



MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSBC & SC MEETING MINUTES

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

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

SUBJECT: School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#13) JOINT with School Committee

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek,	SBC Chair, Lanesborough
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown
	Douglas Dias	Superintendent, MGRSD
	Carolyn J. Greene	MGR School Committee Chair
	Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Thomas Bartels	Williamstown
	Bob Ericson	Lanesborough Selectman
	Rich Cohen	School Committee
	Steven Miller	School Committee
	Gary Fuls	School Committee
	Wendy Penner	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. **SBC Call to Order of at 5:40 PM by M. Schiek with 9 voting members in attendance. SC Call to Order at 5:40 PM by C. Greene with 7 voting members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

a. A short overview of the July 23, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

SBC Motion to approve the July 23, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by C. Greene, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain (T. Bartels).

SC Motion to approve the July 23, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by R. Cohen, 2nd by S. Miller. VOTE: 6 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.

Discussion: A few areas that needed minor edits were pointed out and will be updated by DWMP for record.

PROJECT MANAGERS ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

3. **Invoices Submitted for Approval:**

- a. DWMP invoice #7 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM services (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the DWMP invoice #7 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM services by P. Consolini, 2nd by D. Dias. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- b. DPC invoice #10999 in the amount of \$16,181.00 for design services applied to the feasibility phase (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the DPC invoice #10999 in the amount of \$16,181.00 for Design services by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- c. Cost Update: MGRSD Building Project Clerk Pay History Reports for pay periods beginning on 6/1/2014 through 7/21/2015 (Reports attached).

The Chair of the Committee pointed out that the Building Project Clerk has already been paid for this time, and the pay report is included as an update of the cost applied to the project budget to date.

4. **Working Group Member Update**

Sustainable Buildings: W. Penner pointed out that they have received the Charrette Report from Thornton Thomasetti, which has been sent out to the SBC and SC for review, and should be shared widely after a few edits are made. Penner stated that the group's next steps are to look at the timeline of the selected option and begin do research and collect information on projects that are recognized for their sustainability.

Community Outreach: P. Consolini mentioned that the group had met at the Harper Center to share project updates with the community, where they received good feedback. She mentioned that there were major concerns in regards to the tax impact, as some community members fear that the district will be unlivable if taxes get higher.

The group also received feedback in regards to the importance of sustainability, as well as technology, comprehensive maintenance opportunities, and handicap accessibility.

C. Greene added that a few MG Alumni have made suggestions via Facebook of memorials in the school and campus. She recommended forming a Preservation Task Group down the road to avoid losing sight of the school's history, and stated that interested alumni members can contact the group for tours to see where the project is.

Lastly, P. Consolini stated that they are grateful for the responses and feedback they have received, and encourage the community to keep it up.

5. Option Cost Update

M. Schiek, Chair of the SBC, pointed out that the cost estimates have changed significantly since the previous week after reviewing and reconciling the information received from both DPC and DWMP's cost estimators. M. Schiek added that these are still **estimates**, and are still subject to change. From a fiscal responsibility standpoint, he suggested that both the SBC and SC pay close attention to costs and be responsible with their choices.

T. Elmore of DWMP added that the cost estimate reconciliation process is very important, as they had met with DPC and the estimators on the previous Tuesday to perform this exercise. He pointed out the project budgets that were attached in the meeting package, which encompasses the **total** project budget, include the **estimated** OPM, Designer, Construction, CM Fees, and Furniture Fixtures and Equipment (FFE) costs.

Trip explains that the budget spreadsheet provided shows which costs are eligible and not eligible by the state, and how the state treats an addition/renovation differently than new construction in their contingency reimbursement, with an up to a 2% contingency reimbursement for add/reno and approximately 1% for new construction. He also adds that there is incentive for the use of renovated space.

M. Schiek points out that the MSBA numbers included in the cost estimates are not official, but, again, are estimates to show the variation in cost, but they will likely be in the same neighborhood. He then went on the report the cost estimates for each option as follows:

- **Estimated cost of Option R1c.1:** \$69.2 Million, with an *estimated* district share of approximately \$36.6 Million - \$41.2 Million
- **Estimated cost of Option R1c.3:** \$69.5 Million, with an *estimated* district share of approximately \$38 Million – \$42.7 Million
- **Estimated cost of Option N3b:** \$74.5 Million, with an *estimated* district share of approximately \$44 Million - \$49 Million

C. Greene of both the SBC and SC asked if there were ways to think about bringing the costs down. T. Elmore then explained a Value Engineering (VE) exercise which will be performed down the road; this exercise picks the budget apart, creating a list of things that can be removed, and in turn could save hundreds of thousands in costs.

