

Natick High School Building Committee

Meeting No. 32

Date & Time: 7:20 pm Tuesday 9 Sept 2009

Location: Town Hall



Attended (√) Name, Affiliation

Natick High School Building Committee

√John Ciccariello, Chairman
 √Robert Graham, NPS Director of Facilities
 William Hurley, NPS Director of Fiscal and Management Services
 √Dirk Coburn, NSC Chairman
 √Joseph Keefe
 David Albrecht
 √Steve Meyler

√Jonathan Freedman
 John Hughes, Principal, NHS
 Peter Sanchioni, Superintendent
 √Bruce Wright
 Craig LaRosa
 √Jack O'Neil
 √Mysore Ravindra
 Mark Sereda

RF Walsh Project Management:

√David Billings
 √Paul Kalous

Others in Attendance

√Kelly Foster (NSC)

The purpose of the meeting is to make decisions to facilitate the design and construction of the NHS project.

Item	Date	Topic	Discussion	Responsibility/Action
31.1	8/12/09	Minutes	The minutes of meeting 30 will be considered for approval at the next meeting of the HSBC.	HSBC to consider minutes of meetings 30 and 31 at next meeting
31.3	8/12/09	OPM contract	The HSBC assigned a subgroup to review the RF Walsh Collaborative Partners (RFWCP) contract. The members of the sub group are Mysore Ravindra, Bill Hurley, Bob Graham and John Ciccariello.	HSBC subgroup to review contract.
30.4	6/16/09	Architect Selection	It was reported that the MSBA has not authorized NPS to send the Request for Proposal (RFP) to the model school architects to submit proposals to design Natick HS. This is delaying the progress on the project. The new schedule for submission of proposal from the designers is July 8 th with the presentation now tentatively set for July 15 th .	
	Record	Designer Selection	The MSBA authorized NPS to issue a RFP to the model school architects on July 1, 2009. RFWCP had augmented the invitation with supplemental site information and a pre-proposal meeting to the designer. The RFP are due to NPS by July 31, 2009 with a public presentation by the designers on August 12, 2009. The three designers, Mount Vernon Group	

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			(MVG), Symmes Maini McKee Associates (SMMA) and Ai3 submitted the proposals to NPS on July 31 and NPS distributed copies to all members of the HSBC for review prior to the presentations.	
	8/12/09	Designer Selection	<p>The HSBC convened at 6:00 to review the designer selection process before the presentations. The score sheets were distributed along with proposed question from the HSBC. It was stated that Superintendent Peter Sanchioni was to ask the questions for the NSC and HSBC. The HSBC is to review the presentations, ask follow-up questions pursuant to the list, if the question was not already adequately answered in the presentation. Follow-up questions not listed must be asked to all three presenters, so if a follow up question is asked the first presenter, the subsequent presenter must be asked the same question. Therefore no new question can be asked after the opening presentation.</p> <p>Presentations were made in the auditorium and began at 6:50 pm with the Mount Vernon Group (MVG), followed by SMMA and finally Ai3. Presentations were complete at 9:25pm at which time the committee took a brief recess.</p> <p>The HSBC reconvened at 9:40pm. The HSBC members were instructed to score each designer based on the criteria on the form. Dirk Coburn offered that the criteria should be expanded to include a category for “desirable partner with Natick”. RFWCP stated that the criteria cannot be modified now that presentations are complete, since the criteria were provided to the competing designers.</p>	
		Designer Selection	<p>The HSBC members each scored the presentations based on criteria. The scores were added up. The rated scores of the members are: MVG 227, SMMA 291 and Ai3 290. Craig La Rosa submitted a score sheet but was not included in the final tally. Also indicated on the form was a preferred ranking. This was requested of the membership due to the closeness of the rating. Each member was requested to express their views of the proposals and presentations and indicated their preference. The result was seven members preferred Ai3 and six members preferred SMMA. The members remarks were as follows:</p> <p>Jack O’Neil: Stated that he prefers Ai3 due to their understanding of Natick’s educational departments and their approach to construction administration that saves owners money.</p>	

