



MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: March 6, 2018, at 5:30P.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#47)

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek	SBC Chair
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair
	Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown
	Carrie Greene	School Committee Vice-Chair
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee
	Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
	Al Terranova	School Committee
	Yocelyn Delgado	Business Manager
	Trip Elmore	DWMP
	Jeff Dome	DWMP
	Mike Cox	DWMP
	Jason Springer	Perkins Eastman
	Mike Giso	Turner Construction
	Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:32PM by M. Schiek with 10 voting Members in attendance.**

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

February 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting. *Motion to approve the February 13, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald.*

Discussion: Per the request of the committee, the sentence “and overall priority and criteria for making decisions” will be added to section 8 Summary Budget Update, directly after the line; “The SBC wanted to get some indication of the items and expenditures being considered.”

H. Daley notes, while there was a lot of discussion regarding the revised schedule, no schedule change was accepted or recommended by this board as this time. Until the board states otherwise the schedule under contract will remain the same.

VOTE: 7 approve, 0 against, 3 abstain

3. **Public Comment:** None

4. **Construction Change Order #4 Review and SBC vote to approve:**

Perkins Eastman reviewed Change Order #4 with the committee. There are four (4) changes that are applied to the Construction Contingency account totaling \$129,458.00

COR #21R1 Through-wall flashing at Gym per RFP-047 \$80,025
COR #24 Entry vestibule material \$4,339 (*Confidential – security provision, no back-up attached*)

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

COR#25 Power revisions for stage motors per RFP-060 \$23,014
COR#26 Stained glass exhaust system per RFP-045R2 \$22,080

This reduces the balance in the Construction Contingency account to \$1,641,802.00.

M Giso, Turner PM explained that Turner had expended \$13,939.00 of the GMP Contingency in two Approval Letters over the past month.

AL-139 Added residential appliances \$0 (for \$445 GMP contingency expenditure)
AL-147 Misc. Plumbing/HVAC changes (\$13,494 GMP contingency expenditure)

The current GMP Contingency unspent balance is \$947,842.00.

Motion to approve Change Order #4 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: T. Elmore states, as done in previous meetings Perkins Eastman will address the COR's and Turner will discuss the GMP contingency draws

J. Springer of Perkins Eastman, explained the four change order requests.

- COR #21R1 This was discussed thoroughly in the meeting minutes No. 46
- COR #24 This is security related.
- COR #25 Power revisions as we received the stage fly equipment that was added somewhat late into the project. This COR reflect a change in the power feeds to match the requirements of the equipment that was purchased.
- COR #26 Added stained glass exhaust to new studio, Perkins worked with the Mount Greylock working group to get the cost as low as possible.

M. Giso explained the two Approval letters submitted which were funded from the GMP contingency.

- AL-139 – Turner had an allowance in the GMP for residential appliance. There were changes made in the life skills classroom that just exceeded that allowance by the above amount, and it determined to use the GMP contingency to fund the delta.
- AL-147 refers to a handful of misc. plumbing and HVAC changes due to field conditions. Again, most of this cost was budgeted within the GMP, with the exception of the remaining amount above being funded out of the GMP contingency as illustrated on page 15 of 58.

Committee requests that any official document that has hand written notes or changes, that the approving party initial and date the note for security measures going forward. In the case mentioned above, the change was made to correct a grammatical error only.

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

5. Budget Revision Request #15 to adjust GMP Construction Contingency based on Change Order #4

The OPM explained that the formal transfer of funds in the budget is done through a BRR and is signed by the district and submitted to the MSBA. The BRR is included in the SBC packet for reference.

Motion to approve Budget Revision Request #15 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: T. Elmore explained this is standard operating procedure. Once the GMP expenditure is approved, the funds need to be reallocated through a Budget Revision Request which is submitted to the MSBA for tracking.

