

**Winter Hill Community School  
School Building Committee Meeting Minutes  
September 29, 2025 4:30PM – Virtual Via Zoom**

**1. Call to Order 4:33**

- The meeting was called to order. The roll call confirmed 12 members present.
- Members Present were:
  - 
  - *Ruben Carmona,*
  - *Courtney Gosselin,*
  - *Kathleen Seward,*
  - *Edward Bean*
  - *Jesse Clingan,*
  - Christopher Ames,
  - Courtney Koslow,
  - *Emily Grandstaff-Rice,*
  - *Daniel Grayton,*
  - *Richard Heidebrecht,*
  - *Suraj Rajbanshi*

**2. Approval of Minutes**

- Minutes from the August 18, 2025 meeting were presented for approval.
- **Corrections:**
  - Spelling of *Jesse Clingan* last name was corrected
- A **motion** to approve the corrected minutes was made by Courtney Koslow and seconded by Daniel Grayton and seconded. **Vote: For:** *Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Edward Bean, Jesse Clingan, Christopher Ames, Courtney Koslow, Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Daniel Grayton, Richard Heidebrecht, Suraj Rajbanshi* **Against :** None **Abstain:** *Kathleen Seward,*

**Carried:** 11-0-1

**3. Old Business:**

**MSBA and Construction Advisory Group (CAG) Progress and Schedule Update**

- Khin provided the CAG update. The Winter Hill survey closed with over 2,000 responses, one of the largest the city has received. Survey results and community feedback will be presented at the next CAG meeting. This data will be used in their deliberations. A community communication team is also organizing focus groups, which are scheduled to take place during the first half of October. The CAG is expected to deliver concrete recommendation to the committee by its November meeting, though this timeline could be extended if they determine more deliberation is needed.
- Courtney Koslow asked if the cost information shared at the CAG could be shared with the committee. Emily stated that the request could be made, but cautioned that it is important to understand with the cost is coming from and worries about attaching a cost to the project prior to performing the feasibility study. PMA agreed and questioned what project that cost the CGA is looking is estimating.

## Designer Selection

- The DSP took place last Thursday, September 25. The Selected designer was Perkins Eastman. PMA reminded the committee of the MSBA process. We will investigate many option in the PDP phase, pare down those options. The remaining options will be further investigated, and one option will be chosen at the end of PSR.
- At the DSP, the three first that were shortlisted at the September 9 meeting, Perkins Eastman, William Rawn and MDS/Sasaki. Perkin Eastman was selected as the designer.
- Emily noted that the Committee was well represented at the DSP by Rich, Ruben and Courtney K.
- Reuben was impressed with the way all the firms walked the committee through both their idea process and found their design to be quite impressive. He was really impressed with the firms' deep understanding of two key areas: The needs of the student population and The community in which the school is going to be built. The presentations made him excited about what's coming next for this community. He felt the firms helped him visualize the potential changes that we can introduce to the community and dreamed about what's possible for this next site. He stated that it was really exciting process and that the committee ended up with a great choice, calling the outcome a win-win for all of us.
- In Courtney mind, William Rawn was a close runner up. Their presentation was filled with personal touches, showing they had listened. Their presentation included pictures of Winter Hill students and activities. They specifically included an image of the Mae's Garden an outdoor classroom at the school, which Courtney K. noted had a deep personal significance to her. Courtney K. also praised their plan for the community process. Perkins Eastman Courtney K. called their team fantastic and was particularly impressed that they assembled experts for every facet of the project, including sustainability, security, and the educational components. A key point for Courtney K. was the team's inclusion of people with a background in neurodiversity to specifically support the school's autism spectrum program and experts in universal design. The most impactful element of their presentation was a 3D flythrough concept of a potential building at 115 Sycamore. Courtney K. described this as gorgeous and said it was powerful and helped her visualize what the community deserves.
- Jesse Clingan thanked the members of the committee and started that they represented the committee very well. Jesse stated that he had brought concerns to Courtney and thanked her for having those concerns addressed.

## Project Timeline

- **Contracting:** The first step is to get the selected designer, Perkins Eastman, under contract with the city, a process expected to take 3-4 weeks. Once contracted, the design team will work with PMA to finalize the project schedule. While the team is currently comfortable with the timeline, there may be "room to improve on schedule and to accelerate.

- **MSBA Process:** The project will now move into the MSBA's feasibility study phase, which was broken down as follows. Educational Program Development: Defining the educational needs for the new school. Preliminary Design Program (PDP): This is the first major report. It involves studying all available sites and all possible options (e.g., renovation, new build, different configurations). Preferred Schematic Response (PSR): After the PDP, the committee will narrow down the options to a single preferred solution, which is then submitted to the MSBA. Schematic Design (SD): Once the MSBA approves the PSR, the team moves into Schematic Design, which creates a detailed design and a fully vetted budget. This budget is what the MSBA board will vote on.
- **Funding and Vote Discussion** The committee discusses the timeline for project approval and funding. MSBA Vote: The current schedule targets MSBA board approval for the final project budget in Spring 2027. City Funding: After that approval, the MSBA gives the city a 120-day window to secure its portion of the funding. City-Wide Vote: It is noted that this will require a city-wide vote. The committee discusses the timing, noting the difference between holding a special election or waiting for the regular November election, which could cause a 6-7 month delay. Reuben requests that for the next meeting, the team provide a visual timeline (like a bar chart) to help the committee and the public understand the different phases and their durations.
- Jesse asks if existing feasibility studies from the high school project can be used to get a lot of this information already and speed up the process. Sean and Emily clarify that while site information can be reused, the educational programming piece is specific to this K-8 school and cannot be rushed. Emily notes that the educational planner (MLP) who worked on the city's master plan is also part of the Perkins Eastman team, which will bring valuable "embedded knowledge" to the process.

## 6. Public Comment

- No public comments were received.

## 7. Next Meeting

- **Date:** November 3, 2025 at 4:30 PM.
- **Time:** 4:30 PM
- **Location:** Virtual

## 8. Adjournment

- A **motion** to adjourn was made by Daniel Grayton and seconded by Jill Lathan.
- **Vote For:** *Ruben Carmona, Courtney Gosselin, Kathleen Seward, Edward Bean, Jesse*

*Clingan, , Christopher Ames, Courtney Koslow, Emily Grandstaff-Rice, Daniel Grayton, Richard Heidebrecht, Suraj Rajbanshi, Jill Lathan* **Against:** None **Abstain:** None **Carried**  
: 13-0-0

**Minutes by:**

Sean Burke

PMA Consultants

5:14PM