

Mount Greylock Regional School District School Committee Committee

Location: Zoom Remote Meeting Wednesday, June 30, 2021 5:00PM

Location: Zoom Remote Meeting

Present: Julia Bowen, Christina Conry, Jose Constantine, Curtis Eifenbein, Carrie Greene, Steve Miller, Ursula Maloy

Also present: Jason McCandless, Joe Bergeron, Arthur Eddy

- I. Call to Order
- II. MISSION: At Mount Greylock Regional School District, our mission is to create a community of learners working together in a safe and challenging learning environment that encourages restorative based processes, respect, inclusive diversity, courtesy, integrity, and responsibility through high expectations and cooperation resulting in life-long learning and personal growth.
- III. Review of Fields Project (ADA/Safety/Title IX) bid results VOTE
- IV. Motion to move into Executive Session with intent to return to Open Session pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 30A, 21(a)(3) to conduct a strategy session with respect to collective bargaining (MGEA, all units).
- V. Discussion and approval of agreement with MGEA (all units) for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. VOTE
- VI. Other items for discussion not reasonably anticipated by the chair 48 hours before the meeting.
- VII. Motion to adjourn

MINUTES:

- I. Call to Order: 5pm
5:01pm
- II. MISSION: At Mount Greylock Regional School District, our mission is to create a community of learners working together in a safe and challenging learning environment that encourages restorative based processes, respect, inclusive diversity, courtesy, integrity, and responsibility through high expectations and cooperation resulting in life-long learning and personal growth.
- III. Review of Fields Project (ADA/Safety/Title IX) bid results VOTE

Joe: Art from Traverse will go into details. Moved ADA / safety / title IX out to bid. Have not received any of the details, Art Eddy will reveal.

Art: Two bids, have reached out to two other bidders as to why didn't bid.

MOUNT GREYLOCK REGIONAL SCHOOL
ATHLETIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
BID RESULTS
DATE: 6/30/2021

Bid/Company	HM Nunes & son Construction		Mount View Landscapes	Variance
Vehicular Pavement	\$ 85,000.00		\$ 125,000.00	\$ (40,000.00)
ADA Access Improvements	\$ 45,000.00		\$ 104,000.00	\$ (59,000.00)
Fencing Including Backstops	\$ 130,000.00		\$ 182,000.00	\$ (52,000.00)
Softball/JV Baseball Field Drainage Improvements	\$ 200,000.00		\$ 139,000.00	\$ 61,000.00
Softball Field Improvments	\$ 225,000.00		\$ 405,000.00	\$ (180,000.00)
Athletic Amenities	\$ 230,000.00		\$ 263,000.00	\$ (33,000.00)
Sod including watering	\$ 140,000.00		\$ 112,500.00	\$ 27,500.00
Landscape	\$ 90,000.00		\$ 33,500.00	\$ 56,500.00
Other	\$ 186,000.00		\$ 23,500.00	\$ 162,500.00
Alternate #1 JV Softball/Baseball Backstops	\$25,000.00		\$ 115,000.00	\$ (90,000.00)
Total Base Bid:	\$ 1,331,000.00		\$ 1,387,500.00	\$ (56,500.00)
Total Base Bid and Alternate	\$ 1,356,000.00		\$ 1,502,500.00	\$ (146,500.00)

When look at variances, numbers while close each category is significantly different, trying to understand the discrepancy, both bidders provided all information. HM Nunes & Son: mostly asphalt / walks, do have two fields in their references, did call and got a positive response for Waltham softball field and want to follow up on other, want to see about their qualifications for athletic fields.

Sod, including water, pretty big discrepancy. Came in significantly higher. Other was athletic amenities. Due to covid shortages / labor shortages.

We fall right in the middle each time. Tried to evaluate where we ended up. For example, vehicular placement was \$85k from one, \$125 for another, our \$90 was in-between.

Steve: what were we expecting?

Art: adding drainage, JV, \$1,087,026; this is significantly higher.

Carrie: In terms of process: can accept lower bid, can we delay and see if others planning to bid?

Art: Bid deadline passed, cannot accept any new bids. Could ask for value engineering, have to ask both. Other option not to accept bids.

Carrie: Need to request a waiver from the state as forgoing work cycle.

Julia: To get value engineering we would have to let go of things?

Art: Not 100% true. They might be able to say if we do it this way it is less expensive, are you open to say changing the material.... Issue is time.

Joe: Given your take: is it possible that they are mis-understanding any specification and bidding higher? Asking you to speculate.