B. Ericson of the SBC, who has experience with value engineering, had taken the time to perform the exercise himself, stating that he found upwards of \$500,000 in preliminary potential savings. He added that the more people who perform the VE exercise, the better the potential savings could be.

The Finance Group pointed out that they had used the higher end of the estimated district share from the most recent cost estimates in an updated tax impact analysis, and reported that the apportionment for the regional agreement as it stands right now is a 32.3% share for Lanesborough, and a 67.7% share for Williamstown, which C. Greene added is an estimate based on when the bonding would occur.

M. Schiek then later read the updated **estimated potential** tax rate impacts, as provided by the bonding agent:

- *Option R1c.1 has an estimated potential tax rate impact of \$2.10 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$1.85 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$375 to \$450 and for Williamstown is \$575 to \$650.*
- *Option R1c.3 has an estimated potential tax rate impact of \$2.10 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$1.90 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$375 to \$470 and for Williamstown is \$575 to \$650.*
- *Option N3b has an estimated potential tax rate impact of \$2.50 per \$1,000 of home value in Lanesborough, and \$2.20 per \$1,000 of home value in Williamstown. The average household tax range for Lanesborough is \$450 to \$525 and for Williamstown is \$675 to \$750.*

C. Greene added that there has been a request to look at the regional agreement to see if it can be adjusted, and the SC plans to meet on August 11th and August 17th to begin discussing whether to propose a revised regional agreement that could take into account an adjustable capital apportionment based on changing enrollment and population.

6. **CM Selection Update**

T. Elmore mentioned that the CM at Risk selection process has started, and the advertisement was posted to the Central Register and the Berkshire Eagle on July 29th. DWMP has started to receive inquiries from interested firms, and expect to get their qualifications by the due date of August 19th, 2015.

Once the CM Selection committee reviews the qualifications received, they will create a short-list of firms to interview and invite to provide proposals for the project.

DWMP is hopeful that they will have a CM on board by the beginning of November, 2015, whom, if an option is selected at this meeting, will receive drawings at that time to base their cost estimate on, which will be the cost submitted to the MSBA in December with the Schematic Design submission, and will also be the number that the district will live with for the remainder of the project.

7. Phase 2 “Hazardous Soils” Investigation and Building Site Borings in Schematic Design

M. Schiek began by explaining that the Phase 1 Site Assessment is more of an evaluation of what hazardous materials could potentially be on the site where the proposed options may go, and to identify any areas of concern, which might affect which project will be done. Out of the Phase 1 Assessment, a few areas were recommended for further investigation in a Phase 2 Assessment.

He then added that school building projects are required to perform a Phase 2 assessment in areas that need more testing, and any areas that may need further testing but are not located within the footprint of the proposed project will be passed to the SC to decide if they, too, would like further investigation of those areas.

C. Greene stated that the SC plans to discuss this at their August 11th and August 17th meetings, as well.

8. DPC Review of Energy Model and Option Review

B. Bell of DPC pointed out that they were able to update the energy models to include the Energy Use Intensity (EUI) information for each option, which is included in the Charrette Report provided by Thornton Thomasetti.

While reviewing the options (see presentation attached), he also provided the committees with the **estimated potential** energy cost for each option based off of rough models and assumptions, which are as follows:

- *Existing Building: \$1.93/SF, with an approximate energy cost of \$331k/year*
- *Option R1c.1: \$1.30/SF, with an approximate energy cost of \$172k/year*
- *Option R1c.3: \$1.25/SF, with an approximate energy cost of \$166.1k/year*
- *Option N3b: \$1.18/SF, with an approximate energy cost of \$156.2k/year*

The chair of the committee then opened a discussion on the options, and C. Greene suggested taking option R1c.1 off the table based on the concerns discussed throughout the design process, and the energy model information.

SBC Motion to remove option R1c.1 from the option consideration for the Mount Greylock Regional School Project by C. Greene, 2nd by P. Consolini.

Discussion: P. Consolini asked if DWMP would give an overview of the schedules and phasing procedures for each option.

T. Elmore of DWMP then identified that Option R1c.1 had the longest duration of 26-28 months, and required around 8 phases due to the amount of renovated and occupied space. This option requires the teachers and students to move a number of times, and has an extensive amount of takedown and clean-up work involved.

R1c.3 was reported to have the shortest duration of approximately 25 months, where the major disruption is in the center of the building rather than the classrooms.

