



MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: September 13, 2018, at 5:30 P.M. at the Williamstown Elementary School in Williamstown, MA

PROJECT: Mount Greylock Regional Middle High School

SUBJECT: School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#55)

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek	SBC Chair
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair Williamstown (Left at 6:29pm)
	Kimberley Grady	Interim Superintendent of Schools
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown Selectman
	Carrie Greene	School Committee
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Thomas H. Bartels	Williamstown
	Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
	Al Terranova	School Committee
	Mike Cox	DWMP
	Dan Colli	Perkins Eastman
	Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction
	Mike Giso	Turner Construction

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:46 PM by M. Schiek with 9 voting Members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of August 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

August 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting.

Motion to approve the August 16, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: C. Greene, requests on page 1, under attendance to remove “vice chair” from her name.

M. Schiek request to correct the spelling of his name throughout the meeting minutes. Request to replace “any” with “a specific amount” on page 6 of the minutes before, to the line “R. Cohen states, this body did not approve any amount of money for permitting or fees.”

VOTE: 7 approve, 0 against, 2 abstain

3. **Perkins Eastman Amendment #10, on-site soil stockpile design in the amount of \$23,000.00 (Vote Expected)**

Motion to accept amendment #10 in the amount of \$23,000.00 on the condition that the soil is tested prior to next step of design work by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald.

Discussion: D. Colli states, we have an approximately 15,000 sq/ft stock pile that needs to be moved.

We did not expect to have this amount of soil and would now like to engage an engineer. T. Bartels asks, did we not forecast this amount? And can we test the material? D. Colli responds, we did not forecast this amount as a large portion came from the parking lot which was added late to the project. Secondly, we have not tested the soil to this point, and believe the soil is clean but would will test prior. R. Cohen states. We should test the soil first, but to be mindful of the budget as we go through the process. D. Colli states, in the current contract, we own spreading of the soil around the site, and notes that trucking the soil offsite would be expensive.

VOTE: 8 approve, 1 against, 0 abstain

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7
978.499.2999 ph
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

4. **Construction Change Order Request #068 for Fuel Oil Delivery System upgrades for \$86,629 to be funded from Construction Contingency review and approval (Vote Expected)**

Motion to approve Change Order Request #068 in the amount of \$86,629.00 by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald.

Discussion: The current fuel oil delivery system is a combination of work done in 2010 as well as existing structure. This change will be submitted to the MSBA as a failure from 2010 in hope for reimbursement. Nevertheless, this work will need to take place to correct the system.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

5. **Budget Revision Request #20 to adjust budget line item for Perkins Eastman Amendment #10 for \$23,000. Funded from Owners Contingency. (Vote Expected)**

Motion to approve Budget Revision Request by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley

Discussion: M. Cox explains, as always is the case, we need to move the money in the budget to fund the above approved amendment. The BRR is how we move the money and submit it to the MSBA.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

6. **Budget update – summary included in the meeting packet**

As usual, M. Cox state that the budget is always reflective of the previous months' meetings approved invoice, Budget Revisions, Amendments etc. M. Cox direct the committee to various lines on page 24 of 87 pointing out the Owners Contingency line amount with a remaining budget of \$528,000.00. We do know that some of this amount is earmarked already, as well as the COR-068 that was approved in this meeting and will be drawn from that bucket. The second line item that was point out is other Project cost, where we have a remaining budget amount of \$220,00.00 and again we have four invoices today that will be drawn from that bucket upon approval. Lastly, M. Cox states we have approximately 1.3 million remaining.

7. **Schedule Update –**

M. Ziobrowski state, we are working in the auditorium now and are currently tracking the 3rd week in October to be ready for the town inspection. The boiler room and band storage rooms are also in progress and are tracking a 10/1/18 substantial completion date and will at that point be ready for TCO inspections. On the exterior of the building, there will be sitework continuing through the month of October. M. Schiek ask, why are we behind schedule? M. Ziobrowski response, the schedule is due to lead times on equipment, noting the stage curtains have been ordered but have a long lead time. R. Cohen ask the constructing team, are their any risk factors we should be aware of? How many unknowns are possible with the remaining work to be complete? M. Ziobrowski responds, other than lead times, there should not be any major concerns to watch out for.

