



April 13, 2010, 3:30 PM, Meeting held at the Searles Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room

MEETING NOTES

Committee Members Present: See attached sign-in sheet

Guests Present: Nancy Goodwin NG Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
 Jim Alexander JA Finegold Alexander and Associates (FA+A)
 David Breen DBre KBA/Trident - OPM
 Gino Baroni GB KBA/Trident - OPM
 Dan Bradford DBra KBA/Trident - OPM

Item No.	Item	Description
1.	Call to Order	The meeting was called to order at 3:37 PM by the Chair, Suzanne Lamoureux. (SL)
2.	Approval of meeting notes from 3/9/10	Motion made by Robert Vogler (RV) to accept the meeting notes issued for March 23, 2010, seconded by Bryan Sweet (BS). Unanimous vote in favor.
3.	Schematic Design	<p>Status of 4/9/10 deliverables to MSBA: The package including the completed schematic design plans and the required written documentation was delivered to MSBA on 4/23/10. A copy of the submission was delivered to SL for the record.</p> <p>4/23/10 supplemental submission to MSBA: MSBA allowed for additional information required for the Schematic Design submission to be delivered to the MSBA by 4/23/10. The information to be delivered with this submission includes the Room Data sheets, the updated estimate and the overall project budget. JA reported that the Room Data sheets are nearing completion. DBra indicated that each estimator will be completed with the estimates, that are based on the latest schematic design drawings and specification, on 4/14. A meeting has been scheduled on 4/20 with the two estimators, FA+A and the OPM to review the two estimates and provide a reconciled estimate for inclusion in the supplemental MSBA 4/23/10 submission. When the reconciled estimate is completed, the OPM will revise the project budget and submit that to MSBA on 4/23/10 as well.</p> <p>Project schedules: DBra discussed the overall project schedule indicating that this schedule was developed quite some time ago and the project remains on schedule. DBra also presented a second schedule that focuses on the preparation of the Central School to be ready to house the 9th grade when the construction at the high school is to commence in 2011. Benchmarks in the schedule include 1. Developing the ed plan requirements for the 9th grade, 2. Selecting and hiring the design team, 3. Completion of design and bid documents, 4. Bidding and 5. Construction. Arthur Nicholson (AN) noted that they have completed the ed plan for the 9th grade and will be forwarding that to the OPM tomorrow. DBra discussed the options for hiring an architect. The Committee can negotiate directly with FA+A and hire them as a supplemental service to the current contract. If another designer is to be considered, then Chapter 7 guidelines for Designer Selection would apply. This would include setting up a solicitation, proposal review, possible interviews and a selection. Several committee members commented that there are benefits to extending the FA+A contract to include work on the Central School versus securing another design firm. OPM will generate a list of services expected for this project to be discussed at the next committee meeting.</p> <p>Schematic Design sign off process: DBra discussed the process that has been utilized to provide the committee a level of comfort in deeming the schematic design phase completed. FA+A was asked to submit a written description of the processes and contractual expectations for the schematic design phase. This information was forwarded to Arthur Nicholson. Arthur was to review the process with</p>

Item No.	Item	Description
3.	Schematic Design (continued)	<p>each department head and solicit their input as to the completeness and review of the plans satisfying the educational program requirements. AN distributed a letter indicating that the schematic design plans accommodated the program requirements.</p> <p>Schematic Design Phase Approval: A motion was made by Arthur Nicholson to acknowledge that with the submission package that was delivered to MSBA on 4/9/10 and the supplemental package to be submitted on 4/23/10, FA+A will have completed the requirements for the schematic design phase. Motion seconded by Bryan Sweet and voted unanimously in favor.</p>
4.	Variance status update	<p>GB reported that he has a scheduled meeting with the building commissioner on Thursday at 8:30 to review the submission and discuss the process for establishing a hearing with the State for the variance hearing.</p>
5.	CM at Risk	<p>Follow-up discussion from 3/23/10 discussion about CM @ Risk: Stephen Zanni indicated that he had reviewed the entire IG report on CM @ Risk and it appeared that the benefits cited in the report would apply to the Methuen HS project and he spoke out in favor of utilizing this delivery method.</p> <p>Vote to pursue the CM @ Risk delivery method: A motion to utilize the CM @ Risk delivery method for the Methuen High School Addition/Renovation project was made by Ann Guastaferrero (AG) and seconded by Arthur Nicholson. Voted unanimously in favor.</p> <p>Vote to direct the OPM to prepare the OIG Application to utilize the CM @ Risk method: DBra explained that the application needed to be prepared and approved by the "governing body" which would be the City Council. The application needs to be completed and will be presented to the City Council on 4/19/10.</p> <p>A motion to have the OPM prepare the OIG Application for the CM @ Risk delivery method and submit it to the City Council for approval was made by Robert Vogler (RV) and seconded by George Kazanjian (GK) and voted unanimously in favor.</p>
6.	Invoices	<p>FA+A – 80% Schematic Design fee – A motion to approve payment for this invoice was made by Stephen Zanni (SZ) and seconded by Arthur Nicholson (AN). Voted unanimously in favor.</p> <p>KBA/Trident – Month of March reimbursables – A motion to approve payment for this invoice was made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) and seconded by Stephen Zanni (SZ). Voted unanimously in favor.</p>
7.	Other Business	<p>Central Office Space: There was a brief discussion about the Central Office space requirements. The program space requirements have been submitted from Central Office. RV indicated that he thought the costs associated with the Central Office relocation should be paid for out of the City Bond or the School budget.</p> <p>Next meeting: April 27, 2010 at 3:30.</p>
8.	Adjourn	<p>Motion made by Arthur Nicholson (AN) to adjourn, seconded by Robert Vogler (RV). Unanimous vote in favor to adjourn at 4:05 PM.</p>

To the best of my knowledge, these notes are a fair representation of the issues and items discussed at the meeting. Additional items or corrections should be brought to the attention of the writer.

Submitted by: Daniel P. Bradford, AIA