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

6. Change Order Request from Perkins Eastman in the amount of \$7,307.76 for hazmat monitoring over April vacation

Motion to approve Change Order for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: T. Elmore explains, on the second page in the budget detail on line item 0204-0200 A&E Hazardous Materials. We carried an original budget of \$80,000.00, transfer \$110,000.00 moving the budget to \$190,000.00. To date \$181,389.64 has been expended leaving a balance of \$8,610.36. The COR letter states, Perkins Eastman has the available funds and has allocated for this purpose, however, the document is an official request to approve the allocation in an Change Order to fund and provide hazmat oversight during the April vacation abatement work.

T. Elmore clarifies this is abatement work being completed in the existing building during April vacation to capitalize time prior to the summer demolition phase. The areas that will be abated have been clarified as the flooring of the East Hallway in front of the guidance suit as well as the North East Middle school hallway (Two areas of egress). M. MacDonald stated this remediation work has been completed previously on other portions of the building and will be separate and walled off from the other areas of the building. The area will be completely safe for staff and students before they return the following week. J. Springer adds that the cost also reflects safety concerns and monitoring to assure no one is at risk.

H. Daley comments that he would like to further understand how the OPM and Designer have differing budgets that brought up this request. T. Elmore states to rely on the OPM budget. The OPM has done a complete Amendment review as well as all documents within the Dore & Whittier budget include a signed copy of any official document. OPM will fully vet the letter to assure its accuracy.

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

7. Invoices (Vote Recorded):

a. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 31 in the amount of \$32,700.00 for Designer services in February 2018

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

Discussion: None

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

b. D&W Management Partners Invoice No. 36 in the amount of \$60,000.00 for February 2018 OPM Services

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain

c. Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 20 in the amount of \$2,020,945.20 for February 2018

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by M. MacDonald, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: M. Schiek asks how the project is tracking against the budget. M. Giso explains the work complete this past month was drywall, taping, and painting which is very labor intensive, with minimal material cost. In the coming months the Turner requisition will trend back up as casework and other high material cost will start to be delivered. T. Elmore adds of the remaining Turner Budget, 19M, not all the money will be spent in next four months coming to the opening of the building. This budget also contains the remaining site work, demolition of the remaining building, and retainage that has been withheld through the project to this point (5%).

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain

d. WilliNet Invoice in the amount of \$200 for Video Coverage of the December 7th & January 9th SBC Meetings (Administrative Budget)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by M. MacDonald, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: None

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

e. Town of Williamstown Invoice No. 20180302 in the amount of \$150,280.00 (Other Project Cost)

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley.

Discussion: R. Cohen has requested to clarify his understanding of the cost to the Town of Williamstown to complete the inspection services. From the invoice it noted that the town is discounting the inspection fees of the project in the amount of \$10,398.90. M. Schiek responds stating at the beginning of the project the committee request an estimate of the cost to complete the necessary inspections, which came back at a cost of roughly \$800,000.00. The Town of Williamstown gratuitously capped this cost at \$300,000.00 which was then approved and entered into the budget. It was also added that this includes the same measure of safety and concern as is always attributed to inspections.

C. Greene reads an excerpt from a letter written by Town Manager Jason Hoch to Doug Dias in response to the concern of the high cost of the inspection services, dated 9 December 2015.

"It is my understanding that the project budget has allocated \$300,000 for all permitting and inspection costs. Further, I fully appreciate that there will be costs for third party inspections and reviews required outside of our jurisdiction that will carry costs. To that end, it is my recommendation that we will track the eligible hours and costs through the project and assess those charges to the project at the end of the project IF funds still remain for permitting and inspection after other external charges have been paid. My sense is that this will likely constitute a partial waiver of what would otherwise be charged by the Town. It also ensures that there are no costly surprises late in the project; but also provides a fair acknowledgement to the taxpayers of both towns that there will be costs and responsibilities borne by the Town of Williamstown in support of this having this project built safely and in full compliance with appropriate codes. Our department has a high level of familiarity with the complexities of institutional projects, so I expect our oversight will be informed and efficient."

The committee has questions and concerns understanding what is meant in the above excerpt as the official cost to the project, which also includes the external inspections that are referenced.