R. Cohen ask, how is the egress around the building now that school is in session and site work is continuing? M. Ziobrowski responds, there is no issue. As part of receiving our TCO to open school, it was also required to have an egress plan and exits available around the building in case of emergency.

Punchlist is in progress and is approximately 75% complete to this point on the TCO portion of the building. K. Grady states, the district has an OPM, H. Maynard (OPM Clerk of the Works) who has been going through the punch list daily and is very thorough. M. MacDonald states, as a school we

have a punch list we are creating as well by the teachers, but it should be noted that there is a lot of crossover between the construction punch list and the school manufactured punch list.

8. Public Comment/Concerns -

M. Sheehy, of strongly urges the committee to not take action on the Williamstown Permit Fee invoice agenda item. M. Sheehy believes there needs to be further conversations had on the item. Based on conversation had with the Williamstown select board, he believes more conversations need to occur with that body. After reading all the commentary, M. Sheehy also believes the Williamstown select board is the correct body to make a final ruling on this matter.

Furthermore, there are some questions that still need to be answered, such as what permitting rate sheet is being used, the 2018 form, or the form when these permits would have been pulled? M. Sheehy noted the permit cost have risen 194 percent since the time this project started. M. Sheehy closes out by reiterating, if the body accepts, he requests to not move forward on the invoice, but to wait and have those important conversations and gather more information in a transparent fashion so everyone can understand before a final decision is made.

9. Invoices (Vote Recorded):

a. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 37 in the amount of \$70,426.91 for Designer services and Hazmat Monitoring in July 2018

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

b. D&W Management Partners Invoice No. 42 in the amount of \$66,711.32 for August 2018 OPM and 3rd Party Testing Services

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: M. Cox informed the committee that CME is nearing completion of their scope of work.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

c. Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 26 in the amount of \$2,926,238.14 for August 2018

Motion to approve payment of the invoice with a do not exceed amount of \$2,926,238.14 contingent on a review by DWMP and Perkins Eastman by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

d. Technology Expenditures: Three invoices totaling \$73,412.41 itemized below;

i. HP Inc. Invoice No. 60311535 = \$6,287.36

ii. HP Inc. Invoice No. 60266495 = \$2,851.48

iii. Valley Communication Systems, Inc. Invoice No. 649325 = \$64,273.57

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: R. Cohen states, he made a request back in the June SBC meeting to view the plans and process. As of last meeting R. Cohen again requested this information and states he would be abstaining from voting until this information is supplied. K. Grady responds, this information has been included within the packet.

R. Cohen request to hold reviewing and voting on the technology budget items until after the review. Committee accepts this request.

Upon the review of the technology plans and process the invoices were put up for vote.

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- e. **FF&E Expenditures: 20 invoices totaling \$159,956.62 itemized below;**
 - i. **School Furnishings Invoice No. 27167 = \$92,873.33**
 - ii. **School Furnishings Invoice No. 27168 = \$16,124.51**
 - iii. **School Furnishings Invoice No. 27169 = \$7,275.28**
 - iv. **Mt. Greylock Regional School District Invoice No. 9062018 = \$1,545.15**
 - v. **Flinn Scientific Invoice No. 2253066 = \$1,156.49**
 - vi. **Gardener's Supply Company Invoice No. SINV04951329 = \$503.16**
 - vii. **Gopher Invoice No. 4060202 = \$2,776.35**
 - viii. **Heartsmart.com Invoice No. 390021 = \$1,023.30**
 - ix. **Aubuchon Hardware Invoice No. 390233 = \$118.78**
 - x. **School Outfitters Invoice No. INV12917083 = \$4,579.88**
 - xi. **Life Support System Invoice No. 146785 = \$11,685.00**
 - xii. **Pasco Invoice No. 18IN013146 = \$6,023.00**
 - xiii. **Pasco Invoice No. 18IN013147 = \$939.00**
 - xiv. **Pasco Invoice No. 18IN013148 = \$469.00**
 - xv. **Rogue Invoice No. 4402609 = \$4,794.00**
 - xvi. **B&G Restaurant Supply, Inc. Invoice No. 0177093-IN = \$3,956.16**
 - xvii. **Connors Bros. Invoice No. 14533 = \$190.00**
 - xviii. **EmbiTec Invoice No. 27381 = \$1,294.00**
 - xix. **Carolina Invoice No. 50380280 RI = \$1,125.53**
 - xx. **BroDart Invoice No. 509283 = \$1,504.70**

