



**MGR SBC MEETING MINUTES AND LOCAL VOTE RESULTS**

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 1, 2017, at 4:00P.M. at the Mount Greylock Regional Middle High School in Williamstown, MA

**PROJECT:** Mount Greylock Regional Middle High School  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#38)

<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Mark Schiek	SBC Chair
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair
	Kim Grady	Interim Superintendent of Schools
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown
	Carrie Greene	School Committee Vice-Chair (arrived at 4:43)
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Lyndon Moors	Faculty, MGRHS
	Steve Wentworth	Lanes. Finance Committee
	Thomas Bartels	Williamstown
	Bob Ericson	Lanesborough
	Rich Cohen	Lanesborough
	Al Terranova	School Committee
	Trip Elmore	DWMP
	Jeff Dome	DWMP
	Dan Colli	Perkins Eastman
	Mike Giso	Turner Construction
	Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction

- 
- 1. Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 4:05 PM by M. Schiek with 11 voting Members in attendance. Carrie Greene arrived at 4:43 to make 12 voting members, Rich Cohen left at 5:50 to make 11 voting members. Kim Grady left the meeting at 5:45 and returned at 6:05.**
  - 2. Motion to adjourn to Executive Session with intent to return to Open Session per M. G. L. Chapter 30A Section 21 (a) (4): To discuss the deployment of security personnel or devices, or strategies with respect thereto.**

**VOTE to go into Executive Session:**

Mark Schiek	Aye
Paula Consolini	Aye
Kim Grady	Aye
Hugh Daly	Aye
Carrie Greene	(arrived after the vote at 4:43)
Mary MacDonald	Aye
Lyndon Moors	Aye
Steve Wentworth	Aye
Thomas Bartels	Aye
Bob Ericson	Aye
Rich Cohen	Aye
Al Terranova	Aye

**Kim Grady & Mary MacDonald both left executive session separately for a short period of time. Exit Executive Session at 5:10 PM, and returned to Open Session.**

**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)

3. **Project Change Order Vote:** Motion to allow the district leadership to accept and authorize the security upgrades change order after it has been fully vetted by the Construction Manager, Architect and School Administration, as proposed with a not to exceed value of \$250,000 as discussed in the executive session by H. Daley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by B Ericson.

Discussion:

Rich Cohen commented on 3 things, summarized as follows:

1. A concern that the security measures that we're about to vote on have been recommended by security working group but we've gotten information from other security consultants that have a different view about whether this is an appropriate use of our resources for security purposes given the cost that's involved.
2. A concern that we haven't discussed in open session why we're doing a change order and it's my understanding that the reason we have a change order is that the requirements for these security measures we're not included at the time we put out the bids for the project as a whole and the reason for that may be that the transition from the previous superintendent to the current superintendent did not go smoothly or maybe it's that the previous superintendent did not submit the requirements in time for them to be placed in the original bidding process and I'm not suggesting that the full \$250,000.00 is an additional cost but some amount of that \$250,000.00 is an additional cost based upon the fact that the previous superintendent or the transition to the new superintendent resulted in these requirements not being put in at the original time.
3. It's important that we also note that we are rushed for time because we did not follow the procurement process that is required especially when you have an interest in a single vendor. We need to be diligent about making sure that we comply with procurement processes; this is the second time in six months or so that we've had difficulty with procurement processes and it makes us vulnerable to litigation and delays if we don't set aside procurement policies and it also means that we are not fulfilling our ethical and fiduciary obligations as members.

Mark Scheik agreed there may be need for legal advice and that the district could get legal counsel to review any steps in the procurement process.

Thomas.Bartels asked where the funding for this change come from? Trip replied that it's already in the budget; it's covered already.

Rich Cohen made the point of going with the lower cost proposal and wanted to make that an amendment to the vote.

H. Daley said the CM will assure the same scope of work and vet the contractors for scope and value of the work/bid. There ended up to be no amendment to the motion, motion to vote on the change order: not to exceed \$250,000 subject to vetting by the CM.

**VOTE: 8 yes, 3 no, 1 abstain**

4. **Approval of the May 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes** *Motion to approve the May 4, 2017 SBC Meeting Minutes by P Consolini, 2nd by M MacDonald.* Discussion: None **VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
5. **Public Comment:** letter received from Lanesboro Selectmen which was included in the meeting packet and was read in the meeting by the Chair, Mark Scheik – No other public comment.

6. **Invoices:**

- a. DWMP Management Partners Invoice No. 27 in the amount of \$75,408.86 for May OPM Services and CME on-site testing services. **Motion to approve DWMP Invoice No. 27 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- b. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 15 in the amount of \$80,035.48 for Designer services. **Motion to approve Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 15 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- c. Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 16 in the amount of \$49,778.51 for ACM Monitoring. **Motion to approve Perkins Eastman Invoice No. 16 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- d. Turner Construction's Application Requisition No. 11 in the amount of \$1,795,587.26. **Motion to approve Turner's Application Requisition No. 11 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- e. WilliNet Invoice in the amount of \$100 for Video Coverage of the May 4<sup>th</sup> SBC Meeting. **Motion to approve WilliNet Invoice for the May 4, 2017 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- f. MGRSD Invoice No. 370640 from Pittsfield Communications Systems, Inc. in the amount of \$1,360.56 for mounting materials related to the School, local Police and Fire Communications Antenna. **Motion to approve MGRSD Invoice No. 370640 from Pittsfield Communications Systems, Inc. by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**
- g. Richard A. Jette Invoice No. 42 in the amount of \$460.00 for Accounting Services. **Motion to approve Richard A. Jette Invoice No. 42 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**