C. Greene requests that the committee withdraw the motion to approve until further clarification.

R. Cohen requests to further understand who was involved within this agreement, and states that although the committee received a letter, this is not an official document, and does not state that this committee has formally accepted those terms stated.

The action item is in M. Schiek's court to meet with the Williamstown Town Manager to discuss the SBC's Concerns.

Early on, there was an estimate requested from the town for the price of the inspectional services to be provided and was estimated in the amount of \$800,000.00. This figure was discounted to \$300,000.00. The committee brought up a concern as to the reason for a bill for the ISD at this time, while the letter states the project will be billed at the conclusion of work. R. Cohen noted the ISD is a revenue generator and made a request for an accounting of the cost, which would be beneficial to understand the details of the invoice, and to help the committee further understand the deal in totality.

H. Daley adds the reason behind the reinspection costs are attributed to the inspector having to make a second appearance to solidify the inspection.

C. Greene asks to review the meeting minutes of January 9, 2018 to understand if this letter was put forth in front of the committee.

No Vote at this time.

8. Parking Lot Discussion – Review of plan view and cost estimate breakdown

The finance working group reviewed the financial impact of adding the parking lot to the overall project budget. The analysis focused on two questions:

1. Can we do the parking lot and hold the overall budget?
2. If we include the parking lot, how does it impact our MSBA funding and net financed cost to the district?

Based on the information provided by the OPM analyzing the cost to complete and budget amounts remaining, the answer to question 1 appears to be yes, there is room in the overall budget for the parking lot work. We have \$1,379,000 in potential uncommitted funds. The parking lot budget is estimated to be no greater than \$975,000.

Based on the information provided by the OPM regarding the impact on MSBA reimbursement budget, the answer to question 2 appears to be that the total amount financed will still fall within the range forecasted by the district. We told that the Towns we would be financing between \$31.5M and \$35.3M. With the parking lot, we should end up financing around \$34M. This is highly dependent on the ultimate reimbursement from the MSBA.

Of note, the parking lot will not be a reimbursable item as we have already exceeded the 8% site work cap for reimbursement.

Please note that all budget information is based on current estimates but is subject to change based on new information regarding costs, schedule, or reimbursements.

Respectfully submitted, Hugh Daley 3/1/18

Motion to recommend the construction of the parking lot with a do not exceed amount of \$975,000.00 to the transition committee by C. Greene, 2nd by P. Consolini.

Discussion: T. Elmore explains on page 33, a drawing of the parking lot as was submitted during competitive bidding as an alternate to all prequalified trade contractors within this scope of work. The second drawing is a refined drawing where some parking lot lights and cameras have been removed in an effort to bring the cost down. Conduits will still be run as originally intended to allow for an easier installation/upgrade in the future.

Committee asks J. Wirtes MG Facilities Supervisor his opinion on the revised plan. J. Wirtes informs the committee as items are taken out, specifically vegetation islands, maintenance will become more manageable, including snow removal and landscaping.

Committee states a number of reasons as to why it believes the parking lot as stated above in the letter submitted by H. Daley, should be constructed during the construction and not after the fact.

1. Cost to have sub-contractor remobilize would be above and beyond the cost submitted today. It is far more efficient to have completed now.
2. There is a concern of what the cost would be to tax payers if parking lot was completed further down the road.
3. All agree the parking lot is in need of an upgrade and feel it is their civic duty to submit a complete project. (which includes site work)

S. Wentworth ask T. Elmore, are you confident you have conservatively budgeted the project, that if proceeding with the parking lot will not be a detriment to the completion of the building.

T. Elmore responds, although it is impossible to see into the future, with only 15% of the construction contingency used to date, and the project being 67% complete, that he feels confident. T. Elmore clarifies, of the 67% complete, this includes not only the completion of the school building, but also the abatement and demolition of the existing building as well as all site work, including the parking lot.

With a passing vote the committee will now make a recommendation to the transition committee for their approval.

