

WESTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BUILDING PROJECT COMMITTEE
Westwood, Massachusetts

MEETING MINUTES

May 29, 2020

Attendance and Call to Order

The meeting, held remotely¹, was called to order at 8:03am by Chair Maya Plotkin. Also present on the video conference were: Ken Aries, Brian Bayer, Allison Borchers, Christopher Coleman, Sarah Cronin, John Cummings, Charles Donahue, Pam Dukeman, Abby Hanscom, Nancy Hyde, Lemma Jn-baptiste, Josepha Jowdy, Carol Lewis, Michelle Miller, Anthony Mullin, Emily Parks, and Kate Scales. Mr. Coleman arrived at 8:06am. Mrs. Cronin left the meeting at 9:15am; Mr. Mullin left the meeting at 9:30am; Mrs. Jn-baptiste left the meeting at 9:35am; Mrs. Lewis left the meeting at 9:58am. John Cianciarulo recorded the minutes.

Mrs. Plotkin recognized the live stream of the meeting which was provided for real-time, public access to the activities of the School Building Committee. Members of the public were able to view a live stream of the meeting via the Internet at www.westwood.k12.ma.us/live. Westwood Media Center recorded the meeting for later broadcast on their platforms.

Chair's Report

Mrs. Plotkin updated the Committee on the project/process to date. She stated that the purpose of today's meeting was to present the recommended option to the full Committee today for consideration. The Evaluation Subcommittee has met six times since January, for a total of approximately twelve hours. There is no vote today.

At the meeting on June 12, sustainability options will be discussed. That subcommittee is meeting next week to explore options in-depth.

The focus of the June 19 School Building Committee meeting will be on cost, including a not-to-exceed number and a vote on the final, recommended option and submission of the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA).

Assuming an affirmative vote, the PSR will be submitted to the MSBA in early July. Approval is anticipated in August.

The Committee's work will then move into the schematic design phase for the project option.

Discussion Items

Update to Building Project PDP Submission

Mrs. Plotkin reminded the Committee that the Preliminary Design Proposal (PDP) was submitted to the MSBA in the winter. One section of the proposal included a total number of classroom sections per grade-level. As part of the PSR process, this has been further examined. After reviewing the enrollment data, it has been decided to reduce the number of classrooms in two of the populations.

The number of classrooms for the enrollment scenario of 315 remains the same. For 560 students, instead of five sections, it has been revised to four sections per grade. For 685 students, it has been revised from six sections to five per grade-level. The District is comfortable with these revised numbers as they align with all data from the MSBA and the School Committee's class size guidelines. The design plans and the PSR reflect these revisions.

¹ Remote meeting held in accordance with Executive Order of Massachusetts Governor, March 12, 2020.

Originally, with extra sections in two design scenarios, the funding would be an addition request of the MSBA. It would not be known until later, then, whether or not they would agree as it would have been an “ask.” As the number of sections is now in-line with the MSBA, it is believed that they will all be reimbursed.

Presentation of Evaluation Criteria for Short-List Options and Recommended Option

Mrs. Plotkin recognized Ms. Parks and Rob Fitzgerald of Dore and Whittier, who presented on the evaluation criteria for short-list options and the recommended option.

Options Overview

The Feasibility Study looked at three scenarios:

- Hanlon only (315 students)
 - Renovation
 - Add/renovation
 - New
- Hanlon and Deerfield (560 students)
 - Add/renovation
 - New
- Hanlon and Sheehan (685 students)
 - Add/renovation
 - New

There were fifteen initial design options, which was reduced to a short-list of seven:

- Option 1 (Hanlon renovation, 315 students)
- Option 4 (Addition/renovation at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students; informally known as the “linear” design)
- Option 6 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon only, 315 students; informally known as the “hammer tacker” design)
- Option 7 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Deerfield, 560 students; informally known as the “tree” design)
- Option 10 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Deerfield, 560 students; informally known as the “E” design)
- Option 11 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students; informally known as the “tree” design)
- Option 15 (New construction at Sheehan of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students; informally known as the “butterfly” design)

Dore and Whittier has been slightly revising plans to re-orient the building on the property to take advantage of space for educational programming and playing fields.