7. **Change Order approval for items over \$25,000 that require a committee vote:**

- a. Manafort Bros. Concrete (Early Release Package – bought before the drawings were finished) work change request to include the scope associated with the Bid Set \$194,854.76. The OPM explained that the change was common in the case when Early Release Packages are compared to the final Bid Documents. The team has already reviewed the Change request and found that there are items that were bought in their original contract, items missed in the change and some other number refinements that need to occur. Currently, we received today a revised change request for roughly \$170,000 that has not been fully reviewed. Therefore, the team requests that we review the change revision and if in agreement with the number, have the district to sign the approval letter.  
**Motion to authorize the SBC representatives to approve the Manafort Brothers change request after it has been vetted and approved by the project team, for an amount not to exceed \$185,000 by P Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by B Ericson.**  
**Vote: Unanimous to approve.**
- b. **Champlain Masonry, cost for alternate stone selection, \$38,019.00**  
The Architect received notification that the specified stone(Goshen), a sedimentary stone, may have some flaking or deteriorating properties from the Mason. The mason proposed a granite stone for this premium cost. The Architect visited building that had been in place for the last 16 years and found that the specified stone had not deteriorated and that it could be used on the project. The Committee commented on the pictures that the Goshen Stone has a wide color range due to the Ironoxide nature of its makeup and the architect/CM was asked to look into a similar stone "ashfield" stone that does not have the ironoxide component in it. They agreed to look into and ask the mason to provide a mock-up.

8. **Ongoing Gym fall occupancy discussions with the Williamstown Building Department**

The Williamstown Inspector agreed with the Architect that the egress evaluation is acceptable and the Gym can be used if it can be tied into the current facility life safety and electrical power systems. Currently the team is looking at these systems to determine the best options to make this possible with the engineer and subcontractor. The school is also evaluating if there is an option to not take the Gym area until the remainder of the building is turned over in April 2018. The OPM reported that we are in the middle of gathering information and eventually pricing to compare the assorted options. At that point the school and administration will be able to review these options in terms of both cost and benefit. We hope to have information for Administration to review within 2 weeks.

9. **Procurement Update & Vote for Pre-Approval for Sub Buys**

T. Elmore referred the SBC to the 3 page breakdown of procurement included in the meeting packet. The overall results to date are still favorable to the district and the project is tracking to be under budget.

a. **Procurement Update**

The scope items procured to date and has excluded the “add alternates” for 2 site items, parking lot and amphitheater. Other than those excluded items, it is similar to the presentation in the last SBC Meeting. In addition, we are carrying 2 recent numbers that were generated through the construction administration process that the committee discussed earlier in the agenda, the Concrete design updates that were included in the Final Construction Bid set (Concrete was bid early on incomplete drawings) and a possible Stone veneer upgrade to another product. Also included in the allowance items was an estimate for potential security upgrades of \$252,000. These items are included to show that we are still are under budget due to the favorable bidding results.

b. **SBC Pre-Authorization for the district to sign Approval Letters for remaining Sitework/Landscaping subcontractor scope to be bought, if bids are within the \$2,800,000.00 estimated value.**

The site work design bidding is currently ongoing and the final number will not be ready until the next week or 2, all other scope items can be bid within the next month or so and were previously pre-authorized in the May 4 SBC meeting. Therefore, the team is looking for pre-approval to have the authorized representatives sign the award letter for the sitework & landscaping subcontractor, as was shown in the procurement update sheet to keep the momentum going.

***Motion to allow the SBC authorized representatives sign the approval letters for the Sitework/Landscaping subcontractor scope to be bought, if bids are within the \$2,800,000.00 estimated value carried, by P Consolini 2nd by M MacDonald. VOTE: 12 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain***

10. **Budget Summary update and preparation of the GMP**

A copy of the Budget Summary was distributed in the meeting packet and T. Elmore reviewed the summary level information. He pointed out the transfer of monies to pay for the last designer amendment approved on the May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and how Owners contingency has diminished to pay for FF&E Procurement and Haz Mat Monitoring.

He also forecasted that the GMP for the project would be prepared by either the July or August SBC meeting. He notified the Finance WG that IF they would like to be involved as the process begins, once the Sitework package is bid, they should plan to get on a conference call in a couple of weeks.

11. **Schedule Update: 60 Day Look-Ahead by building area**

Mike Giso of Turner presented the update for the next 30 and 60 day milestones for each of the areas of the project, using a graphic handout as well as projector images.

**12. Working Group Updates:**

- a. **Finance:** H. Daly indicated there was nothing new to report.
- b. **Interiors:** M. MacDonald noted that the FF&E vendor has brought samples to the Library for review by SBC members after the meeting, also as the Locker subcontractor is now on board, the Vendor did not carry the color that was preferred by the district so some lockers color changes have been decided upon: Black lockers in the Locker room and Steel Blue for the corridor Lockers.
- c. **Community Outreach:** P. Consolini reported that project information Tri-folds were being made available at various locations to keep residents aware of the project progress.
- d. **Site design alternates working group** - Thomas Bartels, with other members Richard Cohen, Mary MacDonald, and Jesse Wirtes.. The group has made good progress and the designs are headed in a good direction and after a final review should be ready to be issued for pricing.

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

**14. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums**

- e. Thursday, July 13 at 5:30 PM

**15. Adjourn at 6:11 PM, motion by P. Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by S Wentworth. Vote: Unanimous to approve.**

*Trip Elmore*

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, Assistant Project Manager

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.