



MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: April, 10 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#49)

ATTENDING:

Mark Schiek	SBC Chair (Arrived at 5:50)
Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair
Kimberley Grady	Interim Superintendent of Schools
Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
Carrie Greene	School Committee & Transition Committee
Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
Lyndon Moors	Faculty, MGRHS
Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee (Arrived at 5:46)
Thomas Bartels	Williamstown
Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
Al Terranova	School Committee (Arrived at 5:46)
Yocelyn Delgado	Business Manager
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Mike Cox	DWMP
Jason Springer	Perkins Eastman
Alec Marshall	Turner Construction

-
1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:33PM by P. Consolini with 9 voting Members in attendance.**
 2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - a. **Approval of March 6, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

March 6, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting. *Motion to approve the March 6, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes as amended by M. MacDonald, 2nd by C. Greene.*

Discussion: A few changes as requested by committee members. Changes have been applied to meeting minutes.

VOTE: 6 approve, 0 against, 3 abstain
 - b. **Approval of March 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

March 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting. *Motion to approve the March 27, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes as amended by C. Greene, 2nd by M. MacDonald.*

Discussion: C. Greene request to changes made on page 12, and 13. (*Changes applied to meeting minutes*)

VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 3 abstain
 3. **Construction Change Order #5 Review and SBC vote to approve:**

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

Perkins Eastman reviewed Change Order #5 with the committee. P.E. included a description of all the COR's which was included in the packet. There are 6 changes that are applied to the Construction Contingency account totaling \$829,527.00.

COR#27R1 Parking Lot (Civil/Landscape only)	\$761,276
COR#28R1 Misc. Electrical changes	\$17,748
COR#29 Install added marker/tack boards	\$2,224
COR#30 Waterproofing at Auditorium exterior	\$21,295
Delete foundation dampproofing	
COR#32 Added fireproofing at mech. Shafts	\$5,255
COR#34 Custodial Closets	\$21,729

This reduces the balance in the Construction Contingency account to \$812,275.00.

M Giso, Turner PM explained that Turner had expended \$17,553.00 of the GMP Contingency in one Approval Letters over the past month.

AL-152 Misc. waterproofing changes (for \$17,553 GMP contingency expenditure)

The current GMP Contingency unspent balance is \$930,289.00.

Motion to approve Change Order #5 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by C. Greene, 2nd by M. MacDonald.

Discussion: T. Elmore explains change order #5 exercised the alternate for the parking lot in the amount of \$761,276.00. This includes the civil and landscape work only, not included are the electrical component and the light poles. The committee has \$213,724.00 remaining of the approved do not exceed amount of \$975,000.00 for the parking lot. J. Springer followed by going over each COR listed above. Starting with COR#27R1 which was explained above by T. Elmore, COR#28R1 includes electrical scope either missed or modified. COR#29 is to install the added marker/tack boards, COR#30 is a credit for removing damp proofing where there is no basement, and coordination with ABE. COR#32 includes added fire proofing to duct modifications in the elevator shaft. COR#34 includes an add of a custodial closet to unused space behind elevator on all three floors. T. Elmore explains, although elevators are a file sub-bid and three subs were prequalified, no bid was received on bid day. Process proceeded with Turner soliciting for bid and contracting the elevator vendor. T. Elmore further explains that each vendor dictates the actual space required (size of elevator unit) to install their product. Therefore, shafts are always constructed to accommodate all vendor designs. In this specific case, vendor allowed us to include custodial closets on back side of elevator approximately 4'x8' on all three floors. Doors from the Gym were repurposed to help reduce cost. Committee agrees much needed additional storage space. AL-152 includes miscellaneous waterproofing changes which are funded out of Turners GMP.

VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain

- Budget Revision Request #16 to adjust budget line items to move moves \$17,553 to Thermal & Moist Protect, reducing GMP Contingency to \$930,289.00. Also Moves \$7,700.00 to Construction Testing, reducing Geotech & geotech Environment to \$25,310.00. Also Moves \$20,000 to Testing Services, reducing Utility company fees to \$35,031.28.**

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 #16 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by S. Wentworth, 2nd by K. Grady.

Discussion: T. Elmore explains, the first transfer, as included on page 30 in the packet, is to satisfy Change Order #5 as just approved, to move \$17,553 from Turners GMP Contingency to the Thermal & Moisture Protection line and needs to be approved by committee as standard procedure. The second line moves \$7,700.00 to A&E Construction Testing, for the use of a 3rd party window testing agency explained below in section 5. The third line is to move \$20,000 to Testing Services for future OPM 3rd party testing. T. Elmore explains the remaining budget as currently listed on page 55 line: 0602-0000: Testing Services is \$2,712.43, which will not be enough to complete the project. Further explanation below in section 6.

VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain

5. Contract Amendment #8 to Perkins Eastman Contract for \$7,700.00 for a 3rd party window testing.

Motion to approve Contract Amendment #8 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by R. Cohen, 2nd by K. Grady.

Discussion: T. Elmore states the amendment will allow for Perkins to direct the 3rd party testing agency, R.J. Kenney Associates, Inc. to provide Owner Third Party testing services for window testing. T. Elmore elaborates, window testing includes, sealing specifically selected windows (per plan) from the inside and creating a negative pressure, followed by spraying water on said window to verify an effective seal. Perkins will be directing the sub for this test due to CME (DWMP 3rd party testing agency) being unable to complete window testing. R. J. Kenney was also the low bid for this work.

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

6. Contract Amendment #7 to DWMP Contract for \$20,000.00 for a 3rd party testing.

These funds would be moved to the Testing Services Budget Line Item and will not be reimbursable by the MSBA.

Motion to approve Contract Amendment #7 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by M. Schiek, 2nd by K. Grady.

Discussion: T. Elmore directs the committee to page 55 and proceeds to walk the group through each column, starting by explaining the original testing service budget line was \$100,000.00. In previous transfers we have moved an additional \$23,500.00 to this line. Amendment #7 is due to concerns coming in the summer construction activities. There are going to be compaction test as well as others that will be required. The request of moving \$20,000.00 is to satisfy the upcoming testing work. T. Elmore states this is reimbursable cost. K. Grady raises concern about moving money from the Utilities line due to unknown costs. K. Grady to submit electrical invoices for next month and requests no future transfers out of Utilities line.

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

7. Invoices (Vote Recorded):

a. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 29 in the amount of \$56,900.00 for Designer services in December 2017

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by R. Cohen, 2nd by C. Greene.

Discussion: T. Elmore direct committee to page 35 and highlights the line item labeled, Furniture & Technology Procurement which as shown on the bill as currently billed at 16.0611%. T. Elmore explains although this bill may not include the amendment of \$59,093.00 back to the districts FF&E budget line from the previous month. This will make that line item billed 100%. R. Cohen questions reason for this transfer. T. Elmore explains committee decided P. Constable's (consultant) service was not required to complete this phase of the project. R. Cohen furthers, asking when was the decision made? Committee states, in October, M. Macdonald and K. Grady attended an MSBA procurement seminar. There they spoke with B. Hansbury about possible steps that could be taken to complete this phase without a consultant. R. Cohen asks, at seminar were there talks regarding the Technology aspect of the budget. M. MacDonald replies, no, only furniture. R. Cohen raises his concern about the Technology aspect. Concerns include: people involved in this decision are employed by the school, second concern is those involved are doing this work for the first time. C. Greene states, back when decision was made to shift responsibility to committee, the group had a long conversation and no decision was rushed. In addition, a lot a time was spent with 3rd party to fully understand magnitude and requirements. Technology discussion continues below in section 11.

