

**OLD COLONY REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**476 North Avenue  
Rochester, MA 02770**

**Monday  
November 18, 2024**

**SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Present:** Mrs. Maureen Townsend, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Neil Regis, Mrs. Debbie Quin, Mr. Robert Gomes, Mrs. Shirley Bourque, Mr. Scott Weigel, Mr. Eldaro Amaral, Mr. David Wojnar, Mr. Christopher Plonka, Mr. David Hughes, Mr. Brian Day, Mr. Robert Marshall, Mr. Michael Lorenzo, Mr. Aaron Polansky, Superintendent-Director; Mr. Gary Linehan, Principal; Mrs. Sarah Griffith, Business Manager; Mr. Robert Souza, Facilities Director

**Absent:** Mr. Stephen Lombard, Mrs. Elizabeth Sulger, Mr. Robert Field

**Also:** PMA Consultants: Mr. Chad Crittenden, Mr. Walter Hartley Jr., Mr. Mark Adrean  
HMFH Architects: Mr. Bobby Williams, Ms. Suni Dillard, Ms. Tina Stanislaski

**Mrs. Bourque called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.**

**All in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance and moment of silence.**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Hughes and seconded by Mr. Day, it was Voted: To approve the October 21, 2024 School Building Committee minutes**

**12 – Yes  
2 – Abstain (C. Plonka, R. Marshall)  
3 – Absent (S. Lombard, E. Sulger, R. Field)**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Mr. Hughes and seconded by Mr. Day, it was unanimously Voted: To approve outstanding invoices.**

**14 – Yes  
3 – Absent (S. Lombard, E. Sulger, R. Field)**

**Mr. Hartley provided an overview of the meeting agenda: Continuing feasibility study part II, PSR, to be submitted in December.**

**Mr. Williams provided a review of HMFH workplan, on schedule, more developed floorplans and site plans at this point, will walk the SBC through those updates as well as traffic circulation on the site. Enrollment update will be provided with a deeper look at operational cost for 728 vs 776 enrollment scenarios. Lastly will be a vote on the Preferred solution and enrollment to be further developed.**

**Mr. Wojnar was seeking clarification on field scope. Thinks that the athletic component of project is worth having a discussion on. Having an appropriate training facility and weight room should be considered.**

**Mr. Wojnar stated this could also be just as much a selling point as a detriment.**

**Ms. Dillard reviewed site layout, utility easement, orientation to North Ave. Footprint of proposed new construction design reviewed, has not changed much since last review, some of the parking has been reconfigured for convenience to athletic fields. Orientation of work yards, courtyard and main entry reviewed, bus parking area reviewed, site circulation reviewed. Parent drop off loop vs proposed bus drop off loop reviewed. Location of construction mock house reviewed. Proximity to vernal pools reviewed. Separation of bus and vehicle traffic is the goal, potential to use drop off at side of gym. Orange lines indicate service routes to access vocational shops.**

**Ms. Dillard explained separation between existing building and proposed new.**

**Mr. Hughes asked if stormwater retention is shown.**

**Ms. Dillard stated yes diagrammatically, but some of what is shown on the plan is the existing vernal pools.**

**Mr. Day asked if bus lot captures busing needs for the proposed solution.**

**Ms. Dillard stated it does.**

**Mr. Day asked if there is a benefit to having parking closer versus on the other side of the easement.**

**Ms. Dillard noted the biggest benefit is less tree clearing and closer proximity to building. Currently targeting 460 parking spaces.**

**Mr. Hughes asked if there is a well location proposed if the new water main does not get installed.**

**Ms. Dillard stated not yet, but would be able to locate on the site if there were an issue.**

**Mr. Marshall asked if a site well is needed, would the well need to be drilled first before any plan moves forward.**

**Ms. Dillard stated yes, most likely as the proposed new building is within the buffer zone of the existing well.**

**Mr. Marshall asked what the “Dine” space tag indicates on the site plans.**

**HMFH noted this would be an outdoor dining area.**

**Mr. Linehan asked if consideration has been made regarding the turn radius for delivery vehicles.**

**Ms. Dillard noted currently running models with a 55’ turning radius but still very conceptual on design and this could shift around.**

