



JOINT TSC & MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: April 25, 2018, at 5:45 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#48)

ATTENDING:

Mark Schiek	SBC Chair
Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair
Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
Hugh Daley	Williamstown
Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee
Al Terranova	School Committee and TSC Member
<u>Whiteboard Working Group:</u>	
Eileen Belastock	Whiteboard Working Group
<u>Team Members:</u>	
Rob Wnuk	MGRSD
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Jason Springer	Perkins Eastman

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:55 PM by M. Schiek with 8 voting Members in attendance.**

2. **Interactive Whiteboard Discussion (Potential Vote Expected)**

M. Schiek invited the Interactive Working Group(W.G.) lead, R. Cohen, to give an overview of the groups discussions. The following is a general summary of the topics mentioned during that debrief.

- a. The last meeting where the W. G. was formed, the group was to review and to understand the current selected white board and project capabilities interacting with that surface. The group was able to have a group meeting/conference call where various aspects of the 2 components were discussed for compatibility and function. The projector purchased was selected by the administrations team and architect's consultant for the high-resolution characteristics given the high levels of day light in the new classrooms. These projectors also come with additional interactive capability that cannot be fully used given the current white board selection. The Bluetooth Pen Movement is possible however the finger touch movement is not possible on the current white board.
- b. The W.G. had determined that there would be criteria that would be important to decision making and the SBC was asked to turn to page 4 of the meeting packet to see the table that illustrated factors of importance; Schedule, Feasibility, and cost. It was noted that Eileen Belistock, another member of the W.G., was present in the audience and was available for comments.
- c. The ability to use the touch screen capabilities is one of the factors worth discussing and a possibly bigger issue is the actual size of the boards themselves from a viewing perspective within the classrooms. This viewing size issue was discussed, and Epson data included in the meeting packet on page 16 was reviewed. The current board size provides for 80" diagonal screen sizes where alternate boards provide 100" diagonal screen sizes and also provide for the finger interactive capabilities. The screen size greatly impacts the ability of the deeper rows of desks away from the screen to clearly view data presented at the front wall.

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

- d. The W.G. meeting/conference call included 4 teachers/members from the school and also included a representative from Valley Communication Systems (VCS) who would be supplying and installing the projectors on the project. In the meeting VCS stated that they have had 100% success with interactive project function by installing a different white board that is designed to work with minimal surface fluctuations (less than 3 MM). These other boards are readily available and could replace the current boards if the SBC should choose this replacement route. Conclusion was that the reliability and availability (schedule) was not a factor in the decision-making process.
- e. The installation of replacement boards would need to be explored further, currently the Carpenters hired under the drywall contract have the installation of the white boards and this may need to remain within their scope of work. T. Elmore commented that in order to ensure that the white boards are installed to meet the tolerances required by the projector, VCS may need to oversee the installation. There may be some warranty division by doing this, however the union labor issue would likely override this warranty convenience.
- f. J Springer was asked to comment, he mentioned that at the last meeting Perkins Eastman was asked to put out a Request for Proposal (RFP) to get pricing on the alternate white boards. This pricing as well as the credit pricing was included in the hand out on pages 24, 25, and 26. J. Springer revisited the earlier design and selection process followed to select the white boards and technology. He commented that at another recent school opening the principal was ask about the use of the new interactive white boards and read a quote that provided mixed results from the teaching staff. He stated that the design team regularly revisits design decision made early in a project and that this condition may be another example of that. M. MacDonald discussed some of the factors that resulted in the district asking for the RFP to be for 9 white boards to be replaced in primarily the Math Classrooms. The district wanted to treat this as a pilot program to see if other teachers and classroom may want to also have this technology. As the cost of \$2,000 per white board, times 44 to 49 teaching locations, puts the cost impact close to \$100,000., the administration felt that a small number of Pilot Program white boards was a sensible approach.
- g. R. Cohen questioned the process and inclusion aspects of this decision to choose 9 white boards, which led to numerous comments from the SBC members.
- h. A. Terranova asked where the discussion was headed and wanted to know if a motion was in the making so he could understand what he was being asked to decide upon.

Motion:

A motion to have Turner stop installing White Boards associated with Projectors in all locations going forward, and to ask the supplier to put those white boards on hold or to not ship them until the Working Group and School could evaluate the benefits and differences between an 80" versus 100" viewing surface and touch screen capability by R Cohen, 2nd by S Wentworth. Discussion:

J Wirtes commented that he thought all white board information and discussions should go through the WG. It appears the WG did not have all information.

S. Wentworth asks the committee if they will need to put a time constraint on the research to be done by the working group.

H. Daley states he has two comments, revisiting this decision at this time when we have recently put the design and project team to task on our schedule, and by making this change now, we would be giving them an out if the scheduled should not meet the deadline. It would be sensible to keep all the responsibility on the project team and the design team. Second, H. Daley questions how the projectors are used currently. R. Cohen reply's the current projector in use now has a display size much larger than 100", and our white boards that have been purchased for install will only allow for an 80" display and do not allow for the touch capabilities because of the 2" map rail. H. Daley confirms as currently designed, a stylist can be used to interact with the projector, but it will not read a finger touch. H. Daley adds the screen size issue can be

solved with software. Stating to have teachers and students use a larger font. The committee adds this could be beneficial training for students in their PowerPoint wording.

P. Consolini adds the cost we are looking at of \$100,000 is non-reimbursable, the only difference of doing it now or later is we could roll it into the bond for the construction cost and pay interest over time.

M. Schiek ask T. Elmore what are the other big unknowns that may arise prior to the completion of the project. T. Elmore gives the committee a budget update regarding the owner's contingency line that would be drawn from to finance this change order. He continues stating the budget shows uncommitted funds of \$812,000. The electrical component of the parking lot has just been signed off on and will account for \$210,000. Including that cost we are now looking at approximately \$600,000 remaining. T. Elmore add there have been a few field changes that have taken place in order to make sure all the systems work (typical) and estimates those costs at \$100,000 leaving the owners contingency at approximately \$500,000 at this time.

Vote: 4 Yes, 4 No, 0 Abstain – Motion Fails.

The chair clarified that the work installing the current white boards should proceed as per the current design documents with no interruption.

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

4. **Upcoming SBC Meeting**
i. May 8th

5. **Motion to adjourn by P Consolini, 2nd by H Daley VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
Meeting adjourn at 7:19 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.