Evaluation Matrix

The Preliminary Design Proposal phase evaluation matrix had six categories with six evaluation criteria. The Preferred Schematic Report phase evaluation matrix had five major categories with fourteen evaluation criteria:

- Education
 - Educational Guidelines
 - Guiding questions:
 - How well does the option support and align with the building-based Guiding Principles for Design in the District’s Educational Program narrative?
 - How well does the building support community and collegiality among students and staff?
 - How well does the alternative “retain the small school” feel?
 - All of the new options received the most number of points, with either “4” or “5.” The two highest were those with the “tree” design.
 - Met criteria being sought:
 - Classrooms grouped in proximity
 - Small neighborhoods of classrooms
 - Adjacencies to extended learning areas, breakout spaces
 - Space for adult collaboration
 - Instructional spaces with access to daylight and use of outdoors
 - Differences between the “tree” and “E” designs were analyzed
 - Elementary principals spent time looking at this
 - Unanimous preference was “tree” design:
 - Preferred arrangement of grade-level neighborhoods
 - Location of library / media center and connectivity
 - Separation of public/private spaces
 - Location of gymnasium
 - “E” design received “4” points; “Tree” received “5” points
 - The add/reno received “3” points; renovation received “1”

Mr. Bayer asked for confirmation on the enrollment scenarios in regards to total number of classrooms. The total enrollment has not changed, just the number of classrooms. Ms. Parks confirmed that these are within both the Westwood School Committee and MSBA class size guidelines.

Mr. Coleman asked if there was a difference in anticipated construction costs between the “E” and “tree” design. Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that the subtleties are slight and the designs have minimal impact on cost. Mr. Coleman recommended highlighting this fact.

Mr. Mullin clarified that, at opening, the District does not anticipate a full capacity of 560 students. That is the MSBA’s calculation of a peak enrollment in a ten-year projection.

- Growth and Future
 - Guiding Question:
 - How well does the building organization support the potential for future growth, building expansion, and /or changes in student needs and educational delivery models over the life of the building (70+ years)?
 - Clear that the Hanlon site affords more availability for future expansion due to the size of the site
 - Designs afford more flexibility to adapt and respond to changes in educational delivery
 - New options had Hanlon site were ranked “5”
 - Add/reno does offer the same design within the building; received a “4”
 - New design at Sheehan meet the educational needs, but site itself is very tight and would be difficult for future expansion
 - Renovation-only does not address flexibility for educational delivery and was ranked “3.”
- Outdoor Learning and Connection to Nature
 - Guiding Question:

- How well does the building support outdoor learning opportunities and a strong connection to nature?
 - All of the new designs at the Hanlon site were ranked “5”
 - Connection to nature was a strong theme that came through during the visioning process
 - Through the design, the idea of the “school in the woods” concept has come together
 - The new option at Sheehan received a “4” as it includes outdoor learning spaces. The lower score reflects the fact that the site itself does not afford the same opportunities as at Hanlon
 - Without the opportunity to move the building, the renovation and addition/renovation options were ranked lower
 - Impact to Other Schools
 - Guiding Questions:
 - How does the design enrollment impact the size of the remaining schools?
 - How well does the project address equitable class size?
 - How well does the project address educational delivery vis-à-vis class size?
 - Two Hanlon-only options were ranked the lowest as it impacts the fewest number of students in the District and does not address other needs
 - The highest ranked options were those that consolidated the two smallest schools, Deerfield and Hanlon. This addresses some current challenges:
 - Creating equitable class sizes
 - Staffing schools efficiently
 - Remaining school (Sheehan) is a reasonably sized school
 - Consolidation to 685 students addresses challenges at Hanlon, but retains Deerfield, the smallest school in the District. It also creates disproportion: one school of 685 at one end; and one school of 200 at the other
- Site
 - Circulation and Parking
 - Guiding Question:
 - Proximity of parking to main entrance
 - Whether site supports appropriate number of parking spaces
 - Safe, clear, and easily understood circulation routes
 - Separation of bus, car, and pedestrians
 - Adequate queuing space for buses
 - Safe access into and out of site
 - New options at Hanlon were ranked highest; size and location of site supports and meets this criteria
 - Addition/renovation at Hanlon does not strategically situate the building, but is able to address existing parking challenges. In this design, bus queue abuts the road, which is seen as a significant disadvantage
 - New options at Sheehan were ranked “2.” There is ample parking with separate bus and car area. The bus queue is not large enough, though, due to the location on the site.
 - The renovation-only design retains the existing challenges and concerns
 - Access to Fields and Site Fit
 - Guiding Question:
 - Access to playfields/playground and outdoor learning
 - Scale of building to site: Does the building size proportionate to the site it sits on?
 - All options at Hanlon site scored higher than those at Sheehan
 - New options at Hanlon scored highest, in the “5s”