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by R. Cohen, 2nd by H. Daley

Discussion: R. Cohen asks, do we anticipate any more expenditures in this area? M. MacDonald responds, yes if you look at the budget we still have a great deal of money remaining to be spent. This was done for a specific reason, as we are entering a new building with new spaces and want to make sure we are adequately furnishing the building for the needs of students. M. MacDonald continues, I am expecting over the next two months or so to have a few more expenses, specifically in the area of flexible learning spaces, with soft seating. To continue, as we are now in the space we are noticing we may need more book cases in areas. Another instance is we now know we have the budget to replace some of the weights in the P.E. space that we were non-committal about previously.

*H. Daley would like to confirm, of the FF&E invoices, these will fall into the contracted amount.
Answer, correct.*

A.Terranova asks, as these items arrive, I assume we are verifying we are receiving the correct number of items invoice. Answer, that is correct, as items arrive they are verified, counted, checked for damaged and either marked as damaged or accepted.

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- f. **CC Container Corp Invoice No. 3982 Totaling \$100.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)**

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by T. Bartels
Discussion: The container is holding all the auditorium material.

VOTE: 8 approve, 8 against, 8 abstain

g. Carr Hardware North Adams Invoice No. 606228 Totaling \$88.41 (Other Project Cost Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by M. MacDonald
Discussion: None

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

h. Neathawk Design Invoice No. 1175 Totaling \$2,750.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by T. Bartels
Discussion: They created the oil drum posted letters.

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

i. Williamstown building permit fees invoice # 20180820Turner for MGRSD Project inspections \$154,426.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)

Motion to defer payment by R. Cohen, 2nd by A. Terranova.

VOTE: 5 approve, 2 against, 1 abstain

Discussion: R. Cohen asked, why the cost has reduced from over \$300,000.00 to the amount before us now. The permit before you are in the amount of \$154,426.00 for the Turner Construction portion of the permit fees. The reduced amount is due to the reduction of the electrical permit fees on the prior bill. The electrical portion is currently being review by legal due to a bid protest. K. Grady notes in fairness to the electrical contractor, the plumbing contractor also typically pulls their own permits with the town. The electrical permit fees should have been included in the electrical bid as it was within the project spec. Currently it is a legal matter and cannot be discussed. Turner confirms this is the typical process for obtaining the required building permits.

R. Cohen states, in the process of this discussion some may hope for 100% wave of the fees, however, R. Cohen does not expect the town to grant such a request but to merely have a reduction or discount in the cost set before us. R. Cohen states, he would like to see an accounting of the actual billable hours for both the building permit inspections as well as the electrical permit inspections to understand how the costs were truly created. K. Grady responds the documents within the packet where lines are highlighted (pages 75-78) were the documents submitted regarding the process and fees. The document does not consist of many (3-4) electrical inspections. R. Cohen requests a full documentation of electrical and building permit inspections. H. Daley responds, we cannot quantify hours to cost, these are based off a fee schedule. In rebuttal, R. Cohen states in previous documentation it has been stated that we would receive a bill in the amount of billable hours because this would be a reduction of cost presumably to the published fee schedule. A request to see both hours associated with the project and their billable hourly rate, or a cost of inspection fees totaled to fully understand the costs of the permit fee.