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- b. **Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 32 in the amount of \$32,700.00 for Designer services in March 2018**

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

Discussion: None

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- c. **D&W Management Partners Invoice No. 37 in the amount of \$61,277.10 for March 2018 OPM Services, and 3rd party testing**

Motion to approve payment of the invoice by C. Greene, 2nd by M. Schiek

Discussion: None

VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 2 abstain

- d. **Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 21 in the amount of \$2,146,413.93 for March 2018**

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

Discussion: None

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- e. **WilliNet Invoice in the amount of \$100.00 for Video Coverage of the March 6, 2018 SBC Meeting**

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

Discussion: R. Cohen states although the coverage is broadcasted in Williamstown, surrounding towns in the district are unable to view even after the fact. OPM responds that at the bottom of the meeting minutes is a link to the online viewing location. Video is typically available the following afternoon. OPM has added an addition link where the video can be viewed. In addition, the meetings are live streamed on YouTube.

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

- f. **Technology Expenditures, Invoice. Totaling \$2,724.18 (Technology Budget)**

i. **CDW Technology #LZJ0453 = \$2,241.21**

ii. **CDW Technology #LXR7794 = \$280.14**

- iii. CDW Technology LZJ8494 = \$26.42
- iv. CDW Technology #MBW8456 = \$92.32
- v. CDW Technology #MCF4645 = \$23.27
- vi. CDW Technology #MCH4548 = \$60.82

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

Discussion: R. Cohen states he has never been a part of a group, private or public that has one individual that has the authority to spend \$100,000.00 without an approval process. Raises the question, do we need to vote FF&E invoices. T Elmore responds, yes, as a group we have been voting invoices. T. Elmore notes, Technology invoice are rolled into one sum for approval as well as Furniture. Individual invoices are always attached as backup.

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

8. MGRSD Staff Allocation to the project in the amount of \$4,094.90 (for Record)

Discussion: None

9. Summary budget update

Discussion: T Elmore provided a summary budget update in the meeting packet. T. Elmore directs committee to page 53 in the packet and states every month as we look at the budget, it is reflective of all invoices, BRR's, and amendments from the previous month. The explanation included showing lines that will be affected following this meeting based on the approved BRR and invoices tonight.

10. Schedule Update: Revised schedule for next phase occupancy from April to September, over all completion date unchanged- December 2018

Discussion: T. Elmore introduces Alec Marshall, standing in for M. Giso of Turner Construction to explain the schedule. A. Marshall goes over each slide included within the packet. R. Cohen asks what the critical path is, and how confident Turner feels about it being completed on time. A. Marshall responds the critical path right now is getting all the MEP's installed in the ceiling and Turner also feels it is not seen as a major risk.

11. Discussion on make decisions on FF&E and Technology Items

Discussion: R. Cohen raises the question of why the whiteboards purchased do not match the projectors purchased. R. Cohen passes around a hand out detailing the Smart projector model purchased and the ability/unavailability to use the touch feature with various whiteboard configurations. (Handout is attached for viewing) R. Cohen continues, the whiteboards purchased have a map rail at the top, which as explained in the handout does not allow for the touch sensor feature to work properly. J. Springer weighs in stating the projector was suggest by P. Constable and passed along his concern with the accuracy of the finger touch capabilities. P. Constable does mention the unit also comes with a Bluetooth pen that is far more accurate and consistent. R. Cohen responds there is a great difference between ability to use finger compared to using a stylist. Continues by noting it has been proven the younger generations do not like to use stylist and are very comfortable with touch screens by hand. R. Cohen adds, touch screen capabilities are very useful to use with students with disabilities. The technology is explained as, the touch sensor unit is called to be mounted above the whiteboard and directs a laser field onto the whiteboard allowing for