- Playfields closer to the roads with closer parking
 - Playground closer to cafeteria for recess
 - Outdoor learning close to classroom wings
 - Addition/renovation scored slightly lower
 - Unable to situate fields in front of the building, close to the road
 - New building at Sheehan site
 - Concerns on size of building; not proportionate to size of the site
 - Long distance between parking location and playing fields
- Town Impact
 - Redistricting
 - Guiding Questions:
 - To what degree does the project retain neighborhood communities?
 - What are the redistricting impacts on busing, considering travel time, number of students impacted?
 - How well does the project meet building utilization goals?

Ms. Parks reminded the School Building Committee that the School Committee had its redistrict analyst present at a recent meeting and an entire community forum was held in late April that was dedicated to redistricting.

She shared the analyst's recommendation on how the District would implement a consolidation under different scenarios, showing the existing maps alongside the proposed maps.

- Consolidating Hanlon and Deerfield with 560 students at Hanlon site
 - Relatively simple, combining the Hanlon and Deerfield zones (i.e., eliminating the border line between the two)
 - Other three districts would not be impacted
 - High percentage of Deerfield students are bus riders; this would continue, but would have to travel further down Gay Street
 - Some families close to Deerfield would need to be bused to the new Hanlon
- Consolidating Hanlon and Sheehan with 685 students at Hanlon site
 - Complicated process that removes the Sheehan zone
 - A large number of students would need to get to the Hanlon, which would impact all of the zones, other than Downey
 - This would impact over 400 students by redrawing the lines
 - Significant disruption
 - More complicated impacts on transportation
- Consolidating Hanlon and Sheehan with 685 students at Sheehan has two options
 - Option 1
 - Even more complex than at Hanlon site
 - Downey School would be isolated from the other three
 - All zones impacted, except Downey
 - New Sheehan zone is a large geographic area
 - Option 2
 - Not much of an improvement over Option 1
- Recommendation:
 - Deerfield and Hanlon site for 560 students
 - Impacts smallest number of students/families
 - Least impact to current traffic patterns
 - Resulting elementary school district boundaries are reasonable for:
 - Student population density (where students are concentrated throughout)
 - Geographic layout (using major roads/physical landmarks to set boundaries)
 - Greatest potential for student walkers across the District

- Maintains existing neighborhoods
 - Creates favorable utilization rate across schools
 - The matrix reflect this recommendation. Hanlon/Deerfield consolidation options were ranked “5;” Hanlon-only options were ranked “4” as there is no impact, but would not need the building utilization goals as it is inefficient
 - The 685 design enrollment designs were ranked lower
 - Town Impact
 - Traffic
 - Guiding Question:
 - What is the impact of the traffic on the neighborhood and town?
 - Walkability?
 - What is the impact on overall net increase in cars vs. walkers?
 - Traffic studies took place
 - Hanlon-only scored higher as the question is framed in terms of impact
 - For 560 design enrollments at Hanlon, there would be some impact, but it would not be significant
 - In other options, moving a much larger number of students across town
 - The renovation-only ranking of “2” reflects traffic backing up onto Gay Street

Ms. Parks introduced Mrs. Plotkin, who continued the presentation.

- Community Use
 - Guiding Question:
 - To what extent does the alternative provide benefits to the community, such as sports fields, community space, and gym space?
 - New builds on Hanlon site were all ranked “5” as it will allow for an additional field
 - All new builds have a new gym, easily separate public/private space to host community events, elections, etc., without disturbing educational programming
 - The addition/renovation received a “4.” The proximity to parking for the fields is inconvenient
 - Those at Sheehan only allow for one little league field and one soccer fields. The remaining fields would need to be relocated.
 - Security/Sustainability/Construction Impact
 - Security
 - Guiding Question:
 - How well does the building support a clear separation of public and private spaces?
 - How well does it support a controlled and limited public area for after-hours use?
 - How well does the front door and administration support a direct sightline to parking and the site entry?
 - Designs incorporate best practices
 - Addition/renovation was ranked “4” as there would be some limitations with an existing building
 - Renovation-only would not include any new security features
 - As part of the design, a security consultant and the Westwood Police will have input on safety and security features
 - Sustainability
 - Fairly similar to security rankings
 - Purposeful designs for sustainable options aligned with Town goals
 - New builds were ranked “5”
 - Addition/renovation ranked “4” as it would include some components, but there would likely be limitations
 - Existing ranked “1” as there are no sustainable initiatives in the building