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			<p>David Albrecht: Stated that he preferred the SMMA plan. Stated that he liked Ai3 for the reasons Jack O’Neil indicated, but he is concerned with the size of the Ai3 building on the high school site, and therefore voted for SMMA.</p> <p>Bruce Wright: Stated that Ai3 and SMMA were tied on his score sheet, however prefers the SMMA proposal because he does not think the Whitman Hanson model fits on the high school site.</p> <p>Dr. Keefe: Endorsed SMMA as his preference due to his knowledge of the Hudson model and presentation of their educational programming process.</p> <p>Steve Meyler: Stated that he preferred Ai3 because of their responsiveness to community stakeholders in their design process.</p> <p>Mysore Ravindra: Stated that he preferred SMMA. Stated that the process is flawed because the remarks of other members bring in their prior experience with Ai3 and is being taken into consideration in their stated preference.</p> <p>Jonathan Freedman: Stated that he preferred Ai3. Remarked that he believes that the educational spaces within the school are better designed for Natick. Indicated concern with containing costs on the SMMA proposal that appeared much different from the Hudson model.</p> <p>Mark Sereda: Stated that he preferred SMMA. Stated that SMMA “nailed the site plan”. Expressed concern that the high school site does not adequately accommodate the Whitman Hanson footprint.</p> <p>Bill Hurley: Stated that he preferred Ai3. Stated that the Ai3 model provides the better educational value to Natick. Stated that the SMMA proposal is not the Hudson model. Either firm would be reasonable to work with.</p> <p>Peter Sanchioni: Stated that he preferred Ai3. Stated that the experience that the school administration has had at Whitman Hanson with their model is much preferred over the experience reported by the school administration at Hudson. The Hudson model has had numerous plant and operational issues, such as the HVAC system and the shared cafeteria/circulation space. Therefore the Whitman Hanson model provides the best educational value for Natick.</p> <p>Dirk Coburn: Stated that he preferred Ai3. Stated that he visited all three model schools and the Ai3 model is the best for Natick. Stated that the navigation and way finding through the Hudson</p>	

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			<p>model is inconvenient. Found the “unbounded cafeteria” to be disruptive. The relationship of spaces from one academic wing, through the cafeteria, and to another is better solved in the Ashland model. The elimination of the corridor linking the kitchen to the service area made the SMMA design a “non-starter” and therefore Ashland is ranked higher than the Hudson model.</p> <p>Bob Graham: Stated that he preferred Ai3. Stated that their approach to administrating construction is superior to the other firms. Stated that the educational process that is proposed by Ai3 is better suited to Natick. He indicated that development of the design will be customized to Natick’s requirements.</p> <p>John Ciccariello: Stated that he preferred SMMA. Stated that all three designers are all qualified professionals at school design. Stated that each school had specific and unique criteria to meet when they were custom designed years ago. Ashland, for instance, had greater cost constraints which called for drywall where masonry might be better suited. Ashland has a very creative circulation system. SMMA is preferred because of the site design and it’s response to the residential neighborhood. The SMMA design shows that the building farther from the street. The Ai3 presentation did not address the issue of the building near to the street and this is a big concern.</p> <p>Bob Graham made a motion that was seconded by Steve Meyler that Ai3 be recommended to the school committee over SMMA and finally MVG. This rating was approved on a 7 to 6 vote corresponding to the preference indicated on the criteria rating form and indicated in the remarks as stated above.</p>	
31.3	9/16/09	Site Selection	It was clarified by John Ciccariello that the HSBC and NSC have not taken up the issue of site selection and that neither board has determined that the existing high school site is not necessarily the most advantageous for the model school. The site selection will be explored with the selected architect.	HSBC to review site selection immediately after designer is under contract.
	9/9/09	Site Selection	RFWCP reported that the school administration has proposed that Ai3 present to the HSBC site plans for the model on each the Memorial Field site and the existing high school site on 16 September. RFWCP requested this meeting to devise a process prior to the presentations. It was also reported that the school administration has sent notices to abutters to attend a meeting on Thursday 17 Sept to provide input to the site selection. John Ciccariello asked if the HSBC as committee wants to make recommendation to the School Committee, due to any political implications of whatever decision is reached. Dirk Coburn said that he believed the school committee would like a	HSBC to provide a recommendation to the NSC.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			<p>recommendation from the HSBC. RFWCP reported that Ai3 will be providing a recommendation. John Ciccariello requested that RFWCP provide a recommendation. There was consensus that the HSBC would provide a recommendation. The HSBC will meet on 23 September to discuss and vote their recommendation. The School Committee will select the site at a meeting subsequent to the HSBC receiving their recommendation.</p> <p>RFWCP proposed a process for reviewing the respective site plans to arrive at a recommendation. The process would begin tonight by crafting a list of criteria important in site selection. The advantages and disadvantages of each site would be described for each criterion. The criteria would be submitted to Ai3 as a list of items for them to respond to in their presentation of the two site plans. The criteria are not required to be scored or ranked. Dirk Coburn suggested that using a common sense approach considering all the criteria would be better than a score. A consensus to this approach was acknowledged.</p> <p>RFWCP invited comments on the preliminary draft list of criteria that was provided. All members provided input and the comments are as follows:</p> <p>Add a site facts criterion comparing acreage, street frontage, general description, etc.</p> <p>Parking should break down space counts for staff, students, visitors, event overflow, etc.</p> <p>Vehicle circulation should be changed to bus and car circulation in order to differentiate traffic patterns on the site.</p> <p>Open Space should be changed to Green Space so that there is no confusion with parking.</p> <p>A category called Reimbursement of Demolition cost should be added to the criteria. Bob Graham indicated concern that if the school is built on the Memorial Field site, the demolition of the school on the other site may not be reimbursable.</p> <p>A category called cost of interim athletic field should be added. This item would be the cost to conduct the competition and practice schedules for all high school sports if the Memorial Field is selected.</p> <p>The category called wetland impact should indicate the expanse of jurisdiction on the respective sites. John Ciccariello stated that the expanse may be reduced since the site is currently disturbed with asphalt parking than if the site was undisturbed.</p>	