Art: Hard to tell as only two bidders, want to know why others did not as asked them to bid (RI Sports, Shaker Flats). Hard to tell with such big discrepancies. Might have under-estimated watering for the site. Other is athletic improvement amenities, some material shortages.

Curtis: Did either bidder provide itemization for line items?

Art: No, didn't line item.

Steve: Every time we bid we are so far off, can you comment?

Art: Was a third party estimate. Provided in January. Took that estimate, used their numbers to develop the estimate given. Some pieces we cannot control (labor shortages). I would admittedly say that the watering number was low.

Julia: Wanted a July 5th start so would be ready sometime in the fall.

Art: Value added could push back a few days to just 8th or 9th. Will see numbers come down a little. Cannot say how much.

Ursula: If can do in a few days, support going back but do want to see this started.

Art: Can lose time but cannot lose the project if we go back.

Carrie: Before asking to value engineer: what is the number we are looking for? What is the deadline that we need? The real deadline....

Joe: We couldn't start till July 5th because could have teams playing as late as July 3rd.... First factor in the fall was a September cross country meet, first major item to run across the new fields. Aside from that was looking at JV soccer and not having that field available for the team.

Carrie: Speculation, not sure if helpful to do: One of the reasons to get this done now, besides need to, is it takes the pressure off the bigger project. Breathe and reassess if want to move forward on the bigger project, how does it fit into the academic mission / strategic plan (synthetic turf, track). Separates discussion from what state requires to what we would want. Support getting this done, not sure if coming in significantly higher is a reason to say no. Question: Is there any way to say these prices are coming in higher, mentioned covid and cost of materials, that could continue to go up. Steve alluded to these cost issues before, taking a pass on this doesn't seem the right thing to do, leaning to value engineering. How do we assess they are doing the right things?

Ursula: Agree, don't think we are far enough away that if they can come down slightly in the right ballpark. Feels close enough.

Steve: Fortunate to have a generous gift from the college, not asking the taxpayers, have had this conversation too many times, need to start building, do we have unrealistic expectations about the cost, great to have in the endowment but more seasons with kids not having the benefit of the facilities.

Julia: In agreement with people, thinking of cost benefit, thinking of money in endowment growing, worth trying to save money.

Art: If decide to move from this, don't see numbers coming down, construction cost issues.

Carrie: Can we value engineer?

Art: We can make suggestions, have to bid fairly across the board. Can potentially ask bidders about putting add-alternates into base.

Carrie: do we need a vote to send back to bidders for value engineering?

Joe: Before doing that, school committee would be authorizing team to create an equal playing field that involves value engineering. Both bidders must have an equal opportunity to revise.

Julia: Can they say if do it this way it is less expensive?

Art: Yes

Steve: For the record, new bidders cannot enter to value engineer.

Motion: Motion to authorize administration and design team to perform value engineering and request the bidders to submit updated bids based on that and their ability to lower costs. Moved by Carrie, seconded by Julia.

Discussion:

Carrie: What is the timeline?

Joe: Art, what's a reasonable turn-around?

Art: Will create a list tonight. We do not have to accept the value engineering.

Do not want to meet on the 5th (federal holiday), aiming for Tuesday. Maybe 7th or 8th.

Steve: Let's schedule multiple meetings so if able to go earlier, or if need....

Wednesday at 5pm, Thursday at 530pm.

Motion passes.

Bowen aye, Conry aye, Constantine abstain, Elfenbein aye, Greene aye, Maloy aye, Miller aye.

- IV. Motion to move into Executive Session with intent to return to Open Session pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 30A, 21(a)(3) to conduct a strategy session with respect to collective bargaining (MGEA, all units)

Julia moves, Curtis seconds.

Bowen aye, Conry aye, Constantine aye, Elfenbein aye, Greene aye, Maloy aye, Miller abstain.

Motion passes at 5:47pm.

- V. Discussion and approval of agreement with MGEA (all units) for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.

(return 6:01pm)

Motion to approve all settlement agreements with MGEA (all units) for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. Motion by Curtis, seconded by Ursula.

Bowen aye, Conry aye, Constantine aye, Elfenbein aye, Greene aye, Maloy aye, Miller aye.

Motion passes unanimously.

- VI. Other items for discussion not reasonably anticipated by the chair 48 hours before the meeting.

- VII. Motion to Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Julia, seconded by Curtis, passes unanimously.
Bowen aye, Conry aye, Constantine aye, Elfenbein aye, Greene aye, Maloy aye, Miller aye.
Adjourned at 6:03pm

Motion passes unanimously.

Minutes taken by Steven Miller, Secretary

Approved 7.15.21