

Gorham Randolph Shelburne Cooperative School District Building Committee
Tuesday, August 8, 2006
GMHS Library

Present: Nancy Burlison, John Carpenter, Conrad Deutsch, Katie Kelley, Reed Leberman, Jean Tremblay (@7pm), and Ben Mayerson

Staff Present: Paul Bousquet, Karen Cloutier, Keith Parent, and Pauline Plourde,

Other: Angela Brown, Jo Carpenter, and Greg Corrigan

I. Call to Order: By Ben Mayerson at 6:30 PM

II. Minutes: Nancy moved that the public and nonpublic minutes of the July 24, 2006 meeting be accepted. Motion seconded by Reed. Discussion of revisions ensued. Motion passed, all in favor of revised minutes.

III. Committee member feedback:

- Waterville, Campton, Bartlett, and Jackson should be studied to determine the impact of new home building on student population
- Committee role versus the School Board's role as we move forward
- Hire another consultant if we feel we need it, to make some of the decisions we will be making.
- Contact the Selectmen of the towns for their feelings about whether to build new or renovate the high school.
- To make decisions on these buildings based on long-range master plans
- Evaluate all possible alternatives
- Go through the building requirements and note what was truly needed versus wanted or prioritize the wants versus the needs
- To only move forward with a 10% plus or minus proposal and nothing tighter, due to surprises related to renovation and material increases
- Go to the State and local officials early on the project to get approval
- Not to rush
- Do not trade quality for space
- Work on transition plans, equipment selection, and furnishing plans once concepts are finished
- We need a process chart because it gets busy by October
- We need to meet the architect's timeline for decisions as well.
- Once we see the numbers on a project we will begin to get feedback from the community about what is feasible.
- Provide the architect some financial parameters so that we have four or five viable options
- Committee should members maintain a trusting relationship, which confidently allows us to speak freely at meetings, and foster a supportive dialog.

Paul said that the Committee members are fully participating and that would hold us in a good stead.

Keith said this process would have an impact on our accreditation. NEASC has already pushed our response letter due date to April so that we can inform them of the successful bond vote.

IV. Financials: The bill for Banwell, which had been budgeted at \$39,500, came in at \$26,700. Balance remaining for FY 06-07 is \$338,500 (+/-). \$115,000 has been approved for pre bond architectural fees.

V. Banwell: The contract has been reviewed by the SAU office for the architectural services. The office has sent the contract to the lawyers for review. It will be sent to Banwell for their review. The contract currently asks for up to four GMHS concepts and two EFS concepts. This will include one totally new on site concept for GMHS. A question was asked if we had AutoCAD so that the drawing could be transmitted electronically to the school from David Laurin's office. It was noted that it might not be beneficial to do that and perhaps PDF files would be more appropriate. It was noted that a PDF format was universal for all to read the drawings, would cost nothing compared to literally thousands for AutoCAD, and that files should be provided in a read only format.

Banwell urges us to secure a Construction Manager ASAP. A RFP has been prepared by Pauline with some suggestions from Banwell. The SAU attorney is currently reviewing it. August 16 has been tentatively set for a mandatory walk through by potential bidders. We hope to have the RFP responses in by August 23, so that two or three could be interviewed before the end of the month. It was asked how much input David will have in the selection of the contractor. A member suggested a clear definition of a Construction Manager role, responsibility, and whom he reports to and how he will work with the architect and the owner. It was suggested that having a five-day turnaround at this time of year was perhaps too short, and that least a week from the initial mailing of the RFP, should be allowed. It was asked if we would follow the same process as we used to select an architect. Ben answered that he anticipated the same process, as it had worked well, in the past.

It was suggested that we go see some of Banwell's work perhaps Hanover or Conway. Several members suggested including faculty in the tour, so that they could ask questions and to foster their inclusion in the process. Milford and Concord were also discussed, as would be worth seeing as well. Some felt that Milford was too far away. The office will ask David to join the Committee and others at Hanover and Concord ASAP.

VI. Notes from Interviews: John developed a list generated from the interviews last month for the Committee to look at. It will also be shared with Banwell. A question of what item #p meant concerning "bettering the code by 25%." There was a question about the cost of "staging" the renovation project being 10% as mentioned by one person in the interview. We will ask David for clarification.

Ben asked for a list of questions and topics that David should address at our joint meeting with the Board on August 17 at 6:30 pm. He will forward those questions to David.

Paul was asked about grade reallocation and full day Kindergarten. He said a decision has been made and will be discussed at the Board meeting next week.

VII. Vision Statement: Reed will continue to refine the initial list developed by Katie and him. It will be shared as well with Banwell. We need to clarify terms as we develop the vision such as green building versus high performance structure. It was suggested that the vision statement be no more than 2-3 sentences. The concept of using the list and vision statement as part of the PR campaign was discussed.

VIII. Other & Public Comment: None

IX. Next meeting will be August 17 at 6:30 in the GMHS Library.

The agenda will include: minutes, Construction Management update, Board Actions, David Laurin discussion, Vision Statement development.

Karen Cloutier asked about how soon the educational specifications needed by be done for the Edward Fenn because as our policy states, she would like to include faculty, staff, and community in the discussion.

X. John moved that we adjourn the meeting. Nancy seconded the motion. Meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Sincerely submitted, Kathleen Kelley

bwm