- Logistics and Construction Impact
 - In the PDP section of this category, nothing was ranked “5,” continues in this phase
 - New builds are ranked “4” as students could stay in existing building without interruption; no phasing necessary
 - Large Hanlon site has adequate access and staging areas
 - Add/renovation at Hanlon was ranked “2” as there would be phases of construction, moving students throughout the project
 - New building at Sheehan also ranked “2” as there would not be phases of construction; however, site is tight, so access and staging would impact students and teachers at existing building.
 - Existing Hanlon renovation is ranked “1” as students would have to move to temporary classrooms during construction
- Cost
 - Overall Cost
 - During PSR phase, updated cost estimates were provided. These have been refined and updated as a lot more information about the sites and the design have been refined in the PDP phase.
 - Scores purely looked at just how much the project costs.

Mrs. Plotkin showed updated cost estimates. She stated that a lot more information about the Hanlon site itself is now known with respect to existing ledge. The costs may look higher than the PSR phase, taking into account the increased site work.

In order to receive two additional reimbursement points from the MSBA, the project must be 20% above the energy code. New energy code requirements include more components in the baseline to get to that 20%. What were optional components in the original sustainability designs have now been incorporated into baseline costs.

The costs are for relative purposes only and should not be viewed as definitive. The MSBA asks for a “not to exceed” number which will be submitted as part of the PSR. This will be discussed in meetings next month.

- Net Cost to Town for all Three Schools
 - Weighted the highest
 - The net, capital cost to address all three schools is important
 - Looked at impact of consolidation on the budget
 - Hanlon/Sheehan consolidations scored higher as this includes a bigger school
 - Hanlon/Deerfield consolidations were scored slightly lower
 - The highest cost projects receive the most reimbursement from the MSBA
 - Options 4, 11, and 15 were scored higher
 - Impact to Town on giving school back was worth noting in these numbers
 - Only category using half-points as there are implications for the Town in taking over a building
 - New Hanlon and addition/renovation only solves for one school; capital needs are not addressed as widely

Mrs. Hyde asked Mr. Coleman and Mrs. Dukeman whether the 0.5 reduction resonated with them on appropriately capturing the related costs in turning over a school to the Town. Mrs. Dukeman and Mr. Coleman agreed that this provides acknowledgment.

Mr. Donahue asked about costs on operating existing schools (i.e., capital needs with roofs). Mrs. Plotkin stated that these are all relative to each other. Ms. Parks stated that there is a significant savings in cost-avoidance by consolidation. It takes older buildings that have capital needs offline. This avoids investments in HVAC and roof repairs.

Mr. Bayer asked if the Town has acknowledged whether they want the building and whether this captures demolition costs.

Mrs. Hyde indicated that, as part of the process, a Committee will be put together to assess the vacated school building. The District would need to determine whether the vacated building could be used as a swing space. If it is not needed, or known when it is not needed, the process of having the School Committee vote to turn it over to the Town and the Town taking responsibility over it would take place. This would be similar to the process done with the Colburn School which was ultimately renovated, and redeveloped into housing and retail by a third-party developer.

The Town would have a committee with appropriate representation to make determinations. Hypothetically, if Deerfield were to be turned over to the Town, the building would need some investment to be utilized. The MSBA requires that a plan be in place to address the vacated building. This is reflected in the evaluation ranking.

Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that the costs reflect the demolition of the building on the affected size.

- Busing and Operational Costs
 - Reviewed overall transportation and operating cost impact to the District (opposed to capital costs)
 - Comparative examination
 - New builds at Hanlon were ranked “5” as they had the least impact on busing costs
 - Relatively small additional number of children on buses and then making the buses drive a little further down Gay Street
 - Increase to busing costs is the least adverse
 - Remove two schools offline and operating one new school; efficiencies realized in operating and staffing
 - Add/renovation and Sheehan consolidations ranked lower

Mrs. Plotkin shared the final PSR phase evaluation matrix totals.

