

NORTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Norton, Massachusetts

2011 JAN 26 A 11: 41

NORTON HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
January 11, 2011
Norton High School Library

Attending: Building Committee Chairman Kevin O'Neil, Mark Powers, Paul Helmreich, Michael Flaherty, High School Principal Ray Dewar, Brad Bramwell, Tom Golota, School Committee Chairman Andrew Mackie, James LaPosta (JCJ Architecture), Greg Smolley (JCJ Architecture), Margaret Wood (PCI), Deborah Marai (PCI)

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

1. Kevin O'Neil motioned to approve minutes from 11/16/2010 meeting and approve as amended minutes from 12/14/2010 meeting; motion seconded and approved.
 - 12/14/2010 meeting minutes amended as follows: page 2, bottom, proposed addition from original 1970 site drawings clarified as 100' x 226'
2. Kevin O'Neil stated that these Building Committee Meetings will be held the following upcoming Tuesdays at 6:30 p.m.: January 18 and 25th, February 8th and 15th. There will be no meeting on Tuesday February 1.
3. Kevin O'Neil introduced the project architects selected on December 21, 2011 through the Massachusetts School Building Committee (MSBA) Designer Selection process: Greg Smolley and James LaPosta of JCJ Architecture
4. In Superintendent Patricia Ansay's absence, Deborah Marai of Pink & Co. (PCI) will be taking the minutes of the meeting
5. Margaret Wood suggested that the Building Committee introduce themselves for the benefit of the new team members (JCJ), followed by an introduction by Greg and James to JCJ Architecture and a discussion of their relevant experience
6. Greg Smolley of JCJ Architecture discussed process to date.
 - There has been effective interaction between Greg & Margaret, lots of energy, JCJ recognizes the fast pace required on this project
 - **January 4, 2011 Programming Outreach Workshop:** better part of day spent with Ray Dewar and his staff
 - * Many staff understand the need to look ahead
 - * IT staff very forward thinking
 - * JCJ issued a survey that sought to get at 2 main points:
 1. How people see school
 2. What to expect in working in occupied building
 - Now starting to prepare for **Wednesday, January 19, 2011 outreach with students and community**
 - * Get High School student input during G Period

- * Go next door to get Middle School students input, too . . . expectations even before they reach High School
 - * In the evening, session for community (parents) input
 - Internal at JCJ, starting to program spaces
 - * Thinking about the 3 options required for MSBA Feasibility Study:
 1. Low end: renovate only (no build)
 2. Middle: renovation and addition
 3. High end: new building (rebuild)
 - * Focusing on middle, range of options within that (cost, scope)
 - * Need to look at schedule . . . will start to determine what we can do
7. Margaret presented calendar outlining upcoming meetings and milestones
- Prior to submission of Feasibility Study, need to accomplish:
 - * Design Options and cost estimates
 - * Required due diligence as required by MSBA
 - Reviewed schedule highlights:
 - * **Tuesday, January 4, 2011 Programming Outreach Workshop:** High School staff input
 - * **Friday, January 14, 2011 MSBA Kick-off Meeting:** at Norton, expectation setting meeting; Margaret described roles of participating MSBA staff
 - * **Friday, January 14, 2011 Meeting w/ Norton Building Officials**
 - * **Wednesday, January 19, 2011 outreach with students and community:** High School student input, Middle School student input, community/parent input (Tom Golota suggested casting net further/elementary schools . . . perhaps Town Clerk to post on website, signs outside of schools, Superintendent Ansary to send district wide alert; project team to discuss, Margaret and Greg to draft something for "Alert Now" system)
 - * **Friday, January 28, 2011:** estimates from both OPM and designer's estimators (option 1 "no build" and option 3 "rebuild" estimates will be based on square footage; option 2 "renovation/addition" will be based on general plan and systems)
 - * **Monday, February 7, 2011:** School Committee Meeting
 - * **Tuesday, February 8, 2011:** Building Committee Meeting, review estimates
 - * **Tuesday, February 15, 2011:** Joint Committee Meeting
 - * **Friday, February 18, 2011:** Feasibility Study (no build, reno/add, rebuild options) due to MSBA.
 - * **Wednesday, February 23, 2011:** MSBA Facilities Assessment Committee meeting, sort of screening device prior to MSBA board review
 - * **Wednesday, March 30, 2011:** MSBA board reviews feasibility study, presented by MSBA staff
 - * Develop schematic design from "preferred design"
 - * **April** submittal for schematic design
 - * **June** Town meeting vote in early to mid-June
 - Margaret noted that although the MSBA Board will not formally vote on the Feasibility Study until March 30th, it will be necessary for the designers to continue directly into development of Schematic Design as soon as the

Feasibility Study is submitted on February 18th in order to assure a fully developed and estimated Schematic Design.

