

NORTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Norton, Massachusetts

NORTON HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING

October 18, 2011
Norton High School Library

Attending:

Building Committee - Dr. Pat Ansay (Superintendent), Building Committee Chairman Kevin O'Neil, Ray Dewar (Principal), Mike Yunits (Town Manager), Tom Golota (School Committee), Paul Helmreich (Finance Committee), Mark Powers (Building Committee), Brad Bramwell (Board of Selectmen), Mike Flaherty (Finance Committee), Bob Salvo (Board of Selectmen)

Also in attendance - Barry Nectow (NPS Director of Operations & Finance), Greg Smolley (JCJ Architecture), Jeff Elliott (JCJ Architecture), Jack Crocker (TCI Engineers), Ralph Gifford (TCI Engineers), Jon Rich (WT Rich), Margaret Wood (PCI), Deborah Marai (PCI)

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m.

1. Deborah Marai of Pink & Co. (PCI) took the minutes of the meeting.
2. Kevin O'Neil opened the meeting with motion to approve meeting minutes 8/16/2011, 8/30/2011, 9/27/2011 and 10/4/2011; minutes were approved.
3. The Design, OPM and CM team members introduced themselves.
4. Kevin turned meeting over to Margaret Wood to explain the Design Development (DD) estimate process. The Construction Manager (CM), W.T. Rich, prepared an estimate, and the Designer's estimator, VJ Associates, also prepared an estimate. Both estimates came in over the budget established with the MSBA in the Total Project Budget (TPB). A group of at least 15 consultants has been working to come up with recommendations on how to bring the project in line with the budget with no educational impact and without changing scope in a way that is at all problematic, given prior commitments.

Margaret believes this is the first MSBA project to have CM on board early enough to have them involved with the DD estimate. The project benefits from having the CM involved in this process; it is important to have the input of the people who are going to build the project.

5. Tom Golota asked to revisit why we are over budget. Mark Powers suggested each line item should have been higher in the Schematic Design (SD) estimate that established the budget.

Margaret reviewed some of the factors that have created the need for a budget reconciliation:

- The design documentation is far more developed than Schematic Design, challenging some prior assumptions (and confirming others)

- The CM is now involved in the process and brings different perspective; once reconciled the Project Team will be much more comfortable moving to the next stage of development with the CMs input incorporated
 - MSBA closely reviews and confirms estimates and puts constraints on contingencies; for Schematic Design, the team maximized the MSBA allowed contingency
 - When project moves quickly, the project acquires more risk; this project moved very fast through the Feasibility Study and Schematic Design phases, which was based on the Town's schedule; everyone did a great getting the project to that point as quickly as we did, but it required the estimators to make educated guesses based on other data (square footage (SF) costs based on recent similar projects, % of project costs for similar types of systems such as HVAC, etc.)
 - This design process is iterative: a similar process will occur at 60% and 90% Construction Document (CD) sets; each time, estimates are based on design and documentation that is more developed
 - Margaret suggested that one reason the MSBA provides an extra reimbursement point for using the CM process is because the it gives the MSBA more comfort with the numbers; because school projects often are forced to move quickly, the estimating can be riskier, a risk which is reduced with CM involvement
 - Estimates for certain aspects of the project did rise significantly from Schematic Design to Design Development, particularly structural and HVAC; the increased cost of the structural design was at least partially due to the speed of the project through Schematic Design; Paul noted that there was not a lot of time for design team to get into the building to investigate existing conditions before budget was set
 - Greg Smolley noted that we were within MSBA guidelines at Schematic Design for square footage numbers for renovation and addition projects; MSBA guidelines are based on a substantial database of costs of project in the State; one way to avoid the estimates coming in high after budget is set is to go further into the design process before going to the Town for funding – but the State does not favor this approach
 - In conclusion Margaret noted that high goals were set for the project and the value management process has not impacted this
6. Paul Helmreich asked for an explanation of the construction industry abbreviations used; Margaret will provide a glossary for future reviews.
 7. The desired outcome of this meeting is to put closure on Design Development as far as MSBA is concerned; we need to submit reconciled budget to MSBA.
 8. “Recommendations for Alignment of Scope and Budget/WTR DD Estimate and Value Management Option Analysis” document was prepared by W.T. Rich and is used to help organize options for bringing project into budget. This document captures all ideas put forward as potential value management options; even ideas quickly rejected are included so as to reflect the full history of the process.

