



MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: July 23, 2015 @ 5:30 P.M. in the Mount Greylock Regional School Meeting Room S103 in Williamstown, MA

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

SUBJECT: School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#12) JOINT Meeting with the Mount Greylock School Committee

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek,	SBC Chair, Lanesborough
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown
	Douglas Dias	Superintendent of Schools
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown Selectman
	Carolyn J. Greene	MGR School Committee Chair
	Jesse Wirtes	MG Facilities Supervisor
	Mary MacDonald	MG School Principal
	Lyndon Moors	MG Faculty
	Chris Galib	Lanesborough Finance Committee
	Bob Ericson	Lanesborough Selectman
	Rich Cohen	MG School Committee
	Wendy Penner	School Committee
	Steven Miller	School Committee
	Gary Fuls	School Committee
	Sheila Hebert	School Committee
	Chris Dodig	School Committee
	Trip Elmore	D&W OPM
	Rachel Milaschewski	D&W OPM
	Bob Bell	Design Partnership
	Dan Colli	Design Partnership

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:35 PM by M. Schiek.**

Call to Order of School Committee meeting by C. Greene.

(NOTE: Members S. Hebert and C. Dodig of the School Committee arrived after call to order, and did not participate in the vote to approve the July 9, 2015 Meeting Minutes)

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

a. A short overview of the July 9, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

SBC Motion to approve the July 9, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley. VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 3 abstain (M. MacDonald, L. Moors, C. Galib).

PROJECT MANAGERS ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

SC Motion to approve the July 9, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by R. Cohen, 2nd by W. Penner. VOTE: 3 approve, 0 against, 2 abstain (S. Miller, G. Fuls).

Discussion: C. Greene, Chair of the SC, asked if all members of the SC who attended the July 9, 2015 joint SC/SBC Meeting could be added to the attendance list on the minutes (W Penner, C Dodig), as well as for all future joint SC/SBC Meeting Minutes for distribution to both Committees. Also add as a record on page 2, that the PDP submission copies are at the local libraries in each town and some information is also in the town halls and another full copy for review is in the MGR District offices.

3. **Invoices Submitted for Approval: No Invoices**
4. **Working Group Member Update**

Community Outreach: P. Consolini expressed that she was pleased with the community participation and response on the two Green Charrette Meetings that were held on July 22, 2015 and July 23, 2015. She mentioned that the press release for the Charrette had made it into the Albany News, and in addition, the project Facebook Page and local newspaper ads were successful advertising tools.

The group plans on setting up future meetings at the Rotary and the Harper Center to inform attendees on recent project updates.

A few members of the committee suggested doing a presentation on the project for students at the beginning of the next academic year. The committee agreed that there are a lot of visuals to use for a presentation at this point in time, and it would be a great opportunity for student feedback.

Finance: H. Daley reported that the group had met multiple times in the last week, and they have held meetings with Unibank, who is the bonding agent for both District towns, and the Treasurer. Together, they have prepared a tax impact analysis based on the early cost estimates for each option, which they planned to discuss in the design review towards the end of the meeting.

Sustainable Buildings: W. Penner gave an update on the Green Charrette Meetings which were held on July 22, 2015 and July 23, 2015. She pointed out that there was a lot of success promoting the Charrettes to the community, with a turnout of 25 attendees for the first meeting, and 20 at the second. The Charrette gave an opportunity to hear from the designers, and a handful of consultants on their sustainability expertise, and they received a lot of involvement, positive feedback, and ideas from the community.

She thanked all of the community members who attended, the consultants, and the designers for their efforts put forth. Wendy also added that DPC will create a report documenting what came out of the Charrette, which will be distributed to the SC/SBC.

5. **Berkshire County-Wide Education Task Force Update**

C. Greene pointed out that the County-Wide Task Force is a new group which was created in respect to the County's on-going educational challenges; she stated that a lot of the schools are struggling to pass budgets and state contributions are diminishing. The group is taking inventory of the county's educational facilities, enrollment, school capacities, and any other current building projects to discuss possibilities of creating new districts or sharing educational facilities.

A public comment was made at one of the Task Force's last meetings in regards to the Mount Greylock Building project, stating that the group could have a potential impact on the building project. The Task Force group discussed the projects standing with the MSBA, and stressed that it is very important to stay in the "MSBA pipeline" once a region gets there, as it is a great challenge to get back on the MSBA radar if the project drops out.

Carrie said that so far, there has been great support amongst local legislators, and the group plans to meet every three weeks for the next six months.

6. Discussion on Remote Participation:

M. Schiek pointed out that with upcoming decision points and submissions to the MSBA, the SC and SBC should consider allowing remote participation. Carrie pointed out that there are state rules and regulations that outline the procedure (which were attached to the meeting information package), which they are required to follow. She adds that a physical quorum is required, and all votes must be roll call votes. In addition, the School Committee must vote to allow remote participation prior to the SBC's vote, as the Building Committee is a subcommittee of the SC.

B. Ericson of the SBC and C. Dodig of the SC expressed concern with remote participation, as they are worried that proper dialogues will not take place if somebody calls in on a cell phone, and they worry that some may abuse the privilege of participating remotely. Although some members would agree, they also feel that the need for remote participation at this point of the project is necessary.

