviewed showing the relationships between the new building's orientations, wetlands, traffic and bus circulation, primary and secondary entrances, and access to playing fields. No interior programming has been changed with the "flipping" of the building. DiNisco then walks through the 1st and 2nd floor plans. ➤ K. Bond: Will the service drive be separated from the students? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ D. DiNisco: Yes, there will be a wall or screen in place to separate deliveries and vehicles from exterior learning and play spaces behind the building. ➤ J. Priest: What are the dots representing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ V. Low: Geothermal well field. ➤ M. Simon: Is there a ramp for the elevated music room as well as the stage? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ V. Low: Yes, there are two ramps in the music stage area to provide access to all. ➤ M. Simon: What are the boxes inside and dashed boxes outside the building? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ V. Low: Outside they are proposed canopy locations, inside they denote spaces that are open to below. 	Record

- M. Massardo: Will the community wing be open on both levels due to the staircase being located near the gym?
 - V. Low: there will be a lockable door at the bottom of the stairs as well as the upper-level hallway to allow access to Library if desirable.
- R. Riggs: Does it make sense to have a hallway between the receiving and the kitchen areas?
 - V. Low: This is a secondary corridor. For security and logistical reasons (not all shipments are food items) shipping does need to be separated from the kitchen/dining area.
- J. Priest: There is currently an Assistant Principal at Fox Hill. Will there be office space?
 - D. DiNisco: The admin offices will support all staff and are being refined now.
- M. Massardo: Is there space for general storage and PTO storage?
 - D. DiNisco: We are exploring places to locate the after-school program storage. There is no additional storage for PTO in this project. The team will review the site for the best locations to move the existing PTO storage shed.
- M. Massardo: After school currently has 100 students. Has this been accounted for in the sizing of the cafeteria?
 - D. DiNisco: The current cafeteria design can hold up to 150 students/seating.
- M. Simon: Is there only 1 elevator?
 - D. DiNisco: Yes, there is one elevator that is centrally located and is accessed by keycard.
- J. Priest: Please make sure that the locked access doors separating the academic wing from the community space are located behind the elevator door to provide full access.
 - V. Low: Noted.
- M. Massardo: Will there be a number code access pad?
 - B. Cuhna: this is not the preferred method. The project should include A Phones to locations needed to allow parents/guardians into the building. DiNisco agrees.
- E. Conti asks P. Sagarino if there has been any recent discussion about debt exclusion. Does it make sense to discuss on 2/26?
 - P. Sagarino: Amy Warfield should attend a future SBC Meeting to review scenarios and timelines.
 - S. Brown: We should start to think about the town specific procedure, scheduling and public outreach leading up to the debt exclusion.
 - M. Massardo: I agree and once we come to a date the committee then the Select Board add the debt exclusion on the ballot. Once this has been finalized all information should be communicated to the public. This could happen in March if not then in May.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Massardo: Looking at the timeline, if we slip a timeline does the MSBA funding window change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S. Brown: It is ok if the dates change slightly. Once the funding is approved it kicks off a 120-day window for MSBA to approve funding. ➤ A motion to move forward with the amended design as presented made by M. Massardo and seconded by K. Bond. Discussion: J. Brooks asked if this precludes any further changes. It was clarified that this vote only refers to the “flipping” of the building” Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes – E. Conti – Yes – P. Sagarino -Yes- B. Cunha – Yes – J. Lyons - Yes – D. Villano - Yes - M. Bunker - Yes – K. Bond – Yes- D. Rosenblatt – Yes – M. Massardo – Yes. -J. Danizio – Yes. - Jennifer Priest - Yes. M. Simon – Yes. Abstention: None Motion passes, minutes approved, 13-0-0. 	
6.	<p>Public Comment (15 Minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None 	Record
7.	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Geothermal Test Well Installation and Geotechnical borings (week of Feb. 19th), Traffic/Transportation/Engineering Meeting, DPW, Board of Health, Parks & Recs, Public Safety, Tree Protection, Removal and Planting, Planning Board Review. ➤ Monday February 26, 2024 at 6pm ➤ Tuesday March 19, 2024 at 6pm ➤ Monday April 8, 2024 at 6pm ➤ M. Massardo -What are the test borings for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ V. Low they are to take soil samples to see what can be used during construction and what needs to be removed. ➤ M. Simon: What does DCM stand for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ S. Brown: Development Coordination Meeting. This meeting group includes many of the town infrastructure departments. ➤ M. Simon: What are the Data Sheet Reviews? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. DiNisco: that is an MSBA term for the programming reviews we had with Fox Hill admin and staff to better understand how they use their spaces. ➤ S. Brown: When does the group think they would like to have their next communications meeting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sometime in March or early April. 	Record
10.	<p>Adjourn</p>	Record

	<p>➤ A motion to adjourn submitted made by M. Simon and seconded by J. Priest. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: J. Brooks – Yes – E. Conti – Yes – P. Sagarino -Yes- B. Cunha – Yes – J. Lyons - Yes – D. Villano - Yes - M. Bunker - Yes – K. Bond – Yes- D. Rosenblatt – Yes – M. Massardo – Yes. -J. Danizio – Yes. - Jennifer Priest - Yes. M. Simon – Yes. Abstention: None Motion passes, minutes approved, 13-0-0.</p>	
--	--	--

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Andrea O'Toole

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.