- Option 1 (Hanlon renovation, 315 students), total is 183
- Option 4 (Addition/renovation at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students; informally known as the “linear” design), total is 323
- Option 6 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon only, 315 students; informally known as the “hammer tacker” design) total is 370
- Option 7 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Deerfield, 560 students; informally known as the “tree” design), total is 458
- Option 10 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Deerfield, 560 students; informally known as the “E” design), total is 443
- Option 11 (New construction at Hanlon site of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students), total is 403
- Option 15 (New construction at Sheehan of Hanlon and Sheehan, 685 students), total is 315

Recommended option: Option 7, which is new construction, a Hanlon/Deerfield consolidation of 560 students at the Hanlon site, informally known as the “tree.”

What would happen to the Sheehan School?

- June 2020: The School Committee has previously allocated funds to commission a design study of the remaining school, to be completed by Spring 2021. This study will commence as soon as the School Building Committee approves a final option.
- Spring 2021: Using the results of the design study, the School Committee will recommend either an addition/renovation to Sheehan or construction of a new building. The School Committee will then ask the Town to fund the next phase of design, from schematic design to bidding the project for construction.
- Spring 2022: Assuming the Town approves funds for a full design, the School Committee will ask the Town to fund construction of the Sheehan project.

- Fall 2023: Assuming the Town approves the funds for construction, construction of the Sheehan project will be complete and the school will be ready for occupancy.

Mrs. Hyde expressed concern on the aggressive timeline. Don Walter of Dore and Whittier responded that a new building could be constructed and occupied sooner; an addition/renovation would take longer. Mrs. Hyde recommended a qualifier, indicating a longer timespan to account for this. Mrs. Plotkin agreed and stated that she would revise.

Mr. Bayer was concerned about the level of simultaneous construction projects taking place at the same time.

Mrs. Dukeman asked about submitting a Statement of Interest for an additional project to the MSBA. Mrs. Plotkin said that this was unlikely prior to the pandemic; and since that time, sales tax revenue, which funds the MSBA, has significantly decreased. Therefore, the likelihood of a second project is small.

Mr. Bonfatti agreed with Mrs. Plotkin. He stated that while applying for a second project is not forbidden, (i.e., the given practice of only allowing one active project at a time is not set). However, with relatively smaller communities, that is practice. Working with the MSBA would also extend the timeline by approximately two years.

Mr. Coleman cautioned on the impact of two large projects at same time. The capacity for inspectional services needs to be factored, in addition to other Town projects (e.g., potential new Fire Station 1). The Permanent Building Committee would also have a capacity issue, too. Mrs. Plotkin stated that this would need to be factored into the study.

Mr. Donahue responded that the Town should be strategic in getting approval. Five years ago, the discussion started by looking at competing towns. The Town has been lucky to have a new fire station, police station, library, and high school. He further stated that the physical elementary school buildings are at the back of the pack in the school districts with which Westwood competes. He feels that it is important to document this and present to the Town. Mr. Donahue is hopeful that, in the process of all of their work, Dore and Whittier would have access to data that could be used to document where Westwood's elementary school buildings stand in age with competing communities.

What would happen to Deerfield?

- If the School Committee recommends new construction for Sheehan, then the District would likely return control of Deerfield back to the Town.
- If the School Committee recommends an addition/renovation to Sheehan, then the District will likely retain Deerfield to serve as temporary classroom/swing space while Sheehan is being renovated. When the swing space is no longer needed, control of Deerfield will revert to the Town.
- The Select Board has discussed creating a committee to examine the potential town uses for the vacated school, if/when control reverts to the Town. This will take place in June.

Next Steps

- June 4: Community Forum: Review options with cost
- June 11: School Committee: Enrollment/redistricting vote
- June 12: School Building Committee: Sustainability decisions
- June 19: School Building Committee: Preferred Option and PSR vote

Mr. Bayer sought clarification on the next Town vote, asking if it was for architectural services. Mrs. Plotkin responded that funding is already secured for schematic design. The next request will be in Spring 2021 for full funding for the remainder of the project, including construction.