S. Miller of the School Committee adds that if they find remote participation doesn't not seem to work, the committee can always vote against it in the future, so it is worth a shot due to necessity.

R. Cohen suggested that the SC revisit this topic again shortly down the road to refine the remote participation policy if it is necessary.

Motion to allow remote participation as per outlined in M.G.L Chapter 29, Section 10 for School Committee Meetings by S. Miller, 2nd by S. Hebert. VOTE: 5 approve, 1 opposed, 0 abstain. Vote passes.

Motion to allow remote participation as per outlined in M.G.L Chapter 29, Section 10 for School Building Committee Meetings by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 10 approve, 1 opposed, 0 abstain. Vote passes.

7. Revisit Project Goals and Design Option Evolution

M. Schiek points out the tally sheet that was handed out to both committees is available for members to use as a guide when scoring the design options, and how they relate to the project goals, in preparation for the vote on July 30, 2015. He stated that they are not required to use the tally sheet, and they are for personal use only, as it becomes a public record once it is brought to attention in a committee meeting.

T. Elmore of DWMP asked the committees how they would like to go upon voting for the Preferred Option, as a tally sheet will be used which is similar to the one used to vote for the Preliminary Design Program (PDP), though the committee creates the scoring procedure.

The Chair of the SBC stated that he would like to use the same voting procedure that was used in voting for the PDP, which ranks each member's 1st, 2nd, and last place choices; these votes will then be tallied, ranked, and read for record.

Carrie then added that the SBC will first vote to recommend their highest ranked option to the SC; the SC then votes to approve the SBC's recommendation. She mentions that if the SC does not approve the SBC's recommendation, then the vote does not pass and the project has a potential of being delayed up to two months due to the MSBA's Board Meeting Schedule, where Preferred Schematic Report submissions are reviewed. The SC and SBC have been holding the joint meetings so that all SC and SBC members are informed on each other's opinions, in an effort to keep this from happening.

A member of the committee asked that if they are unable to attend physically or remotely to the meeting to vote on July 30th, if they could have a stand-in. The chair pointed out that they are welcome to have a representative attend to voice their opinions, though, they do not have the authority to vote for a member.

M. Schiek added that if any committee members cannot attend either physically or remotely, he would accept their comments in advance, and would read them at the meeting for record, prior to any action to vote.

Design Partnership then went on to present the on-going evolutions of the design options (presentation attached).

There were a lot of concerns from both the committee and the public with the phasing and length of construction of option R1c.1, though the feedback on options R1c.3 and N3b was positive.

A public comment was made by a parent of a Mount Greylock student, stating that they are concerned for the students who would live through the construction of the building throughout their term at MG, and the level of stress they would experience in that time is concerning, also pointing out that their child has looked into other schooling options to avoid such a lengthy construction period. They also added that while R1c.1 is the cheapest option, they feel as if non-monetary value is more important to the well-being of the students and faculty, and strongly emphasized that the circumstances of option R1c.1 is unworkable.

The committees then went on to discuss the tax impact analysis that was generated from the **early** option cost estimates. Mark began by stressing that is important **not to get attached to these numbers or set them in stone, as they are based solely on early cost and reimbursement rate estimates, and the numbers are likely to fluctuate.**

Mark first commented on the cost of base repair, which is the option to simply “fix” the existing building and bring it up to code, but does not meet the education programming needs, meaning the MSBA will no longer participate in the project. The cost of base repair is estimated at approximately \$58 Million, which the district would be fully responsible for without reimbursement from the MSBA.

He then read the following **estimated potential** tax impacts as follows (see sheet attached):

- *Option R1c.1 has an estimated district share of approximately \$32 Million, with an estimated tax rate impact of \$1.75 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$1.50 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$350 to \$450 and for Williamstown is \$500 to \$600.*
- *Option R1c.3 has an estimated district share of approximately \$38 Million, with an estimated tax rate impact of \$2.00 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$1.75 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$400 to \$500 and for Williamstown is \$600 to \$700.*
- *Option N3b has an estimated district share of approximately \$42 Million, with an estimated tax rate impact of \$2.25 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$2.00 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$450 to \$550 and for Williamstown is \$650 to \$750.*

H. Daley, lead of the Finance Working Group, added that these numbers are based on a financing plan by Unibank, starting (hypothetically) in fiscal year 2017, with 27-29 year bonds (State max is 30 years). These numbers are also using estimates of what the market rates may be in the future. Hugh pointed out that while they may be broad ranges, they are trying to be realistic, and keep the payments as low as possible.

8. **Other Business not anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting:**

M. Schiek pointed out that the designers are looking at the Phase 1 Site hazard analysis, and will need to discuss the testing of particular areas based on the chosen project moving forward; any hazardous material discovered in areas affected by the building project will have to be identified, while the treatment of areas outside of the building project's range are up to the School Committee to handle as a separate issue.

9. **Next SBC Meeting(s) and times**

a. Thursday, July 30, 2015 at 5:30 PM in Williamstown: *SBC Vote for Preferred Option*

10. **Adjourn**

SBC Motion to adjourn by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM

SC Motion to adjourn School Committee Meeting by R. Chohen, 2nd by S. Miller. VOTE: Unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

Rachel Milaschewski
Dore & Whittier Management Partners, 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 10 days, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.