



MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: October 10, 2018, at 5:30 P.M. at the Mount Greylock Regional Middle High School in Williamstown, MA

PROJECT: Mount Greylock Regional Middle High School

SUBJECT: School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#56)

ATTENDING:	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair Williamstown
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown
	Carrie Greene	School Committee Vice-Chair
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee
	Thomas Bartels	Williamstown
	Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
	Al Terranova	School Committee
	Trip Elmore	DWMP
	Mike Cox	DWMP
	Dan Colli	Perkins Eastman
	Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction
	Jason Hoch	Williamstown Town Manager

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:36 PM by P. Consolini with 9 voting Members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of September 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

September 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting. *Motion to approve the September 13, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes as amended by C. Greene, 2nd by H. Daley*

Discussion: H. Daley notes a revision on page 7 of 77 "Turner responds, the cost is 100% 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" Please change the last line to 'H. Daley adds the fee schedule is not created by the select board.'

T. Bartels request to remove "Interim" from Kim Grady's title on the attendance.

C. Greene requests a change on page 9 in the middle of the paragraph where it is stated that the school currently has an enrollment of 270 students, please revise to a current enrollment of 570+ students.

R. Cohen request to change the follow except; "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."

The corrected version now reads; 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."

VOTE: 6 approve, 0 against, 3 abstain

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

3. Invited Guest, Williamstown Town Manager

P. Consolini introduced, Williamstown Town Manager Jason Hoch.

J. Hoch starts by adding context to the permit fees invoice. Stating a lot of time has elapsed since we first started this conversation. Going back to the letter that was sent to Superintendent Dias back in 2015. If you go back to the time period, I was asked where the town is as far as fees were concerned. I was cognizant of where you all were at having just come out of the value engineering phase and we still had ahead of us, final numbers going out to both committees for the bond vote. We also didn't know what the interest rate environment was going to be like at that point, and at the end of the day you were doing a large project with renovation in it. So, in all of your well-planned contingencies there were a lot of unknowns, as is with all renovation projects. Obviously, the town wanted to be as supportive as we could to the project considering that uncertainty. On the other hand, the town charges for these services and we have one fee schedule. We charge all projects, whether it's a home owner with a garage or a college or school project, from one standard fee schedule. And that fee schedule is based in part on cost and in part on where market numbers are. Cost is a very difficult thing to track. We in Williamstown have been blessed recently with a lot of really large projects. In the years you have multiple large projects, the cost of one more project is negligible, however in years where there are few projects it is not. We don't have a see-saw schedule. We do however, test every now and again to make sure we are not outliers to our peers. It is important to note there is no one benchmark. Different rates are charged around the state, so its more region by region.

J. Hoch states, the rates are set though the town office with his approval which came during the town vote back in 2000, granting that authority to the fee charging departments. J. Hoch adds, the only times fees are not charged are when the project is paid in full (100%) by the tax payers of Williamstown, including the library, Williamstown Elementary School and the police station. When Superintendent Dias requested to wave the permit fees, it made for a difficult decision for the Town Building Department. Just a couple of weeks prior, a town meeting was held, and a vote passed on how to allocate the charges among the towns. Therefore, J Hoch made an agreement, that if the project was completed under budget and that funds were available with no uncertainty that the expectation is the fees would be paid in full. However, if something happened along the way, and the project ran short of funds, the town would not want to stand in the way of a critical part of the building project, so the Inspection fees could be paid. J. Hoch continues, at this stage, the project has been run very well and there are funds available. Therefore, we are reaffirming, that the permit fees will be paid in full at the end of the project, given that no great surprises arise from now through the end of the project. The question was raised again at this time because it had been a while since previously discussed, and technically the issuance of a TCO requires all permit fees to have been paid in full. On typical projects fees are paid at the beginning of projects, therefore J. Hoch raised the question when going through the August 2018 TCO checklist prior to opening the building. The TCO in fact was not held up for this due to the agreement/understanding J. Hoch had from previous communications.

H. Daley, asks J. Hoch, the fees are simple math based on our project budget, correct? J. Hoch answers, yes.

T. Bartels states, I believe the main understanding is to do this on a cost bases. Charging the permit fee on what was spent, which would come to a much lower total amount than that of the fee schedule. Adding, that he would like to wait until the end of the project to vote on permit fees as J. Hoch had previously suggested.

J. Hoch responds by confirming that time is not an issue, but rather we could not issue the TCO without at least raising the question again, and he is looking for confirmation that if funds are available at the end of the project that the permit fees would be paid in full in accordance to the bill and fee schedule. Continuing by stating it is very difficult to be able to monetize the time spent on the project. The inspections can be monetized, but the time spend on emails, calls, research, etc. cannot be.