Turner responds, the cost is 100% of the fee schedule at the time the permit was pulled (2016). H. Daley adds the fee schedule is not created ~~by the town but by a 3rd party.~~ **by the select board.**

Second Motion: Motion to invite the Williamstown Town Manager to the next SBC meeting to put forth the bill in front of the SBC, with a request to supply backup documentation prior to the meeting with a request to supply back up documentation.

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

10. Working Group Updates:

a. Facilities:

K. Grady states, at this point we have completed a majority of the trainings and have videotaped all required trainings. Additionally, we are still learning more about the building and continue to understand how to manage it effectively.

b. FF&E:

M. MacDonald states part of the google forms for teachers to voice punch list concerns is also where we are getting furniture and equipment concerns or issues. We receive feedback on where we might be short, simultaneously we are doing an evaluation on how the flexible learning spaces are being used since this is a new concept to us, as we continue to address other furnishing we might need.

C. Greene asks, since this is the first time we have meet, can we have a quick update from M. MacDonald on how the first couple of days have went, the overall reaction to the building. M. MacDonald responds, we have new faculty and staff, on top of having new student. The feedback we have received is everyone enjoys it so far. Students are still getting used to having lockers with locker combination of them, etc. In addition, we are still making mechanical changes as we adapt and learn our new building.

c. Technology:

K. Grady states, we have to finishing up work with impact to the fobs, servers, etc. and we have been pushing to have the sub get to site, which they arrived this afternoon and will be onsite for the next three days to complete the work required, therefore R. Wnuk had to remain at the high school and is unable to attend tonight. R. Wnuk was however able to submit information showing the expenditures within the technology budget line. K. Grady adds, both M. MacDonald and R. Wnuk took a shell of expenditures the FF&E consultant had before we as a body let him go, and really had to work to organize everything we as a district needed in our building. R. Cohen states, since the request was made by him, he would like to defer the discussion until next meeting. District request the OPM make a side by side comparison of the purchases made by the school to the P. Constable list created initially for the project.

K. Grady adds, it is important to note with the work continuing that in regard to security, the police, state police and fire have walked and are familiar with our facilities. They have the necessary key and fob access to the facility, with plans and egress.

d. Whiteboard:

R. Cohen, on page 86, you will see there are two images of while boards. The whiteboard on the bottom is an 8' Epson whiteboard which is compatible with the projectors we have, cost less and allows for the touch module. In addition, the image is large and very clear. While the whiteboard on top (12') is a more expensive board, is not compatible and has a map rail that is in the way to fully utilize the touch module. More importantly the image on the top is very poor and of extremely low size and quality.

K. Grady responds, it is extremely important to note, the reason the image on the top whiteboard is poor is due to the instructor bringing in her own computer rather than the school issued laptop. It is an unfair comparison of the whiteboards or projectors and their quality of image.

Request to have a true side by side comparison of bot white boards with the projected image from the same computer with the same settings.

R. Cohen explains the survey on page 85. This survey is of 23 faculty members and they were asked to rate what type of content they show using the projectors. Of the responses it was determined that 78% of people use their projectors frequently.

11. Parking Lot and Cafeteria Capacity Discussion

The cafeteria is designed to hold a max capacity of 320 individuals. This should be understood to be individual chairs possibly set up in rows, an example is in the occurrence of an overflow from the auditorium during an event or other similar situations. When the original cafeteria lunch table set was put together the original design had 272 seats available, however this was considered a little tight by the fire marshal regarding egress and movement. To oblige to this request, the school has changed to three lunches, not as many seats are now required per lunch period. The current traditional layout has 200 seats available, with space for two folding tables to hold an additional 20 seats, as well as 15-20 additional spaces available for chairs to be placed at the end of tables, in location available for wheelchairs. This allows for 235-240 available seats for lunch. The largest lunch currently is 215 students. It is important to also note in the previous cafeteria was very large and had many extra seats available at both lunches. D. Colli adds, the space is maxed out for allowable square footage and the square footage is based on the agreed upon enrollment number of 535 students. The school currently has an enrollment number of 270 570+ students. Additionally the MSBA would typically request for three lunches. R. Cohen states, a form that's was created by M. MacDonald and was submitted to