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

9. **Summary budget Update**

T. Elmore provided a summary budget update in the meeting packet.

The project is running on budget, and there are some contingency expenditures as was shown in Change Order #4 reviewed earlier in the meeting that will show up in next month's meeting update

T. Elmore explains, as usual the budget is always a reflection of one month in the past. T. Elmore guides the committee through various line items within the budget.

Committee question as to why there is a red number of \$122,804.00 on line item 0502-0030 GMP Contingency. T. Elmore explains that the system does not like to take negative numbers. However, as you look down budget you will see positive numbers that offset this cost in a debit/credit manner. The update to the FF&E, we received an invoice of \$270,000.00 coupled with the previous invoice of \$17,000.00, brings the current budget to \$287,000.00.

Committee asks, of the Technology budget, will the item be phased in, as well as does the budget contain all Technology items? It was confirmed this encumbers all technology items with the exception of the wire that is pulled by the electrician. This budget is tracking on point.

10. **Schedule Update**

M. Giso explains the slide within the packet, illuminating the various phases the project is at as well as the substantial completion dates of the separate areas. M. Giso clarifies that substantial completion includes the completion of all tasks with the exception of punch list. (inspection ready).

Committee agrees life safety is going to be a milestone and should be treated as such on the revised schedule to be submitted for approval. Turner has a meeting set up for the upcoming Monday, March 12th with the life safety contractors to go over the schedule.

The entirety of the new building with the exception of the auditorium and band room. (areas directly connected to future demolition work) will be completed and ready for inspection by the first week of July. M. Giso explains that although the building cannot receive temporary CO for the various areas individuals, the plan which has been discussed and encouraged by the town inspectors, is to have the separate locations walked and inspected as they become complete for two reasons. One to get ahead of any items that the inspector may note, secondly to allow the final inspection to be quicker and easier for the town to complete when ready. Idea is to capitalize all the time available.

Committee asked how we are tracking with LEED. T. Elmore states that although we feel we are tracking correctly to fall within the acceptable range for reimbursement, there is no way to officially know until the project is complete and various paperwork is submitted to the USGBC.

Action items; Turner to submit a revised schedule by March 15th

A revised schedule will be formally submitted as a Change Order with no cost.

11. **Working Group Updates:**

a. **Interiors:** M. MacDonald passed out a spreadsheet she created that clearly defines the priority of the FF&E items, and the order in which the items will be purchased to stay within the agreed upon budget. It is stated that the students will always be of priority, and therefore the first items on the list are all student and classroom-based items. M. MacDonald adds that some items will be reused, while the remainder of old FF&E items will be offer up to the surrounding schools as well as the moving program which will remove old furniture and supply it to low income schools, mostly in low income countries.

M. MacDonald continues to explain the spreadsheet that was submitted into the packet was created by a third-party contractor to capture all the items that will be needed within the new building. From this form, M. MacDonald and her team have been able to dissect and determine of the received list, what can be salvaged from the existing items, as well as prioritizing the items in such a manner to stay within budget while also assuring the students, and staff will receive all items that are required.

b. **Exterior:** M. MacDonald brought samples of the two stones that will be used on the sign. The first is an Ashfield stone that will be used for the columns. The second is a granite from within New England and states a decision to go with a honed finish on the granite to extenuate the stone and have the

lettering become more plainly visible while driving on route. 7. M. MacDonald also brought a sample of the letter and states it is a Brandon Grotisque font and will be painted in black.

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

13. **Upcoming SBC Meeting**

i. April 10th

Discussion: T. Elmore reminds committee, M. Giso will be on vacation during the April 10th SBC meeting, any schedule questions should be handled before hand if possible.

Turner has been requested to submit a revised schedule to the committee by March 15th

M. Schiek propose a possible joint meeting with the transition committee on the 27th of March at 5:30PM to discuss and approve the schedule that will be submitted.

14. **Motion to adjourn by P. Consolini, 2nd by S. Wentworth, VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain Meeting adjourn at 8:03 PM**

**This meeting is recorded and can be viewed on the local Willinet community TV and internet link:
<https://vimeo.com/willinet>**

Trip Elmore

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.