C. Greene, we received a bill back in March for the permit fees. This has been on our radar since that time. We as a committee have been under the impression that these fees were required to be paid in full.

R. Cohen challenges that the total cost to the town based on research he has done would equal closer to \$30,000.00. I believe it is important to note, you are charging us 5x the reasonable cost. Jason, responds, thank you for bringing these numbers with backup, but I can come here and bring an alternate variation of those numbers to support my side as well.

R. Cohen brings further research, to represent how being a part of a region typically follows with a reduced or removed permit cost.

To wrap up, the permit fees being asked to be paid by J. Hoch are the general contractor fees in full, determined by the fee schedule. The renovation portion is based on a dollar amount of the estimated cost, and the new construction is based on a per square foot cost.

The "other" permit fees that were initially included in the \$300,000. Bill brought forth two month ago are no longer on the table. They are currently being reviewed with counsel.

4. **Public Comment:** *None*

5. **Budget Update - summary included in the meeting packet**

T. Elmore states, we did meet this month, as we have in the past. We reviewed the forecast which has been ongoing since last January. On page 11 of 77, the typically budget. I am going to reiterate, the budget is updated to the last school building committee meeting, it does not include forecasting. We have realized while not out of money, we are getting close to the end and would like to put a stop to change work. Turner has informed us the GMP contingency has all been allocated to work to be performed, continuing, and we are 99% done at this point.

To reiterate, we have not gone over, we have slid right up to the end and are now stopping other changes. The Permitting fees \$154,426.00 has been included as a cost to be paid within the latest budget forecast.

C. Greene do we have a figure put in for the dirt pile. T. Elmore states we have put \$300,000 aside for the dirt, should we have to handle beyond the scope we have with the site contractor. We have a current plan to distribute it into the abutting hill slope and create a flattened plateau which could be potentially be mowed and used as field space. Currently, we own the spreading of this dirt stockpile. But nothing further than that. Turner is looking to be released and given direction on where to move it, which the architect is currently working on this plan. Lets' remember, we had to take out 2+ ft deep of fill in the parking lot that added to the dirt pile as a part of that Change Order, which more than doubled the volume of the stockpile.

T. Bartels, from my understanding the material is typically owned by the sub-contractor. T. Elmore we did not buy removal of any of the dirt from the site. The soil pile is owned by the Owner, not anyone else. C. Greene, to go back to T. Elmore's statement, we did do a great deal testing when initially were looking for a site. C. Greene asks, were any of the areas we flagged as possibly contaminated. T. Elmore states, we have no reason to believe it is contaminated based on previous testing locations.

R. Cohen, we do not have any money set aside to correct the whiteboard problem. Auxiliary parking, do we have any sort of plan? T. Elmore responds, the trailer area is currently planned to be graded and seeded. If we were to add a parking lot we could be required to go back in-front of the zoning and planning board which would add a significant amount of approval time.

T. Elmore states, if the SBC wants to like to proceed with this, we would need to get a design and give direction to Turner.

C. Greene, how does waiting till May 2019, effect closeout. Town Policy, T Elmore responds that, realistically we will be slice seeding in May for areas recently or will be seeded. For all the subs who have completed 100% of their work it will take 2-3 months of changes being processed to close out their contracts. So, the close out most subs occurs between December – February. Contracts that will remain open are site and landscape trades for the comeback seeding and site erosion repairs. The LEED submission will not be fully reviewed until you give them the 10 month commissioning report which is like to be issued in September 2019. Therefore, LEED will issue their report this time next year. Then we can move to MSBA, they will take 6 months to review. Bringing us to March 2020. (Forecast Closeout)

H. Daley stats, we need to do a forecasting, to know if this is even cost effective or possible timeline. T. Elmore, I do not believe this can be done before the snow fall.

*Motion to have the architect review and propose options with a not to exceed amount of \$7,500.00 to alter the laydown area into an auxiliary parking lot and show project impacts by R Cohn, 2nd by M. MacDonald. (design services only).
Discussion: none*

VOTE: 4 approve, 4 against, 1 abstain. Motion Fails.

