



**MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 5, 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#52)

**ATTENDING:**

Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair
Kimberley Grady	Superintendent of Schools (Arrived Late)
Hugh Daley	Williamstown
Carrie Greene	Transition Committee Vice-Chair
Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee
John Goerlach	Lanesborough Select Board Chair
Thomas H. Bartels	Williamstown
Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
Al Terranova	School Committee

---

Lee Dore	DWMP
Mike Cox	DWMP
Dan Colli	Perkins Eastman
Bob Bell	Perkins Eastman
Dawn Guarriello	Perkins Eastman
Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction
Mike Giso	Turner Construction
Carl Steward	Turner Construction

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:36 PM by P. Consolini with 9 voting Members in attendance. K Grady arrived late, making it 10 voting members.**

2. **Approval of May 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes**  
 May 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes as presented in the Meeting Packet and distributed prior to the meeting.  
*Motion to approve the May 8, 2018 SBC Meeting Minutes by C. Greene, 2nd by J. Georlach.*  
 Discussion: None

*VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain*

3. **Construction Change Order #7 Review and SBC vote to approve:**

Perkins Eastman reviewed Change Order #6 with the committee. There are three changes that are applied to the Construction Contingency account totaling \$62,606.00.

- COR #036 Revisions to PE Alternative Suite \$23,555.00
- COR #038 Revise individual room floor finish at areas C & D \$22,301.00
- COR #039R1 Add water seal and water barriers to Penthouse above Locker rooms \$16,750.00

This reduces the balance in the Construction Contingency account to \$537,437.00

**PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS**

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

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

M. Cox explained that Turner had expended \$37,138.00 of the GMP Contingency in two Approval Letter over the past month.

AL-161 Additional Structural Steel for stage rigging (for \$7,975.00 GMP Contingency Expenditure)

AL-163 Misc. Carpentry and Drywall Changes (for \$29,163.00 GMP Contingency Expenditure)

The current GMP Contingency unspent balance is \$889,286.00.

*Motion to approve Change Order #7 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by M. MacDonald, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: M. Giso explained the changes within Change Order 7;

COR #036 – Includes various changes with the Alternate P.E. room to make the space more useable

COR #038 – Includes revised floor finishes in area C & D, which included program related upgrade to linoleum tile in three rooms. There will be a credit from the painter to follow.

COR #039R1 – Includes robust water seal in the mechanical room floor to contain any leak should they occur in the future.

AL-161 – Includes required addition structural steel to support the stage rigging equipment, this is typical with auditoriums.

AL-163 – Various carpentry and drywall work around the building on T&M.

The OPM add, the three COR's will be funded out of the Construction Contingency budget line, while the two AL's are funded out of Turners GMP Contingency budget line.

*VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain*

**4. Budget Revision Request #18 to adjust GMP Construction Contingency based on Change Order #7**

*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 #18 for District Signature and Submission to the MSBA by M. MacDonald, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: M. Cox explains, BRR18 - moves \$29,163.00 to Finishes, reducing GMP contingency to \$897,261. Also moves \$7,975 to Metals, reducing GMP contingency to \$889,286.00.

*VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain*

**5. Invoices (Vote Recorded):**

**a. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 34 in the amount of \$89,450.00 for Designer services in May 2018 and 3<sup>rd</sup> party hazmat monitoring**

*Motion to approve payment of the invoice by C. Greene, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: The billing progress is in line with the construction phase we are currently in and will continue to follow the projects progression.

*VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain*

**b. D&W Management Partners Invoice No. 39 in the amount of \$62,745.60 for May 2018 OPM Services, and 3<sup>rd</sup> party testing**

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

Discussion: The OPM explained, the bill includes the standard \$60,000.00 OPM fee as well as 2,745.60 in 3<sup>rd</sup> party testing services performed by CME for compaction and concrete tests required.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**c. Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 23 in the amount of \$2,509,440.76 for May 2018**

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

Discussion: The OPM states, when looking at Turners bill, a good way to gauge the buildings progress is to take the percentage billed vs the contract value. The OPM then directs the committee to page 27 in the packet and explains the explains the math. Turner currently has billed 78% of the project which is accurate to where we stand. As a reminder, the majority of the work remaining (final 22%) is in demolition of the current school building and the sitework.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**d. Diamond Relocation Invoice No. 3626 in the amount of \$34,320.00.**

*Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: M. Cox explained, the committee approved the contract last SBC meeting, and this is a 50% deposit which was required.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**e. Willinet Invoice in the of \$100.00 for Video Coverage of the May 8, 2018 SBC meeting (administration budget)**

*Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: C. Greene asks, why are we not being taped tonight?