the touch capabilities. J. Springer comments, at the MLK school in Cambridge, they are using the smart projectors and only 75-80% of the touch screens work. Touch feature requires a perfectly flat whiteboard through all seasons. R. Cohen states, after having spoken with the vendor rep, the sensor system is suggested to be purchased with a specific whiteboard. This suggestion was not taken by the purchasing team, resulting in whiteboards that are not compatible. R. Cohen furthers his point by stating the whiteboards needed for compatibility do not have a map rail and they also are backed with a rigid steel. In the memo submitted by R. Wnuk, stating the current plan that was determined to forgo the use of the interactive white board modules. K. Grady states the whiteboards were a purchase as part of a bid. T. Elmore furthers by stating there were three bids received by Turner and as per the process the low bid was accepted. M. MacDonald states the whiteboard brand was suggested to the committee but noted the concern with the touch systems. Committee request and update from Turner on the status of the whiteboard installation. Is it possible to order different whiteboards and maintain schedule? Turner Responds under, 25% of all whiteboards have been installed. Further states all whiteboards are scheduled to be shipped and will be onsite within the next month. T. Elmore states, without doing further research, there will be a ripple effect to freezing the installation of the whiteboards. Furthers this point by stating, all whiteboards will need to be installed, projectors mounted, and all penetrations sealed to pass inspection. Vendor will not guarantee touch screen compatibility to whiteboard if the board is not installed prior to the projector. M. MacDonald clarifies, current issue as not with the projectors but rather with the whiteboards. R. Cohen request to know who is involved in the Technology working group. No confirmed answer. Group proceeds forward in a request to Perkins Eastman to verify quantity of boards that would be required to be replace, obtain a cost for material and labor, as well as verify lead time. All parties agree the timeline is top priority. Turner comments it will take approximately 1-2 weeks to obtain a quote and shipping time. C. Greene, requests project team verify from vendor the handout received tonight is accurate. J. Springer adds, Perkins will confirm with P. Constable about specifications. (P. Constable is still working as a consultant to casework and will respond with qualified answers). R. Cohen requests to re-establish Technology working group to determine a solution and adds it is extremely important to include teachers into the group. T. Elmore reminds committee the working group is established not to make decisions, rather to give suggestions to the committee. Continuing by stating there will need to be one leader and a handful of participants.

T. Elmore states if there is no alteration to the schedule, whiteboards can be replaced, however if the schedule will be flipped to accommodate, it is the OPM's suggestion to keep the current whiteboards.

Group establish will include Rob Wnuk, Eileen Belastock, Rich Cohen, Lyndon Moors and possible additional two teacher who have used the technology.

Motion by C. Greene to establish a working group to work with the four members (listed above), and possible two teachers who have used the technology, to work with the project team to asses cost and schedule implications and make a recommendation to the committee second by, R. Cohen

Vote: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.

P. Consolini states it is important that the group work quickly and efficiently to come to an understand to be brought forth to the group. It is reiterated by the committee that schedule is the driving factor.

A.Terranova requests in future distribution of the packet to the committee, for there to be a message stating to read a specific section(s) of interest for the coming meeting.

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

Discussion: M. Schiek received a letter from the Transition Committee recommending the SBC to authorize a \$5,000.00 retainer to bring on board an Attorney of Law (Strang, Scott, Giroux & Young). The cost will be drawn from the legal budget. Document is attached.

Motion to accept the recommendation by R. Cohen, second by S. Wentworth.

Vote: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.

R. Cohen passed around a handout as a prop in the above mention section 11. The document is attached.

13. Public Comment

None

14. Upcoming SBC Meeting

i. May 8th at 5:30pm

Discussion: M. Schiek notes a possible meeting may be added in short notice to accommodate the new working groups task at hand.

Motion to adjourn by A. Terranova, 2nd by S. Wentworth

VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

Meeting adjourn at 8:00 PM

This meeting is recorded and can be viewed on the local Willinet community TV and internet link:

<http://willinet.org/content/mgrhs-committee-meetings>

Or

www.mgrhs.org/broadcasts/

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.