6. D&W Management Partners Amendment #8 in the amount of \$13,875.92 for additional Owners 3rd Party Testing (Vote Expected)

Motion to approve Amendment #8 in the amount of \$13,875.92 by H. Daley 2nd by S. Wentworth
Discussion: T. Elmore states, we received two bills from CME testing agency. As I have been stating we were getting close to this, in addition to the bill in hand I have added \$5,000.00 to see us through to the end of the project.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

7. Construction Change Order #9 in the amount of \$84,070.00 (Vote Expected)

Motion to approve Change Order #9 in the amount of \$84,070.00 for a new fuel delivery system by H. Daley, 2nd by T. Bartels.
Discussion: T. Elmore states, as you recall from last meeting, this change work for a new fuel delivery system was approved with a “do not exceed” amount of \$87,000. We have since done the review work and it has been reduced to \$84,070.00. Again, if you recall this work was a rush because the boilers need to be turned on by this Monday 10/15 and is critical.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

8. **Budget Revision Request #21 to adjust budget line item for D&W Management Partners Amendment #8. Funded from Owners Contingency. (Vote Expected)**
Motion to approve Budget Revision Request by H. Daley, 2nd by T. Bartels.
Discussion: T. Elmore explains, as we have been doing all project, as money is approved in amendment, we need to fund those contract changes with a budget revision request. D&W Management Partners amendment is funded from Owners Contingency, leaving a balance of \$724.00
VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
9. **Invoices (Vote Recorded):**
- a. **Williamstown building permit fees invoice # 20180820Turner for MGRSD Project inspections \$154,426.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)**
*Discussion: T. Bartels moves to postpone **discussion** of the permit fee vote until the end of the project. No objections raised, motion passes unanimously.*
VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
- b. **Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 38 in the amount of \$39,300.18 for Designer services in September 2018**
Motion to approve payment of the invoice by C. Greene, 2nd by H. Daley
Discussion: None
VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
- c. **D&W Management Partners Invoice No. 43 in the amount of \$71,509.48 for September 2018 OPM and 3rd Party Testing Services**
Motion to approve payment of the invoice by C. Greene 2nd by S. Wentworth
Discussion: None (H. Daley stepped out)
VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
- d. **Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 27 in the amount of \$1,015,981.36 for September 2018**
Motion to approve payment of the invoice by C Greene, 2nd by S. Wentworth.
Discussion: None
VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain
- e. **Technology Expenditures: Seven invoices totaling \$339,350.98 itemized below;**
- i. **HP Valley Communications Inv No. 649794 - \$39,138.17**
 - ii. **Valley Communications Inv No. 649795 - \$234,444.48**
 - iii. **Valley Communications Inv No. 649796 - \$3,295.70**
 - iv. **Valley Communications Inv No. 649797 - \$896.20**
 - v. **Valley Communications Inv No. 649798 - \$59,698.36**
 - vi. **Johnson Controls Invoice No. 41195653 = \$1,396.00**
 - vii. **CDW-G Inv No. PGV4120 = \$482.07**

Motion to approve payment of the Technology Expenditures invoices by A. Terranova 2nd by C. Greene.

Discussion: R. Cohen states, I made a request back in June regarding a service contract for \$15,000.00 and how it fit into the project. Since then I have made many requests for a budget update, and to have a better understanding of how these purchases were being made. R. Cohen adds, I was abstaining until we received this information. Last month R. Cohen chose not to abstain because he felt he had started to see the information requested. However, this month we still do not have a true update, and it was requested to have a comparison matrix of the technology budget items purchased to the 3rd party information we received before letting that 3rd party go. T. Elmore responds, regarding the 3rd party, no one owns that kind of review. Although a request has been made. The District has been following a needs-based approach for the school.

R. Cohen follow up, asking, how do we know where we are with the overall budget and how much remains. T. Elmore answers, to explain, what we do is receive all invoices or known PO's from the district and enter them into our budget. Continuing, on page 13 of 77, sixth line from the bottom, Computer Equipment we have a budget line amount of 672,000.00. There is a contracted amount of \$631,000.00 and we have previously paid 289,000.00. Leaving \$342,000.00 left and there is a \$40,000.00 budget balance.

R. Cohen follows up by asking, are we aware of any additional needs we may have from now until the end of the project? Wish list items? P. Consolini responds states, unfortunately the Superintendent isn't here tonight, otherwise she would be able to answer those questions.

R. Cohen responds, if there is any money remaining, we know there is a defect which is the incompatibility of the whiteboards, can we allocate some of that extra funding to remediate this issue.

P. Consolini, responds, we can certainly look into this, however, we also need to understand the MSBA reimbursement ramification of moving the budget around. Continuing, the needs-based approach as worked well in this project and as M. MacDonald noted, it has help save a lot of money in the furnishings budget.

M. MacDonald states, the needs base approach has worked very well thus far. The approach has also worked well specifically in the flexible learn spaces as we are learning how the teachers will be using these spaces. In the coming department meetings, one of the agenda items is the use of flexible learning spaces and feedback from the teachers on what other furnishing could be useful.