8. MSBA Feasibility Study/Schematic Design Process

- Greg noted that there is a lot of information that the school has to generate
- MSBA programmatic allowances are largely fixed, except for Special Ed proposal where there is a range to work within
- Greg discussed the positive aspects of the MSBA's process (well organized and managed); however, he noted that a down side is insufficient allowances for technology costs
- Margaret noted that the MSBA's process is intended to eliminate surprises
- Kevin O'Neil asked difference between Feasibility Study and Schematic Design, what can board expect?
 - * Greg noted that the Feasibility Study is a stop along the way to Schematic Design; make sure everything fits and discovering constraints; determine the most effective adjacencies for uses; anticipate questions; understand systems; plan with narratives; what's best end result and how to use most grant money to get there
 - * Greg noted that Schematic Design tells us what it is going to look like
- Margaret: coming up - next week JCJ will outline options, will get Building Committee input

9. Margaret asked the Building Committee what JCJ needs to know

- Kevin O'Neil suggested reading the minutes from last 2 meeting
- Brad Bramwell brought up concerns about project costs above the \$15-20 million discussed when Feasibility funds were voted. Project team will need to justify every penny spent: the value needs to be clear.
 - * Margaret reviewed a first draft of a comparison with the Foxboro High School project. Foxboro's project cost, which benefited from an exceptional bid climate, is currently at \$17 million and did not include an addition (min. \$5M) and systems which Norton will require (sprinkler \$1.5M). Margaret will continue to develop this comparison for discussion.
 - * Kevin O'Neil said that based on the December meeting when Pinck indicated that the upper range for the project envisioned might be \$30 million, he has update the website to indicate that the range is \$20-30M (with net as well, based on reimbursement)
 - * Andrew Mackey noted what was said earlier, that the original number based on similar project in a contiguous community, which was a good place to start; but the projects are more different than first thought
 - * Kevin O'Neil noted it is important to understand what the number is as it relates to tax payer dollar
 - * Andrew Mackie noted that major changes in the estimate are difficult to handle and need to be fully vetted before sharing publicly
- Brad Bramwell and Tom Golata both noted the need to be "conservative", don't spend dollars on anything frivolous, justify design

10. Margaret asked JCJ to discuss their initial ideas about the project

- Outreach: set priorities of people who live in this building; look at the program, consider adjacencies

- Code: JCJ believes we will need to add fire wall to segregate new addition(s); because of the expense of these separations, the design will need to minimize fire walls; keep program on either side of fire wall separate; less expensive to expand to once; sprinkler will allow us to add a small addition, but still more economical to build addition in one location; be clever on how you approach it; building lends itself to one addition on east end
 - * Margaret noted that code issues are major driver ("this move is most cost effective way given code constraints")
 - Program: move "public" spaces to northeast corner of building (cafeteria, library, etc.); spaces that can be used also as community outreach
 - Learn about existing spaces that are difficult: cafeteria and server have issues, a lot of potential that cannot be realized as it exists; also, classrooms with no windows are problematic
11. Committee discussed issues surrounding technology
- Margaret noted the trade off between money spent on technology dollars and money spent on spaces designed for specific uses vs. flexible uses
 - Greg suggested using technology to help with programming . . . more flexible spaces, less fixed computer labs
 - Greg noted that the High School IT person has developed a good backbone; the hard-wiring of current technology is holding them back
 - Greg noted they could fairly quickly go from computer lab to sophisticated High School system; struggle is not adopting technology, it is getting people who think that they can only do computer work in a computer lab to think forward . . . think 5, 10, 20 years out
 - * Andrew Mackie asked how do we build to capture this concept? Others responded: create infrastructure, then upgrade end point distribution. End point distribution is increasingly likely to be owned by students rather than the school system (phones, notebook computers, etc.)
 - Margaret suggested this ties back to project cost: it will be more cost effective to make flexible spaces where rooms can evolve for future educational functions (vs computer lab); less dedicated space, less space you have to build . . . Tom Golota noted that the need for community education on this
 - Ray Dewar noted that the technology changes relate to size of classrooms, the way they are configured, and the flexibility of furniture
12. Final remarks
- Kevin O'Neil noted that the process is off to a good start with JCJ interviewing staff, students and community and providing critical commentary about what they are hearing and how this translates into the project design
 - Andrew Mackie suggested thinking about where the jobs of the future are in terms of how we are educating the students
 - Andrew Mackie referenced the HVAC system presented by the other architects interviewed by the MSBA . . . think about air handling that is healthy and helps promote learning; please consider this

Adjourned: The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2011, Norton High School Library

Respectfully Submitted,
Margaret Wood
Pinck & Co.