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**f. Technology Expenditures totaling \$19,411.20 itemized below;**

i. EPlus Technology, Inc Invoice No. V2107458 = \$4,411.20

ii. CompuWorks Invoice No. 116616 = \$15,000.00

*Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: Committee requests more information on the CompuWork invoice. What are the services provided? R. Cohn also adds a request to understand the total picture of technology equipment to be purchased. What is the long-term purchase plan? More information to be provided next SBC.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**g. FF&E Expenditures totaling \$780.00 itemized below;**

i. KGS Associates LLC Invoice No. 400 = \$780.00

*Motion to approve payment of the invoice by H. Daley, 2nd by J. Georlach.*

Discussion: Why did we receive 4 shelve on this PO only? Response, this is for R. Wnuk.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain

**6. Hazmat Monitoring Proposal review and vote to award the Summer Hazmat Monitoring Scope**

Dan Colli, Perkins Eastman, furnished a letter in the packet and was asked to give an overview of the proposals received and recommendations to the committee. Summarized below:

For this scope, we have requested that each sub-consultant provide us with a lump sum proposal based on the work plan created by the Hazardous Materials removal contractor. It is our understanding that these costs reflect the scope of work as presented by that contractor. The work will be based and billed on a time and material basis of actual time on site.

We have solicited quotes from 3 vendors –

- Universal Environmental
- Smith & Wessel
- Eco-Genesis

Universal Environmental opted to withdraw citing excessive workload over the summer and the potential inability to service the project as needed.

Scope	Smith & Wessel	Eco-Genesis
Pre-Con Meeting	\$600	\$295
Meetings	NIC	\$3,255
Project Monitoring Shifts	60 - \$36,000	165 - \$79,970
PCM samples	360 - \$3,600	Incl. as needed
TEM samples	4 - \$1,700	6 - \$2,854
Expenses	\$5,750	\$2,364
Management	\$1,520	\$6,392
Close-out report	\$650	\$4,900

The primary difference between the 2 proposals is found in the number of shifts and meetings being accounted for. Smith and Wessel is proposing to have a project monitor on site for every shift as per the current phasing schedule provided to them for a total of 60 shifts. Eco-genesis is providing multiple people each day depending on the potential workflow (between 2 and 4) for the full duration of the project a total of 165 shifts.

The number of shifts correlates to the following factors -

- The overall number of containment areas in each phase
- The overall number of workers on site each day during the abatement process

Essentially if the project phasing is such that there are multiple teams, abating multiple areas on a daily basis then there could be a need for additional project monitors.

According to American's work-plans there are 6 main areas as shown above plus a 7th area that consists of the exterior work around the building perimeter. In conversations with TCCO the goal is to have 20 to 30 workers on site per day with multiple containments happening concurrently.

Both Smith and Wessel and Eco-Genesis have corresponded with American regarding the Phase 4 work, Smith and Wessel is confident based on the conversations that 60 shifts will be adequate and if need be can provide additional staff on occasion as required. Eco-Genesis's

quote carries an average of 3 persons per day throughout the project. Based on Perkins Eastmans experience we find this to be an unusual yet cautious approach to the stated scope. The project would be assured to have coverage at all times, but this comes at a cost.

Based on what we currently understand we would be comfortable with the owner selecting either sub-consultant. We feel the primary issue here relates to overall demolition schedule risk –

- The EcoGenesis approach is risk free, the management of this risk comes at a higher cost. For Eco-Genesis - \$113,520
- The Smith and Wessel approach relies on the subconsultants experience as guidance, this could be less than what the project needs and thus the initial lower cost could increase. For Smith and Wessel - \$54,802 (if we select this subcontractor we recommend adding \$16,500 to the total for added monitoring and testing that may be required during the process) bringing the total to \$71,302.

FEE noted above – each includes PE's 10% mark-up allowed by contract

C. Greene comments EcoGenesis has done work for Mt. Greylock in the current building as well as site testing. This gives them more knowledge going in. P. Consolini asks Perkins if having fewer shifts could slow down the work. Perkins responds that while the two companies have proposed a different number of shifts (60 for Smith and Wessel & 156 for Eco Genesis), they are both billing on a per shift basis. Therefore they will be billed by the amount of work performed. Those rates are broken down above. Perkins states Smith and Wessel has confirmed they can supply more people at our request. T. Bartels states he feels uncomfortable with the additional \$60,000 for EcoGenesis. T. Bartels asks if we can receive letters of recommendation from companies who have worked with Smith and Wessel in the past. Perkins responds that this can be fulfilled, however Perkins has worked with them in the past and has a good working relationship. Reiterates they are a very reputable company. Committee asks, in the opinion of Perkins and Turner, whether one person can monitor all spaces. Both Turner and Perkins respond confidently, yes. Perkins notes that there is an additional \$16,500 in the Smith and Wessel contract as a buffer, which mostly likely will be used. Committee asks, how many days are we expecting to have monitoring going on? Construction team responds, 60 days.