A.Terranova states, we have put subcommittees together for the purpose of gathering this information and determining what the school needs. We need to lean on these individual's expertise.

M. MacDonald, in a formal meeting we have had a review of the whiteboards, and I will come with that information as well as pictures of both whiteboards with the same picture resolution.

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain

- f. FF&E Expenditures: 14 invoices totaling \$16,971.28 itemized below;**
 - i. Amazon Invoice No. 390267 = \$102.53**
 - ii. Aubuchon Invoice No. 948802 = \$165.25**
 - iii. B&G Restaurant Supply Invoice No. 0178790-IN = \$145.18**
 - iv. MG invoice No. 9192018 = \$1,525.71**

- v. **Richco Invoice No. 146459-1 = \$2,706.00**
- vi. **Richco Invoice No. 147098 = \$3,510.25**
- vii. **Sargent Welch Invoice No. 8083550799 = \$1,522.99**
- viii. **The Library Store, Inc. Invoice No. 349858 = \$34.44**
- ix. **The Library Store, Inc. Invoice No. 350437 = \$363.46**
- x. **Ward Science Invoice No. 8083517169 = \$593.60**
- xi. **Ward Science Invoice No. 8083600823 = \$3,522.40**
- xii. **W.B. Mason Invoice No. I58456634 = \$1,194.74**
- xiii. **W.B. Mason Invoice No. I58461890 = \$504.77**
- xiv. **W.B. Mason Invoice No. I58665214 = \$1,079.96**

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by S. Wentworth 2nd by H. Daley

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

g. Connors Bros. Invoice No. 14548 Totaling \$570.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by M. MacDonald 2nd by A. Terranova

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

h. Diamond Relocation, Inc. Invoice No. 3763 Totaling \$4,499.00 (Other Project Cost)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by R. Cohen 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

i. CC Container Corp Invoice No. 4030 Totaling \$100.00 (Other Project Cost Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by R. Cohen 2nd by S. Wentworth

Discussion: How long do we expect to have these containers? Response, until the auditorium is completed in November.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

j. StrangScott Invoice No/ 18002 Totaling \$940.00 (Legal Fees Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by R. Cohen 2nd by M. MacDonald

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

10. Schedule Update

M. Ziobrowski notes over the course of the last month, we have maintained schedule. A few milestones we have or are about to reach at this point in time are;

Boiler Room

- The fuel oil delivery system is currently being installed and will be online for Monday.

Auditorium

- Metal panel work on the back side of the auditorium, replacing panels.

Exterior

- The fire-lane road around the building was paved, final sidewalks are being laid for egress.

Punchlist

- We are at approximately 85% complete for the August TCO areas.

We are still holding October 24th as substantial completion, which will trigger the start of the TCO walkthrough/inspections with the building inspector. Commissioning activities will take place during the first week of November.

11. Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

Date: Friday, November 16th at 1:30PM

12. Working Group Updates:

a. FF&E

M. MacDonald informs the SBC the district is currently in a freeze pattern in respects to ordering furniture until all budget items are known. The district has created a wish list at this time that will continue to be reviewed. Focus is purchasing 2-3 more café tables, and storage for MCAS exams as well as additional furniture for flexible learning areas ~~as well~~.

b. Finance:

H. Daley informs the committee that the finance group has meet and reviewed the budget forecast for the remainder of the project. All the contingency and holds have substantially been allocated now, so we need to keep ourselves tight to the budget. Right now, we have done one (construction financing) bond \$29.8 million. \$5-7 million more will be required to close out the project. Three million of which was borrowed this summer. Following the MSBA process, once we receive the reimbursement from the MSBA and we will then float the final bond to cover the final cost of the project, tracking a March 2020 timeframe.

c. Outreach:

Public board updates are being scheduled.

13. Other Business Not Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting:

R Cohen comments there has not been regular SBC attendance of certain folks making it difficult to reach a quorum and wondered what might be done about this.

P. Consolini comment, we and or the School Committee will address this issue after the November elections. Acknowledging that we are entering a new phase of the project where the focus is more financially based. It might be a time to restructure and potentially reduce the number of SBC members if some individuals feel that they have given enough of their time or would like to move on. We need to hear from the School Committee for direction on these potential changes.

14. Upcoming SBC Meeting

- November 8th at 5:30PM at Mount Greylock Regional School

15. Motion to adjourn by T. Bartels, 2nd by R. Cohen, **VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**

Meeting adjourn at 8:07 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, Project Manager/Director

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.

Approved with edits 11.20.18