

**School Building Committee (2020)**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**City Hall Room 335**  
**100 Broadway**  
**And Virtually via ZOOM**  
**Tuesday April 19, 2022**  
**6:30 PM**

**Committee Members Present:** Chairman Mark Bettencourt, Alderwoman Stacy Gould (ZOOM), President Pro Tem Joe DeLucia, William Hull, Peter Gauthier and Gregory Carabine, Cindy Beauregard (ZOOM), Mark Kulos (ZOOM) and Christine DiStasio (ZOOM).

**Committee Members Absent:** Mark Adams and Gregory Ballassi.

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** None.

**Citizens Present:** None.

**I. Call to Order and Quorum:** Chairman Mark Bettencourt called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

**II. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meetings:** Peter Gauthier made a motion to approve the April 6, 2022 special meeting minutes, with some minor adjustments. William Hull seconded. The chairman called the roll of members present and all were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**III. Update by DRA representatives Jim Barrett and/or Greg Smolley:**

1. Building Programming
2. Building Program Test Fits
3. Existing Site Evaluations,
4. Next Steps,
5. April 26 public meeting

Gregory Smolley recapped the next steps listed for DRA to take from the April 6, 2022 Special Meeting. Gregory Smolley stated they were still working to touch base with Chief Daley but that they received agreement from central administration on grade configuration for pre-k to fifth grade and sixth to eighth grade. Gregory Smolley stated they are awaiting to hear if pre-k and kindergarten will be full day and district-wide, but are planning ahead as if that will be the case. Gregory Smolley stated DRA considered many of the elementary schools but focused their study on three of them. Gregory Smolley stated the committee would need to decide which of the presented program guidelines they would like DRA to pursue (OSCG&R, MSBA or Other) and agree on a site plan once the test fits had been reviewed.

Gregory Smolley explained that DRA took three approaches to their study predicated upon curricular and pedagogical needs:

- the Office of School Construction Grants and Review, which would maximize the district's reimbursement;
- the Massachusetts Schools Building Authority, to serve as a check and balance;
- and a Working Program developed by DRA, which accounted for the education curriculum and pedagogies.

Gregory Smolley explained the comparison values for the study. Gregory Smolley explained the OSCG&R approach can be somewhat prescriptive in areas and is very tight with programming allowances. Gregory Smolley stated the MSBA programming was less prescriptive but still established, with reasonable programming allowances. Gregory Smolley stated the Working Program developed by DRA was established through educational programming with the district leadership and uses the OSCG&R guidelines as a basis. Gregory Smolley stated the working program fell between the OSCG&R guidelines and MSBA approach. Gregory Smolley stated the working plan would provide a starting point for developing a building program for the city's Master Plan.

Gregory Smolley explained that DRA established comparative programming for seven schools with 300 students each, four schools of 525 students each and three schools of 700 students each. Gregory Smolley discussed the breakdown of square footage allotted per area type based on the three different sets of student enrollment numbers. Gregory Smolley further detailed the types and sizes of classrooms accounted for in the working model compared to the OSCG&R compliant and MSBA comparative numbers, for the three different programming approaches.

Gregory Smolley continued onto the test fits which compared the OSCG&R compliant and working program to the existing spaces. Gregory Smolley explained that the goal of the test fits was to identify the programmed spaces that are not accommodated for and to provide a basis for the discussion of the potential of each of the buildings.

Gregory Smolley discussed the test fit values and how they applied to each school within the study, for each of the three programming approaches. Gregory Smolley went through the program assessment for each approach based on the three programming options.

Gregory Smolley listed the observations made by DRA on the 300 student test fits as none of the schools have the adequate classroom space as currently configured, only two of the schools have adequate cafeteria space and only one had a properly sized gymnasium.

Gregory Smolley reported that DRA noted for the 525 student test fit model, compliance with the OSCG&R guidelines would be difficult and none of the buildings have spaces required for the working program.

Gregory Smolley noted that the 700 student test fit showed that none of the buildings have spaces as required for the OSCG&R program nor the working program. Gregory Smolley noted that state funding would look at how close the proposed buildings are to the stated guidelines.

Gregory Smolley stated that DRA next took the OSCG&R guidelines and compared them to the existing buildings and sites; specifically Moriarty, Uncas, Veterans and Stanton Elementary Schools. Gregory Smolley added that DRA also worked to

identify wetlands, watercourses and other natural or manmade constraints that may affect the sites. Gregory Smolley went through the land and building requirements for OSCG&R and what the sites currently consisted of. Gregory Smolley discussed topography, layout, and pertaining environmental restraints of schools identified. Discussion ensued.

Gregory Smolley outlined that the next steps for DRA would be:

- connect with Chief Patrick Daley;
- confirm if pre-k and kindergarten will be full-day and district wide;
- investigate potential non-school sites;
- develop conceptual floor plans for indefinite alignments;
- and develop conceptual site plans for identified alignments

**IV. Discussion and action upon report:** President Pro Tem DeLucia asked if the three or four facility plans included building a new school. Gregory Smolley responded that the four facility program would most likely require a new school, based on data reviewed, but with the three school model it could be debated whether it is more economical to renovate a school opposed to building new. Mark Bettencourt stated he wanted to ensure the Committee fully explains options to the public.

Mark Kulos made a motion to instruct DRA to focus on studying a three and four elementary facility programming study. Gregory Carabine seconded. President Pro Tem DeLucia suggested the committee wait until receiving feedback at the Public Information Session on April 26, 2022 before pursuing any avenues. Discussion ensued. The committee discussed holding an additional special meeting in May following the information session. Mark Kulos and Gregory Carabine withdrew their motions.

**V. Planning for April 26th event:** Jim Barrett went through a proposed agenda for the April 26th Public Information Session based on a 6:30PM start time. Jim Barrett discussed the types and styles of workshops to be held. Mark Kulos asked if the city's recently completed Affordable Housing Study would assist DRA with their demographic studies. Jim Barrett stated it would and they would provide their demographer with a copy to see if it influences his observations. Peter Gauthier asked if the demographer could note if pre-k programs drive any factors other than the first year of education. Discussion ensued regarding video recording of the informational session.

**VI. Additional Agenda Items:** None.

**VII. Adjournment:** Bill Hull made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 7:45 PM. Gregory Carabine seconded. seconded. The chairman called the roll of members present and all were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

*Respectfully Submitted, Katherine Rose*