*Motion to approve Smith and Wessel for hazmat monitoring in the amount of \$71,302.00 by H. Daley, 2nd by S. Wentworth.*

*VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain*

**7. Perkins Eastman Amendment #9 For Hazmat Monitoring**

The Committees decision to select Smith and Wessel to perform the Hazmat monitoring will be put into an amendment (#9) to the Architect's Contract and will be executed by the district. For Record.

**8. Project Team Staff Update to SBC – Turner Letter (see attached)**

A letter was issued to the OPM from Turner as notification that the CM would be planning to change on site staffing in the future. The Letter and discussion is summarized as follows:

“As critical milestones near completion, Turner plans to implement the following staffing changes:

Chris White will transition off the project as MEP Superintendent. The critical MEP activity remaining is

commissioning of building equipment and systems. Mike Ziobrowski has already taken the lead role in the commissioning process since April and will continue in this role.

Mike Giso will transition off the project as Project Manager. Mike Ziobrowski will assume PM responsibilities for the remainder of project in conjunction with Mike Giso. Mike Ziobrowski has been involved with the project since preconstruction, and has recently managed and closed out a project for The Clark in Williamstown.

At this time there is no definitive date for these changes to occur. The earliest potential would be mid-June 2018, however nothing will be implemented without complete buy in from the project team and owner to assure the construction schedule will not be impacted. Once transitioned off, the staff will be available to return if there are any concerns or issues to be worked out."

#### **9. Working Group Updates**

M. MacDonald supplied a brief update of the FF&E working group. The flexible learning areas are a continuing work in progress as the district works through what will be required in this space. There have also been a few minor changes in the science room.

H. Daley gives a brief update on the Finance working group. The committee is going out to bid on remaining bond that was not encumbered in the initial bond. H. Daley reiterates, we knew this was coming, while also noting this will not be the final bond.

#### **10. Budget update – summary included in the meeting packet**

Mike Cox identified that the Project is currently on budget and may have some budget savings at the end of construction. Currently there are unspent funds within the GMP and Construction Contingency line items, as well as other smaller amounts of unspent funds in other categories as is shown in the far right hand column of the budget.

#### **11. Schedule Update – Slides included in the meeting packet**

Classroom wing - 30 day look ahead:

complete ceiling tile, stairwell flooring, complete casework, acoustical wall panels, doors / hardware, final paint, window shades / signage, final cleaning

Kitchen - 30 day look ahead:

complete food service equipment, mep trim / devices, ceiling tile, final paint, doors / hardware, final clean

Cafeteria - 30 day look ahead:

complete exterior, storefront, porcelain wall tile, mep trim / devices, ceiling tile

Area c 30 day look ahead:

complete taping & ceiling grid, painting, interior storefront, mep trim / devices, ceiling tile / wood ceiling panels, marker / tack boards, doors / hardware, acoustical wall panels, flooring / sealed concrete, casework install, porcelain tile

Auditorium - 30 day look ahead:

complete wall / soffit framing, complete rough-in over stage, drywall / finishing, painting, ceiling grid

M. Giso supplied an updated completion scheduled in the packet and can also be found attached. K. Grady adds, as she has been working with Ryan on the building inspections, Ryan has noted he does not want to have to approve the building all at once, and rather is inspecting it as areas become available. Ryan is also walking unfinished areas and giving feedback on the work that will need to be complete before inspections. K. Grady states this is not work he is billing for and they do not get recorded as failed inspections. Rather Ryan is working to help us. C. Greene asks are there any additional ADA inspections that need to be scheduled. Perkins responds, no separate inspection is required, however a 3<sup>rd</sup> party company out of Pittsfield may come by and do an inspection. Perkins continues anyone can file and issue with ADA and these inspections can be completed by third party and given to the building inspector. Perkins reiterates, this is not a requirement to have anyone come inspect, however it should not be a concern if a 3<sup>rd</sup> party company does arrive and complete an inspection. C. Greene asks, do we need a CO or TCO to occupy the building for school activities come September. M. Giso replies, we will receive a TCO. The CO will not come until all the sitework is complete, however this will no effect the ability to obtain out TCO and have the building occupied in September.

Committee states, we are affirming our confidence in meeting the current construction schedule as provided by the construction manager.

**12. Other business not anticipated 48 hours prior to meeting**

None.

**13. Public Comment**

None.

**14. Upcoming SBC Meeting**

- i. Thursday, July 12<sup>th</sup>, **Tentatively, scheduled for 4:30 PM** at Williamstown ES Cafeteria. Update regarding final time will be sent out when confirmed.

**15. Motion to adjourn by A Terranova, 2<sup>nd</sup> by S. Wentworth, VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain  
Meeting adjourn at 7:14 PM**

*Mike Cox*

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Dore & Whittier Management Partners

Cc: Attendees, File.

The above is a summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact D&WMP 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. These minutes serve as contractual notification to the owner of project information.