

NORTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Norton, Massachusetts

**NORTON HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING**

February 8, 2011

Norton High School Library

RECEIVED
NORTON TOWN CLERK
2011 MAR -4 P 1:30

Attending: Building Committee Chairman Kevin O'Neil, Superintendent Patricia Asay, High School Principal Ray Dewar, Paul Helmreich, Tom Golota, Brad Bramwell, Mark Powers, Andrew Mackey, Greg Smolley (JCJ Architecture), Margaret Wood & Deborah Marai (PCI)

Others: John Young (Energy Manager and Custodian) and Ralph Steffanelli (community member)

Call to Order: Kevin O'Neil called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

1. Deborah Marai recorded minutes of the meeting.
2. Kevin described the schedule of upcoming meetings and milestones.
3. Kevin reported that the main agenda item is an update on the Feasibility Study progress.
4. Margaret reported we will have professional cost estimates the week of 2/21; PCA and JCJ prepared and presented a preliminary cost comparison of options for the group to review which will be updated for the Joint Committee meeting on the 15th with the professional estimator's numbers.
5. Kevin asked Margaret to summarize the Feasibility Study requirements and the Schematic Design requirements. Margaret suggested that the Feasibility Study could be likened to a pre-qualification application for a mortgage: the intention is to describe for a funder (the MSBA) the likely scale of the loan and the core needs the loan will satisfy. The MSBA, in reviewing and voting to approve the Feasibility Study is agreeing to continue to work with the Town as the development of the project in Schematic Design proceeds. The Feasibility process is intended to outline a set of options (re-use of the existing building with code required improvements, re-use of the existing building with additions, and new construction) in order to reach a common agreement about the best option for Schematic Design.

Greg added that the outcome of the Feasibility Study is this best option, or "preferred alternative". Next steps in Schematic Design will be to develop a project scope and budget based on the preferred alternative. After the 2/18/2011 Feasibility Study submission, the Project Team will be focused on the April 15, 2011 Schematic Design submittal. The Schematic Design process will involve a number of detailed decisions about project scope.

Greg gave some examples of types of Schematic Design decisions, specifically around cost efficiency: (1) We may be able to identify savings on typical technology costs because the existing technology backbone has been well planned; (2) May meet with educators and find certain things work well the way they currently are instead of conforming to established MSBA guidelines (existing classroom size for some uses); (3) Decisions may be made not to renovate certain things, but to live with "as is" (flooring, paint).

6. JCJ options/sketches - option 2D meets most of criteria: incorporates new science rooms; improves circulation; addresses changes in code since original construction (plumbing fixtures deficient, egress/stairs insufficient, handicap accessibility issues).
7. Paul asked about septic and track: these items are not reimbursable, and are noted below the line in the budget. Both will require a Town meeting vote and a debt exclusion vote.
8. Andrew suggested a conversation about where we might add on in the future (15-20 years down the line), if needed. Margaret reported that the MSBA project manager (Chris Alles) said that we should anticipate a question from the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee. JCJ will review and propose future addition locations.
9. Margaret walked through the JCJ/PCI Preliminary Cost Comparison (see attached):
 - NHS 1: renovation only/code compliance
 - NHS 2: renovation & 1-story addition
 - NHS 3: renovation & 2-story addition
 - NHS 4: new building & playing fields

Blue highlights represent decisions to be made in the next phase of project (Schematic Design): a major goal for the project will be to find the sweet spot where the best value can be achieved for a budget acceptable to the Town.

Pinks highlight represent the contingencies in the projects: protection for evolution/change/unknowns. As Owner's Representative, PCI will track these on behalf of the Town.

Yellow highlight represent potential areas of risk/actual costs that will require additional input or negotiation from the Town and its employees/consultants (legal counsel, water department permit).

Comments:

- Greg will verify added SF number for NHS is correct.
- Kevin asked for clarification as to why site cost for NHS 3 two story addition is so much more than NHS 2 one story addition. Margaret explained that the one story addition does involve moving the entrance and all things associated with that.
- Kevin asked what the cost is to have secondary access for busses; if it is a lot, then that would be one of the hard decisions that need to be made. Margaret said that this will be priced as an alternate, MSBA will ask this of us; there also may be some issues with the abutter that need to be considered.

- Andrew asked for clarification on why the Preliminary Cost Comparison was done if we are getting professional cost estimates/more real numbers next week. Margaret said that the purpose is to get a sense of how we are going to be presenting information to Joint Committee.
 - Andrew expressed concern that School Committee will be asked to vote on information (from professional cost estimators) provided at the last minute. Kevin asked that this information be available prior to the meeting next week.
 - Pat mentioned that Chris Alles emailed her to say that the Building Committee has to vote on the package that goes out, but Pat thinks the School Committee needs to weigh in. Greg said that any vote has to take in the consensus of the School Committee to demonstrate that the educational needs of the Town have been considered.
 - Paul noted that the Finance Committee will be interested in the cost to the Town.
 - Greg added a caution about NHS 1 – just doing code upgrades will not be eligible for the same reimbursement because this does not meet the educational needs of the school; might be able to get smaller reimbursement for Green Repairs (heating, windows, etc.).
 - Brad asked for clarification on how the renovations were broken down: minor, moderate, major. Greg explained that “Minor” describes rooms where the scope is limited to the replacement of ceilings to install sprinklers, “Moderate” describes rooms with a larger scope of renovation that did not moving walls, doors; “Major” describes moving some wall and door locations, possibly adding a window. Margaret commented that the delineation between these three categories and the choices which will be required is the work of Schematic Design.
10. At Kevin’s request, PCI presented an initial draft “Comparison of Options”. Kevin said the point of this is to describe the intangibles which are not captured by the numbers. Margaret asked for comments on her first draft.
 - Kevin suggested that we convert to letter (vs. numerical) “grades” and the information be put in grid format; give a total “score”; add option NHS 4 for doing a new building as well because it may help to explain why such an option may or may not be the most favorable option even if cost were not a consideration (for example, length of construction and disruption to the school, fields); others were in agreement.
 11. The Foxboro High School comparison sheet was discussed:
 - Margaret prepared these as “talking points” to understand differences in the Foxboro High School project (which many people in the Norton Community are aware of) of the Norton High School project.
 12. Margaret said that another key question which we can anticipate is “Plan B” in the event that the Town does not support the project in the June votes. MSBA officially has a 120 day limit, but they do have some flexibility; the most significant project impact from a delay would be an increase in project cost.
 13. Margaret mentioned that at last Friday’s weekly project meeting, team worked on Frequently Asked Questions for the campaign to get out the vote; PCI and JCJ are working with Kevin, Pat and Drew on communication channels.

14. Kevin noted that the MSBA Facilities Assessment Subcommittee meeting needs to be added to the project calendar: February 23, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. The MSBA has asked that the names of participants from the Town committees be forwarded.
15. Kevin reminded the group that we will be presenting the Feasibility Study to the Board of Selectmen next Thursday, February 17, 2011.
16. Kevin O'Neil asked for motion to approved January 25, 2011 minutes; seconded and approved.

Adjourned: The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Next Meeting Date: Joint Committee Meeting - Tuesday, February 15, 2011, Norton High School Library

Attachments:

- JCJ Option & Code Analysis sketches 1/31/2011
- PCI/JCJ Preliminary Cost Comparison
- Foxboro High School project comparison

Respectfully Submitted,
Margaret Wood
Pinck & Co.