The suggested value management categories:

Category 1: Design Clarification, Technical VE and Non-Program Changes

Category 2: Scope Changes Recommended

Category 3: Scope Changes / Other Options

Category 4: Scope Changes, Not Recommended

Category 5: Rejected, Not Viable

The focus of tonight's meeting is Categories 1 and 2: if all are found acceptable this will bring the project into budget. Margaret does not believe there is loss in terms of quality or program in these 2 categories: the project still includes what Town wants. Category 3 will be discussed as required.

The document is organized by item number, nature of change (clarification, value engineering, aesthetics, program), description, cost, remarks, LEED impact

Greg walked participants through the items with input from various team members.

9. For the purposes of the meeting, value engineering (VE) or value management was defined as seeking the best possible value with the same function and life cycle, but with a lower initial cost; the example discussed was #15, which reduces additions to the existing roof framing to accommodate new rooftop HVAC units by changing how and where additional framing is placed.
10. Category 1: Design Clarification, Technical VE and Non-Program Changes
Team reviewed Category 1 items #1-29; items were clarified as necessary; no comments or requests to move items from this Category.
11. Category 2: Scope Changes Recommended
 - #30 Plan Modifications: this proposal makes more effective use of space in the existing building and reduces the size of the addition; a more critical look at the floor plan has allowed a reduction in the overall number of plumbing fixtures consistent with Code requirements; the MSBA will appreciate this modification because it maintains scope while reducing SF; note teacher collaboration space is now interior.
Comments/action/follow up - JCJ to change name of Wrestling Gym to Fitness; consider adding trees where gained exterior space at rear of addition; consider bringing back canopy at rear given change in design; design team reserves flexibility of which are designated boy's and which are girl's locker/team rooms
 - # 31 Administration C116 Entry: this proposal relocates access to Admin area
Comments/action/follow up – Ray Dewar would prefer to keep access in current location if we can; item #31 was rejected
 - #32 Heat Mirror Window Glazing in lieu of Radiant Heating: this proposal incorporates the use of a mylar film with in the double pane glazing, thereby allowing a reduction in radiant heating; this argon filled window product also has low-e coating for performance and high visible transmittance light; its use will increase the building envelope's performance and increase comfort in warmer weather; the originally proposed perimeter radiant heat would be deleted in favor of an "all air" heating system; the Project Team prefers this option to using triple glazed windows to get similar result because triple would be heavier; this option decreases amount of energy building utilizes, but will cost a couple of cents per square foot more in operating costs because base heating

system will need to run all the time (more efficient to pump water than to blow air, however this is partially offset because of increased envelope performance)