Action Items

Approval of April 17, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mrs. Hyde made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 17, 2020. Mr. Aries seconded.

Roll-Call Vote:

Mrs. Plotkin	Aye
Mr. Aries	Aye
Mr. Bayer	Aye
Ms. Borchers	Aye
Mr. Coleman	Aye
Mr. Cummings	Aye
Mr. Donahue	Aye
Mrs. Dukeman	Aye
Mrs. Hanscom	Aye
Mrs. Hyde	Aye
Mrs. Jowdy	Aye
Mrs. Lewis	Aye
Mrs. Miller	Aye
Ms. Parks	Aye
Ms. Scales	Aye

Vote: 15-0-0.

Result: Approved (Unanimous)

Acceptance of Evaluation Subcommittee March 31, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mrs. Jowdy made a motion to accept the Evaluation Subcommittee meeting minutes of March 31, 2020. Mr. Cummings seconded.

Roll-Call Vote:

Mrs. Plotkin	Aye
Mr. Aries	Aye
Mr. Bayer	Aye
Ms. Borchers	Aye
Mr. Coleman	Aye
Mr. Cummings	Aye
Mr. Donahue	Aye
Mrs. Dukeman	Aye
Mrs. Hanscom	Aye
Mrs. Hyde	Aye
Mrs. Jowdy	Aye
Mrs. Lewis	Aye
Mrs. Miller	Aye
Ms. Parks	Aye
Ms. Scales	Aye

Vote: 15-0-0.

Result: Approved (Unanimous)

Acceptance of Sustainability Subcommittee April 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mrs. Hyde made a motion to accept the Sustainability Subcommittee meeting minutes of April 23, 2020. Mr. Cummings seconded.

Roll-Call Vote:

Mrs. Plotkin	Aye
Mr. Aries	Aye
Mr. Bayer	Aye
Ms. Borchers	Aye
Mr. Coleman	Aye
Mr. Cummings	Aye
Mr. Donahue	Aye

Mrs. Dukeman	Aye
Mrs. Hanscom	Aye
Mrs. Hyde	Aye
Mrs. Jowdy	Aye
Mrs. Lewis	Aye
Mrs. Miller	Aye
Ms. Parks	Aye
Ms. Scales	Aye

Vote: 15-0-0.

Result: Approved (Unanimous)

Approval of Invoices

Mrs. Jowdy moved to approve invoices for the period ending April 30, 2020, totaling \$78,961.25, as recommended by Compass. Mr. Aries seconded.

Roll-Call Vote:

Mrs. Plotkin	Aye
Mr. Aries	Aye
Mr. Bayer	Aye
Ms. Borchers	Aye
Mr. Coleman	Aye
Mr. Cummings	Aye
Mr. Donahue	Aye
Mrs. Dukeman	Aye
Mrs. Hanscom	Aye
Mrs. Hyde	Aye
Mrs. Jowdy	Aye
Mrs. Lewis	Aye
Mrs. Miller	Aye
Ms. Parks	Aye

Ms. Scales	Aye
------------	-----

Vote: 15-0-0.

Result: Approved (Unanimous)

New Business

Mrs. Plotkin thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She stated that the project is an ongoing conversation and that if anyone has any questions to contact her.

Adjournment

Mrs. Hyde motioned to adjourn. Mr. Cummings seconded.

Roll-Call Vote:

Mrs. Plotkin	Aye
Mr. Aries	Aye
Mr. Bayer	Aye
Ms. Borchers	Aye
Mr. Coleman	Aye
Mr. Cummings	Aye
Mr. Donahue	Aye
Mrs. Dukeman	Aye
Mrs. Hanscom	Aye
Mrs. Hyde	Aye
Mrs. Jowdy	Aye
Mrs. Miller	Aye
Ms. Parks	Aye
Ms. Scales	Aye

Vote: 14-0-0.

Result: Approved (Unanimous)

The meeting adjourned at 10:00am.

List of Documents and Exhibits Used at Meeting:

- Evaluation criteria matrices, date April 7, 2020
- Evaluation Criteria Subcommittee meeting minutes of February 6, 2020
- Monthly Vendor Invoice Package for financial period ending March 31, 2020
- Meeting Minutes of March 20, 2020
- Presentation on Sustainable design and updated options slideshow by Dore and Whittier, dated April 17, 2020