



MEETING MINUTES – Norton High School MSBA 1 - Kick Off Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: 14 January 2011

Chris Alles, Project Manager, MSBA	X	Chris.Alles@MassSchoolBuildings.org	617-720-4466
Carolyn Walsh, MSBA	X	Carolyn.Walsh@MassSchoolBuildings.org	617-720-4466
Dr. Pat Ansay	X	pansay@norton.k12.ma.us	508-285-0100
Kevin O'Neil, Chairperson, Building Committee	X	kevinoneil@nhsbuildingproject.org	508-285-8545
Tom Golota, Building Committee, School Committee	X	tgolota@verizon.net	508-285-3652
Representative Jay Barrows (Precincts Three, Four and Five)	X	fjaybarrows@mahouse.gov	617-722-2488
Representative Steve Howitt (Precinct One)	X	Steven.howitt@mahouse.gov	617-722-2305
Representative Elizabeth Poirier (Precinct Two)	X	Rep.elizabethpoirier@mahouse.gov	617-722-2976
Meredith Rodman, aide to Rep. Barrows	X	Meredith.rodman@mahouse.gov	617-722-2488
Jacob Ventura, aide to Rep. Horowitz	X	Jacob.ventura@mahouse.gov	617-722-2305
Jennifer Pinck, Owner's Representative, Pinck & Co. Inc.	X	jpinck@pinck-co.com	617-445-3555
Margaret Wood, Owner's Representative, Pinck & Co., Inc.	X	mwood@pinck-co.com	617-216-5760
Deborah Marai, Owner's Representative, Pinck & Co. Inc.	X	dmarai@pinck-co.com	617-445-3555

x = attending; distribution to all

New content in **BOLD**

	Item	Discussion	Action by:
1.1	Introductions	Participants introduced themselves and their role on the project.	Record
1.2	Communications	Chris relayed that all communications to the MSBA for the project should go through him.	Record
1.3	Status of Enrollment, Contracts and Agreements	The following are in place: Enrollment agreement for a maximum of 700 students (dated March 22, 2010). Feasibility Study Agreement (dated August 27 th , 2010) OPM Agreement (dated September 23, 2010) The designer fee has been negotiated and is ready to be signed by the architect.	Record
1.4	Feasibility Study and Evaluation of Alternatives, Estimates	The alternatives being evaluated include: a renovation only option, a renovation and addition option and a new construction option. Kevin O'Neil expressed, on behalf of the Building Committee, a strong preference for the renovation and addition option. Estimates for all three options will be included in the Feasibility Study by both the architect and the OPM.	Record
1.5	Facilities Assessment Subcommittee Presentation	This presentation is scheduled for February 23 rd at 10am at the MSBA. Dr. Ansay and Kevin O'Neil will attend on behalf of the Town.	Record
1.6	Getting to a Project Scope and Budget Agreement, Schedule	Chris noted that the goal of the Feasibility Study is to arrive at a project budget which is required for the execution of a Project Budget Agreement. The Feasibility Study is due to be completed and submitted to the MSBA no later than February 18 th . Following staff review and response to any staff comments, the project is slated for review by the MSBA Board at their March 30 th meeting. The approval of the Feasibility Study will lay the groundwork for an April Schematic Design submittal to the MSBA, for a May review by the MSBA Board. This aggressive	Record

		<p>schedule is intended to meet the goal for a June Town meeting debt exclusion vote.</p> <p>Chris noted that the MSBA requires a supporting vote from the Town within 120 days of the MSBA Board vote. Chris noted that it is not too early to consider a contingency plan in the event that the Debt Exclusion does not pass. Although recent construction costs have continued to be flat, it was agreed that the anticipated increase in costs this year would likely result in a 3-4% increase in project costs if Town support for the project were delayed till the fall.</p> <p>He also commented that the DESE approval of the SPED plan if required to finalize the Project Funding Agreement.</p>	
1.7	Questions, Comments, Concerns	<p>The following were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Ansay noted that she and her staff have found the Pro-Pay system to be very user-friendly. • Representative Howitt inquired about planning for future maintenance of the building. Margaret shared the MSBA's typical evaluation for Maintenance and Capital Planning which will be submitted as part of the process. • Representative Howitt asked whether Massachusetts jobs were likely to be created by the project. Jennifer noted the Town was strongly considering the CM at Risk delivery method. This means that the process by which the Contractor is selected is a two step process based on price and qualifications. This, along with subcontractor prequalification, affords the selection committee a means to evaluate firms based on a number of factors including experience working in Massachusetts and with unique Chapter 149 filed sub-bid requirements. • The need to publicize the project was discussed. Kevin described the work that the Pride of NHS group is doing to educate voters about the project. • In conclusion, the state representatives asked to be regularly updated on the project. 	
1.8	Building Tour	Principal Ray Dewar led a tour of the high school	Record

The above is assumed correct unless the writer is notified within 5 days after receipt.

Prepared by: Margaret Wood, Pinck & Co, Inc

Distribution: As noted above