- #33 Delete Alucabond (metal) feature wall: replace with abuse-resistant gypsum wall board (GWB) and epoxy paint
- #34 Delete 550 linear feet of classroom casework: no one requested it in the first place, designer added "Nice to have"; wasn't shown in schematic design package, was drawn and priced for DD
Comments/action/follow up – consider as an add/alternate
- #35 Reuse Existing Auditorium House Lights: house lighting is functional per Ray; biggest problem with fixture is that cannot access them easily
Comments/action/follow up – Greg proposes to replace with LED bulbs; need to get money for LED lamps in budget
- #36 Reuse Existing Gymnasium Lights: lighting is fine per Ray
- #37 Delete Wood Proscenium Brow in Auditorium: at first, JCJ didn't know if this was needed to bounce sound off; now know it is not functional
- #38 Replace Metal Panels with Masonry In-fill at Existing Windows, West Side & Rear: metal panels expensive, JCJ showed images of infill option
- #39 Replace Metal Panels with Masonry In-fill at Existing Windows, Front: same as #38 except at front of building
- #40 Replace Portion of Cafeteria Storefront with Stucco: JCJ wanted as much connection between cafeteria and outside as possible, but considered partial infill option as cost savings; showed images of (1) vertical infill areas and (2) low horizontal/knee wall infill
Comments/action/follow up – Paul said if we had to do one, he would prefer 2nd option; item #40 was rejected
- #41 Delete Air Conditioning to 2nd Floor NW Classrooms: approach maximizes efficiency and compactness of rooms to be used for summer school if required, locate classes in one room at first floor adjacent to Admin area and Media Center flex labs (all currently called to get air conditioning); improved ventilation in building will make all classrooms more comfortable in warmer weather regardless of air conditioning
- #42 Air Condition Auditorium instead of Cafeteria: this was more of a team clarification; Auditorium has many scheduled school functions in late spring, when weather warms up; also used for town meetings, open houses, etc. in all seasons; heat gain in auditorium is higher than cafeteria (new cafeteria has operable windows and new ventilation system which will help to move air)
Comments/action/follow up – Tom expressed concern about the desired community aspect of cafeteria; consider as add/alternate
- #43 Delete Loading Dock and Equipment: loading dock more complex than just lowering (requirements for drainage, OSHA, etc.); water table is high, don't yet know inverts, depressed loading dock may require pumping water out
- #44 Revised Approach to Lighting Controls: DD showed replacing all building lighting with dimmable fixtures on network control; DD set called for new fixtures because even though much of existing lighting is not that old, technology changing quickly and can get improvements in efficiency; Margaret reminded the team that we can go through National Grid rebate system again for new fixtures, but Greg cautioned that the rebate

program only defers the Town's cost and cannot increase project budget; proposed changes include using non-dimmable fixtures, reusing some of the existing lighting, and deleting complex network controls (still have in-line occupancy sensors); may be LEED impacts, need to be careful with any changes;

- Regarding new fixtures: Jon Rich explained that big part of savings in this option come from the fact that DD set called for dimmable fixtures, going from dimmable to step ballast system is where money is; once team got to this point, thought of replacing relatively new existing fixtures with exact same thing seemed wasteful; have a lot of same fixtures, so this helps with possibility of salvaging, storing and reusing a percentage of existing; regarding possibility of LED fixtures, would be very expensive, though Ralph Gifford noted this would certainly be positive in terms of energy model
- Regarding network controls: DD set called for highly automated system, proposed network lighting is Cat 5 system; instead, proposed change accomplishes controls with simpler hard wire and switching without the network;

Comments/action/follow up – Mark Powers suggested there is risk (are these lights/pieces still available), and questioned that taking down and storing/safeguarding is cheaper; Building Committee asked for a breakdown of this item, savings for not replacing with dimmable, for reusing some of existing fixtures, and for deleting network system also; to address concerns about the reality of savings to salvage and reuse fixtures, W.T. Rich will reduce the assumed number of salvaged fixture from 80% to 70%

- #45 Ground Face Block at Addition in lieu of Brick: JCJ passed samples around and showed images; cost savings but also helps aesthetically because difficult to fully match existing brick and new; with ground face block, could try to match color with different material or do contrasting
- #46 Delete Air Conditioning at Media Center:

Comments/action/follow up – item #46 was rejected

12. Category 3: Scope Changes / Other Options

- #47 Fire Partition at Addition: JCJ is following up on a less expensive option for the fire partition shown where the addition meets the new building; have discussed with local officials, but this item can only be done once with a variance from the State BBRS (Board of Building Regulations and Standard)/cannot count on it; the value of this item \$61K; if allowed to make this change, possibly take something from add/alternate list back into base project
- #48 Delete Classroom Speech Amplification System: note that speech amplification is currently called for in every classroom, and is tied into AV & PA systems

Comments/action/follow up – Greg Smolley noted that statistics that show real impact on learning, and Mark anecdotally mentioned that his wife, a teacher, has said the same thing; Pat Ansay said that this is something the school department is chasing this as students come in, retrofitting on an as-needed basis; Pat recommended having one room in

each pod/department with speech amplification; it was agreed that 8 rooms total would have speech amplification in the base bid, and the rest would be considered as an add/alternate

