



MEETING MINUTES

Project: Tri-County Vocational High School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting No. 11
 Location: Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High School
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No: MP20-28
 Meeting Date: 6/9/2022
 Time: 4:00 PM
 Prepared By: R. Rincon

Present	Name	Affiliation	Prese	Name	Affiliation
✓	Brian Mushnick*	SBC Chair		Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Karen Maguire*	Superintendent	✓	Trip Elmore	DWMP
✓	Dan Haynes*	Business Admin.	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
	Michael Procaccini*	Principal		Mike Cox	DWMP
✓	Jonathon Dowse*	SBC Member	✓	Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Brendan Bowen*	SBC Member		Charlie Lyons	DWMP
	Stanley Widak Jr.*	SBC/SC Member	✓	Carl Franceschi	DRA
✓	Harry Takesian*	Facilities Manager	✓	Vladimir Lyubetsky	DRA
	Jane Hardin*	SBC Member		Sara Carda	DRA
	Sarah Solomon	Marketing			

* SBC Voting Member

Item No.	Description	Action
11.1	Call to Order: 4:13 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair B. Mushnick with 6 of 9 voting members in attendance.	Record
11.2	Previous Topics & Approval of June 9, 2022, Meeting Minutes: A motion to approve the 6/9/2022 meeting minutes as submitted made by J. Dowse and seconded by B. Bowen. Discussion: None. Abstentions: None. All in favor: Motion passes, minutes approved.	Record
11.3	<p>Review of the Space Summary with the SBC – (DRA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Franceschi shares this is a form that the MSBA requires us to use to itemize every space that exists in the building today and what is proposed for the future project. We are not sure what the future project is yet so we cannot fill out the middle column about what is proposed. For the first submission (Preliminary Design Program) in August, we will theoretically base it on a new school. Once you plug in the agreed upon enrollment which is 1,000 students, the spreadsheet populates all the columns. This spreadsheet tells you in a typical high school how many classrooms, science labs, gym size, library size, are all based on a theoretical basis. The MSBA will use this to establish what they will pay for and what they will reimburse. If the spreadsheet says you need 26 classrooms, but you want 32 classrooms, you will need to pay for the additional 6 classrooms. Another example is the educational program argues for an auditorium, but the MSBA will only pay for three quarters of the student population up to a maximum of 750 seats because it is an expensive space to be built and the school does not use the space often for the entire school. Originally the MSBA would not allow you to build more than the basic policy, but they have since changed it noting that in addition to paying for more space, you also need to pay more to the OPM fee and the Architects fee because they recognize you are designing a larger building. ➤ C. Franceschi walks the SBC through the form noting that this is not set in stone. This will be locked in during schematic design. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ H. Takesian shares the current auditorium seats about 280. K. Maguire notes capacity is problematic as it is now also for community meetings. ➤ K. Maguire notes she would like the capability of the drop-down screen and projector in the gymnasium space as well. ➤ C. Dell Angelo mentions the benefits of the Gym-Café-Torium idea. ➤ B. Mushnick shares we want the space to stand out and we want the community to be able to rent it out. ➤ C. Franceschi notes if demonstration is more important than performance, another option is to have a removeable stage giving you more flat floor area. 	Record

<p>11.4</p>	<p>SBC review and discussion on the option evaluation criteria as proposed by DRA – (Team):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Franceschi shares this is a way to help evaluate the options as we develop them. The columns represent different options such as addition, renovation, or new construction. ➤ DRA requests the SBC’s feedback on the evaluation criteria and which criteria is most important to them. ➤ Impact on abutters will be added to the evaluation criteria. ➤ C. Franceschi explains there are a few ways to use this tool. We want to represent people who are quantitative vs qualitative. Some people want to use the colors and say green is good while red is bad, or people want to score it using numbers. We want to show at our first submission in August that we have done a preliminary evaluation of the options. ➤ DRA will share their preliminary pass for the evaluation matrix and the committee will then provide their feedback at the next meeting. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. Hayes asks does the MSBA dictate how many add/reno options versus new? C. Franceschi responds they require us to look at all possibilities, but we should have at least one addition/renovation option and one new option. 	<p>Record</p>
<p>11.5</p>	<p>SBC working session - review and discussion of the options presented by DRA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DRA shares the Preliminary Options Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Space Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic Classroom count adequate, variety of sizes desired. ▪ Science “Classrooms” conversion to “Labs” ▪ “High Bay” shops adequate area; (Auto Body to be converted); Related rooms, support spaces needed ▪ “Low Bay” (Health, Legal, Dental, CIS) shops need expansion ▪ Auditorium addition (conversion?) ▪ Locker Rooms-parity and accessibility upgrades required ○ Educational Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic / Career Tech integration ▪ Extended Learning areas: Collaborative, Break-out spaces, Small Group Rooms ▪ Improved Customer access to public shops ▪ Improved access/ separation to Post-graduate programs ▪ Auditorium/ Large Group space 	<p>Record</p>

- Potential Addition Locations
- Potential Auditorium Locations
- Addition/Renovation
 - Option 1
 - Option 2
 - Option 3
 - Option 3.1
 - Option 4
- Potential Building Zones
 - Option A.1
 - Option A.2
 - Option B
 - Option C
 - Option D

Discussion:

- B. Mushnick comments shares we would like to possibly create a media department with TV, video broadcasting, radio, and graphics.
- B. Mushnick shares we want the school to look 21st century.
- J. Dowse comments the satellite auditorium option does not work well. K. Maguire agrees.
- Potential Building Zones
 - Option A:
 - Not worth pursuing any further.
 - Option B:
 - Close to abutters.
 - Great student common space
 - There is not full access around the building for a fire truck
 - Option C:
 - K. Maguire does not like the long hallways
 - Option D:
 - There would need to be discussion about relocating the solar panels and it is \$3 Million to discontinue the contract.
 - Least amount of impact on abutters
 - Provides better visibility
 - Private outdoor space in the courtyard
 - Better light quality
 - Layout helps separate the shops

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option D is the preferred option followed by B, and C. Option A can be eliminated. ➤ Addition Renovation Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B. Mushnick likes option 1 and 3 together and would possibly like to combine the two. ▪ Auditorium could be rented ▪ Security in areas needed. ○ Option 3.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ B. Bowen thinks this option is also favorable. ▪ J. Dowse likes the idea of community members being able to go directly to cosmetology and culinary while not interacting with other students ▪ B. Bowen does not like the auditorium in this option ○ Option 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ K. Maguire, B. Mushnick and H. Takesian prefer this option. ▪ Great swingspace and layout ▪ Small courtyard ▪ Want to “dress up” the front entrance 	
11.6	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
11.7	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
11.8	<p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ July 14 at 4 PM remote meeting to review updates on the building options. ➤ July 28 at 4 PM remote meeting to approve the submission of the Preliminary Design Program by the D+W and DRA to the MSBA 	Record
11.9	<p>Adjourn: 6:18 pm A motion was made by K. Maguire and seconded by H. Takesian to adjourn the meeting. Discussion: None.</p>	Record

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Rachel Rincon

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.