**Mr. Linehan stated that Carpentry should be located closer to the mock house because they use it more than any of the other programs.**

**Mr. Linehan asked if any of the programs move, would it change the scissor design.**

**Ms. Stanislaski noted there are opportunities to shift and that all options are still on the table and floorplans really do not start to get locked down until Schematic Design.**

**Ms. Dillard reviewed floorplans, main entry location, central office location, proximity to special services. All captured within a central plaza, admin, guidance, special education, etc. Hub of school will have cafeteria, gymnasium. Big open windows to allow natural light into spaces.**

**Mr. Linehan asked about music, art and media center and if they can be consolidated.**

**Ms. Dillard and Ms. Stanislaski noted yes this is an option.**

**Mr. Linehan would also like to see the science labs on the same floor to create a science wing.**

**There was a question about administration versus central office.**

- **Central office is the business office where the superintendent would be located.**
- **Administration is the school’s front desk / reception team.**

**Mr. Williams noted when walking into the space it is very open to showcase the programs and create visibility to highlight the importance of these spaces within the school.**

**Mr. Marshall thinks that central office and nurse may benefit from exchanging locations.**

**Mr. Polansky noted this was discussed earlier and that is the plan.**

**Mr. Polansky noted may be worth considering extending gym and expanding weightroom, use of this space is a very common request from member towns and currently unable to accommodate member towns at all times. Understand the MSBA caps but this space but still may be worth reviewing. Would also be open to consideration of an elevated walking track above the gym, even if not a regulation track.**

**Mr. Wojnar noted athletic teams have supporters in the Old Colony community and may be able to assist with fundraising effort.**

**Ms. Stanislaski noted the proposed gym is 12K SF, alt PE of 2K SF and weightroom of 1800SF. The gym can handle two full-size cross courts and one competition court with bleachers fully extended. Mr. Williams noted can exchange SF between these spaces if desired.**

**Mr. Day inquired how many seats in Auditorium.**

**HMFH responded currently designing for 2/3 of enrollment.**

**Mr. Day noted Apponequet auditorium seats 506 and gym can fit 1040 people. Auditorium to 750 is an option but the additional space would be ineligible for reimbursement.**

**Ms. Dillard provided review of add-reno scenarios. Building orientation discussed. Circulation patterns discussed. Entry sequence discussed. Service access and location of construction courtyard discussed. Parking lot to accommodate 18 buses.**

**Mr. Marshall asked if we were to go add-reno would that add a lengthy period of time to the construction process.**

**Yes, we are currently carrying a 55-month construction duration in the add-reno scenarios.**

**The CTE nature of the building requires complex phasing, a recent example of this being Somerville High School which had a construction duration of more than 66 months.**

**Mr. Hartley presented the latest concept level cost data from PM&C. Major changes include additional detail informing the new construction options for 728 and 776.**

**728 increased by \$2M and 776 resulted in a slight reduction. Both add-reno scenarios increased during this round of estimating. District share for each scenario discussed.**

**Mr. Polansky reminds eligible vs ineligible cost are an important consideration, the district share projections are based upon MSBA's known caps as of today. Some confusion around the construction \$/SF shown on the graphic, why is add/reno same construction cost per SF but more expensive overall.**

**Mr. Hartley noted the add/reno options include some space inefficiencies due to it being a slightly larger building.**

**Mr. Crittenden also noted that the construction cost per SF does not capture increased incidental cost either. Higher owner contingencies on a renovation scenario or additional moving cost being two quick examples of these incidental cost.**

**Operating cost presented by Mr. Hartley and Mrs. Griffith, \$15.6M projected in 2030 based on existing enrollment vs \$25-25.5M in 2030 for the 728/776 scenarios. Important to**

note that these figures INCLUDE debt service on a proposed project. The 776 option represents a 2.1% operational cost increase as compared to the 728 enrollment scenario.