- #49 Redesign New Addition to save \$50K:
Comments/action/follow up – not being considered at this time
- #50 Physical Education and Athletic Lockers: reuse existing lockers
Comments/action/follow up – push back from some members of the Committee on this item; after reviewing the condition of the lockers after the meeting item #50 was rejected
- #51 Auditorium Entry: JCJ showed images for proposed reduction in scope (deleting canopy and feature wall)
Comments/action/follow up – Margaret suggested we table this option and have JCJ consider other options for reducing cost at this area
- #52 Aluminum Bus Bars: option is to use aluminum bus bars in all electrical distribution and branch circuit panels boards in lieu of copper; requires having an electrician come in after 2 years to torque lugs at panels & distribution equipment; would call out in operating manual; Jack Crocker noted that the technology for aluminum has changed, so much of the problems people know about this from the past are no longer relevant

13. Category 4: Scope Changes, Not Recommended & Category 5: Rejected, Not Viable – not discussed other than to say that these are included to show history of things that were considered; items in Category 4 and Category 5 are not being considered by the Committee at this point as options for aligning the DD estimate with the project budget

14. Jon expressed that it is great we are pushing for aligning the DD estimate and the budget so closely, but cautioned that this process is not an exact science; although W.T. Rich attempted to be conservative, practical and not overly-optimistic in estimating for VE options, the process is less precision and more rule of thumb and square footage costs. Having said that, when the team does another detailed estimate for the 60% CD set, there will be a much more precise estimate number on new design; this process is iterative - having gone through this process in great detail for the DD estimate, the process for the 60% CD set will require less of this sort of effort

15. Discussion of Alternates: Alternates will be refined in the next two weeks and will be reflected in the 60% CD set; need to consider not only what items to include as alternates, but what order to put them in (in the public bidding process, they must be accepted in the order they are listed). For simplicity and to insure getting the best price for alternates: keep the number of alternates to a minimum; only consider alternates that have a substantial cost estimate; and try to limit the involvement of Trades in any one alternate (only one if possible). Currently be considered on the list of Alternates:

- Classroom casework
- AC in cafeteria
- Speech amplification in the remainder of classrooms
- All new light fixtures
- Dimmable light fixtures

16. Vote: there was a motion to recommend to the School Committee the acceptance of items in Categories 1, 2 and 3 as noted above and discussed; motion was seconded, voted on and approved.
17. The list of options will be finalized at the next Building Committee meeting.
18. Margaret informed the group that aspects of the project have been progressing while the DD estimate process was underway; today, PCI posted notice for subcontractor prequel process, the advertisement will appear in the Central Register on 10/26/11. Deborah Marai will contact Barry Nectow regarding advertisement in COM-PASS and the local newspaper.
19. Sewer work: W.T. Rich would like to bid as soon as possible and be completed by March 1st; leaching field overlaps new addition. Last week, JCJ and PCI held a coordination meeting with Otter Creek (civil engineer for sewer work) and CDW (civil engineer for remainder of project); Design team is getting required invert locations; Otter Creek will adjust design they did for the Town to apply only to the scope of this project; once design is done, can begin the DEP permitting process, which can take some time. Bob Salvo noted that the new sewer line was placed in the street (lining the existing abandoned water line), but not sure it was ever tested (die or vacuum).
20. Recent and upcoming milestones:
 - Friday, October 21st: Homecoming
 - Tuesday, November 1: next Building Committee Meeting

Attachment:

“Recommendations for Alignment of Scope and Budget/WTR DD Estimate and Value Management Option Analysis”

- 10/17/2011 version review at 10/18/2011 Building Committee Meeting
- 10/19/2011 version updated after 10/18/2011 Building Committee Meeting

Adjourned: The meeting was adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2011

Respectfully Submitted, Deborah Marai, Pinck & Co. Inc.