the state for this project and now is a model on the state website reads, that we request to keep two lunches specifically. R. Cohen adds two lunches is what we as a group agreed upon and proposed to the state and the community. The switch to three lunches occurred without a conversation or notion to the committee this was a possibility. M. MacDonald responds, when the analysis and documents were created we projected 98 students to enter the school each year. This year we have a 7th grade class of 128 students which is certainly an anomaly. Therefor, to have the 7th, 8th, and 9th grade to all have lunch together would have been too large to manage. R. Cohen rebuts, although scheduling is a school activity we have a duty to build a building for not just the present but the future 30-50 years, one suggestion brought forward to increase seating capacity would be to add bar seating along one wall. This was address by informing the committee the discussions of adding bar seats was had, was considered not a good option particularly for middle school students. M. MacDonald adds that with the additional FF&E budget the school is still currently looking into possible seating options now that we can see how the school will need to operate. For example, an additional café table of similar look is being looked at to replace the folding tables currently in use. M. MacDonald also states we also did not buy all new tables, we simply replaced the seats to match the new design.

R. Cohen request that we as a community not just the administration or staff be able to bring forth outside ideas to upgrade the academic eating experience.

~~Parking Lot - R. Cohen brings forth some concerns brought forth with the brief parking lot working group that the new parking lot capacity will be much less than the original lot. Due to the location on Rt. 7 we do not have the ability for street parking or other venues. R. Cohen wanted to bring forth the idea of possibly using the area the trailers are currently placed as overflow parking.~~

Parking Lot - R. Cohen brings forth some concerns that he had brought forth with the brief parking lot working group during the early design discussion that the new parking lot capacity will be much less than the original lot. Due to the location on Rt. 7 we do not have the ability for street parking or other venues. R. Cohen wanted to bring forth the idea of possibly converting the area the trailers are currently placed as overflow parking within the scope and lifecycle of this project. The discussion does not have to take place tonight but would like to have this discussion before it's too late.

M. MacDonald addresses the concern of the six electric car parking spaces. Stating these six spaces, similar to the bike racks, were additions to help the project reach our LEED point goal. There are no signs that the spaces are not available unless you have an electric car. It is also important to note that to the knowledge of M. MacDonald and K. Grady that they, nor any faculty drive electric cars currently. Again, similar to the bike racks, the school does not encourage students to ride bike, and to her knowledge no students do, although a few teachers ride.

C. Greene request we possibly create a public form to receive outside concerns. Committee responds, there are no available personnel to manage a document or a website. M. Schiek adds, we currently do have a public form in the SBC meeting. Similar to what M. Sheehy did earlier this evening, he sent an email and attended the meeting to voice his concern. It is understood that not everyone can attend the meeting, but the emails of the administration are available for the public to reach out to.

H. Daley adds, the running of the school, and the setting of the schedule most likely having at the school committee level. It is important to know anything at the operations level be knocked off the plate as we do not have any control in those matters.

12. Other Business Not Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting: None

The Ribbon Cutting Ceremony has been postponed to a later date. Once a date and time have been determined more information will be available.

13. Upcoming SBC Meeting

- i. October 13th at 5:30PM at Mount Greylock Regional School (Meeting will be able to be recorded but not live streamed)

**14. Motion to adjourn by A. Terranova, 2nd by H. Daley, VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
Meeting adjourn at 8:11 PM**

These minutes are a summation of the meeting and may not include all details discussed or comments made. For an accurate record of this meeting it has been recorded and can be viewed on the local Willinet community TV and internet link: <http://willinet.org/content/mgrhs-committee-meetings>

Mike Cox

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File.

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.