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			<p>It was agreed that construction duration and mitigation issues is important to not only the neighborhood, but the student body within the existing neighboring school.</p> <p>Neighboring uses impacting school should be changed to adjacent uses. It was noted that the uses adjacent to the Memorial Field that include the DPW yard to the west and the recycling yard to the south may not have a positive impact on the school.</p> <p>A category indicating proximity to existing infrastructure services and costs to extend utilities should be added.</p> <p>A category regarding landscape and streetscape should be included.</p> <p>Expansion capacity options category should be added. This criterion would describe flexibility to add to the school such as an academic wing or a pool or whatever.</p> <p>A category indicating impacts on existing gyms should be included.</p> <p>A category regarding the likelihood of soil contamination issues should be included. Without sampling this could be an indication of any known sources. Bob Graham said that an oil tank was removed and the soil samples that are documented do not indicate any contaminant outside of the tank walls.</p> <p>A category indicating zoning compliance should be included. John Ciccariello said that due to the Dover Amendment, public schools and places of worship are exempt from zoning regulation. He noted that the analysis should indicate where the project would stand in regards to the local bylaws.</p> <p>It was noted that the recommendation by the HSBC should be qualified as pursuant to the best of the committee's current knowledge.</p> <p>RFWCP stated that the comments received would be incorporated onto the list and submitted to Ai3 tomorrow morning.</p>	
30.5	6/16/09	Schedule	<p>RFW presented the schedule for the project based on a Sept 30 MSBA Board vote on a project scope and budget agreement as discussed two weeks ago. This is now an unlikely time frame because the MSBA has not sent the RFP to the model school designers that start the designer selection process. A schedule based on an</p>	

<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Responsibility/ Action</u>
			MSBA Board vote on Nov 16 was presented and discussed in detail. The new schedule changes the MSBA Board approval from September 30 to November 18, 2009. The new schedule also changes the date for Town project funding approval to March 2010 from October/ November 2009. This schedule is recommended because it will allow for a sufficient time period for educational planning, site selection and building design. Because of the delay in starting the designer selection process, there is not enough time to reasonably complete these tasks and make the September MSBA Board. The new schedule has these important design tasks being completed in mid October for submission to MSBA on October 19, 2009. In order to meet the recommended bid/ construction time frame, the design process will continue with construction documents due by February 1, 2010. The new schedule notes that additional project funding will need to be secured at the Fall 2009 Town meeting to fund the construction document process.	
			The HSBC voted unanimously to recommend to the School Committee that the School Committee adopt the revised the schedule titled Model School Timeline-Spring 2010 Project Approval.	RFW to present schedule to NPS on Monday 22 June 09.
	8/12/09		Not discussed due to special agenda.	RFWCP presented schedule as requested, record.
	9/9/09	Schedule	RFWCP presented an updated schedule as part of the August monthly meeting. The schedule shifts approximately two months due to the delay in starting the designer selection process by the MSBA.	Record.
32.1	9/9/09	Fall Town Warrant	The finance committee has a place holder for a request for additional funding from the school department to fund design to the spring Town meeting. The school department indicated that they are aware of the request, however they are evaluating if additional funding is necessary. The Architect's fee and payment schedule proposal was just received and will be reviewed in light of the scheduled Town meetings.	The school department will inform the finance committee as soon as possible.

Future Meetings:

Date	Time	Group	Location
16 Sept 09	7:00 pm	HSBC	Town Hall
17 Sept 09	7:00 pm	School Administration	HS Library
21 Sept 09	7:30 pm	School Committee	Town Hall
23 Sept 09	7:00 pm	HSBC	Town Hall

These notes will become part of the project record as written, unless corrections or additions are received in writing by RF Walsh by 23 September 2009.