Mr. Day noted it would be helpful to see just the operational cost delta without the debt service, would also be good to understand the annual ramp as the new building and new programs come online over a 4-year period.

Mrs. Griffith noted this data exists and is readily available, was not included in presentation to avoid unnecessary confusion and simplify the discussion, but can be provided.

Mr. Amaral asked if the additional operation cost would be partially offset by additional revenue.

Mrs. Griffith stated yes but noted projecting revenue is difficult, can use what is known now but this does have the potential to change year by year.

PMA reminds that the goal at this phase is to understand operational cost delta between 728 and 776, once we know the preferred solution the budget statement and revenue projections can be taken to the next level of detail.

Mr. Hartley turned the meeting back over to Mrs. Bourque for enrollment discussion.

Mr. Marshall asked for reminder which programs would be added in each.

Mr. Polansky noted 728 adds plumbing and HVAC, 776 adds plumbing, HVAC and dental assisting which also addresses gender inequality.

Mrs. Bourque asked if any general thoughts on 728 vs 776. She believed that the incremental cost increase to go to 776 is something that should seriously be considered, this is the one opportunity to address the community's needs.

Mr. Polansky added that it would not be 48 additional students' year 1, it would be phased in over 4 years, 12 students per year.

Mr. Marshall asked what present gender ratio is.

Mr. Polansky noted it is roughly 60/40 split.

Mrs. Quin stated as a parent it is heartbreaking that Old Colony is not able to pull in more women to these programs and believe it would be a disservice to not add dental assisting given the opportunity to do so.

Mrs. Bourque agreed there are young women out there who desire a technical education but need to see programs which attract them.

Mr. Polansky noted attracting is often the biggest challenge, once they (females) are in they might find another program they enjoy via exploratory.

**Mr. Wojnar, Mr. Day both echo that they think it would be a disservice to not include dental for equity, the incremental cost to go to 776 is small in comparison to the value added.**

**Mr. Hughes agreed and believes this is the time to make that decision.**

**Mr. Lorenzo stated increasing enrollment at OC reduces enrollment at other schools which could result in operational cuts at those schools.**

**Mr. Lorenzo completely understands for the benefit of OC, just important to understand how that decision impacts other schools.**

**Mr. Townsend noted with Carver being the only school that has its own High School in the district, this consequence of increasing enrollment at Old Colony will be felt more.**

**Mr. Townsend stated that it is not just going from 728 to 776, it would be going from 560 to 776.**

**Mr. Wojnar respects Mr. Lorenzo's perspective but counter argues that the trends are shifting towards vocational education and if this is where the demand exists then the districts have an obligation to make that education available.**

**Mr. Marshall noted last time took a straw poll on these two numbers he was strongly in favor of 728 but asked what impact do we think going to 776 would have on the project's ability to pass local funding.**

**Mr. Day asked how many students were turned away last year.**

**Mr. Polansky noted 160.**

**Mr. Day stated we are not providing the education that is desired to the community.**

**On a motion duly made by Mr. Hughes and seconded by Mr. Wojnar, it was unanimously**

**Voted: To approve the 776 enrollment with New Construction with the addition of HVAC, Plumbing and Dental Assisting as the preferred solution.**

**14 – Yes**

**3 – Absent (S. Lombard, E. Sulger, R. Field)**

**Mr. Hartley provided a cashflow update.**

**Mr. Hartley reviewed the schedule & next steps and stated we are on target for December 13<sup>th</sup> PSR submission and the vote tonight will help us get there.**

**Next School Building Committee meeting is December 9, 2024 to vote to approve PSR.**

**PDP comments received back from MSBA and team is working on response package, no issues anticipated.**

**It was determined the next meeting will be as follows:**

**School Building Committee Meeting – Monday, December 9, 2024 – 6:30 p.m.**

**Meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Mr. Chad Crittenden  
PMA Consultants**

---

**Mrs. Shirley Bourque, Chairperson**

---

**Date**