Lastly, N3b has minimal disruption to any occupied space, as it is a new building, but requires a large amount of demolition and site work after the new building has been completed, which adds a number of months to the project, giving an estimated duration of approximately 26 months.

P. Consolini concluded that option R1c.1. is problematic on a number of levels, as it doesn't save a considerable amount of money more in comparison to the other two options, and the duration and disruption to the teachers and students is unacceptable.

R. Cohen added that the layout of this option is sub-optimal for middle and high school academics, and B. Ericson also added that the option could end up to be more expensive in the long run due to possible unknowns of such a largely renovated space.

VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against. Motion passes unanimously.

The committees then went on to discuss the remaining options R1c.3 and N3b.

9. SBC/SC and Public Comment on Option Review

C. Greene began by pointing out that the major concerns to take into account are the unknowns of a renovation, phasing, and overall cost of the selected option.

The committee overall voiced similar concerns, while they all kept the safety and satisfaction of the educational program in mind as priorities.

A member of the committee commented on the cost variation of option R1c.3 and N3b, pointing out that it comes down to a difference of around \$4-6 Million. Some members agreed that this wasn't a large variation, though there was still concern on the tax impact that a new building would have on the district, and how it could affect people moving to the community. S. Wentworth spoke for the Finance Working Group, stating that they felt the upper \$2.00/\$1000 of home value range was the limit of what the Lanesborough Community could afford and would support overall.

It was apparent that the committee paid close attention to the amount of disruption that the students and teachers would experience throughout the construction process, as well as the importance of sustainability to the community.

Many members of both committees felt that option R1c.3 had a very appealing design, as its North/South orientation and 3-story layout is very energy efficient, and provides a convenient environment for proper middle and high school separation as needed, while still offering a strong sense of community and flexibility.

The committees felt as if option R1c.3 had a nice balance of the district's needs and also recognizes the fiscal challenges that the District faces, as well.

Following the SC and SBC feedback, a number of community members attending the meeting made comments, as well.

These members voiced their concerns in regards to phasing and disruption to the faculty and students, and asked questions about the cost coverage of possible unknowns that may surface with a renovation project. DWMP responded, stating that the construction and owner's contingency is built into the budget to address such issues.

DPC and M. MacDonald both commented on phasing of a renovation, stating that they try to limit the amount of moves to the least possible, and for as little disruption as possible.

M. Schiek also pointed out in response to another public question that the gym and the auditorium are slightly larger in the renovation option than in the new building, due to the MSBA's reimbursement cap for these spaces, which is based on square footage.

After the public comments, C. Greene asked DWMP and DPC if they would consider R1c.3 to be a high risk addition and renovation project. Both agreed that while every project is different, they are familiar with the materials and structure of the timeframe in which the building was constructed, and they would expect to see a lot of similarities to what they have seen and experienced on other renovation projects.

The 7-30-2015 meeting is posted to the WilliNet website for those who would like to hear the discussion in full detail.

10. Option Selection: Roll Call Vote Expected by School Building Committee and School Committee

The Chair of the SBC discussed the voting procedure and asked the committee if they felt whether it was necessary to use the provided tally sheets to rank the remaining options, as there were only 2 left on the table.

SBC Motion to proceed with option R1c.3 as the preferred option for the Mount Greylock Regional School Project by B. Ericson, 2nd by R. Cohen.

The SBC Chair then recorded a roll-call vote (see roll-call vote sheet attached).

VOTE: 8 approve, 1 against, 0 abstain. The motion passes.

The Chair of the School Committee then stated that they would entertain a motion to approve or not approve the SBC's recommendation.

Motion to adopt the recommendation by the School Building Committee to submit Option R1c.3 to the MSBA as the Preferred Option by C. Dodig, 2nd by G. Fuls.

The SC Chair then recorded a roll-call vote (see roll-call vote sheet attached).

VOTE: Unanimous to approve. The motion passes.

11. **School Building Committee and School Committee approval for the OPM and Architect to Submit the Preferred Schematic Report and for District Leadership to sign the Local Actions Letter: Roll Call Vote Expected and Certified by SBC Chair**

SBC Motion to approve the OPM and Architect to submit the Preferred Schematic Report by B. Ericson, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: Unanimous to approve. The motion passes.

SC Motion to approve the OPM and Architect to submit the Preferred Schematic Report by S. Miller, 2nd by S. Hebert. VOTE: Unanimous to approve. The motion passes.

12. **Other Business not Anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting: None.**

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

- a. Thursday, September 3, 2015 at 5:30 PM

14. **Adjourn**

SBC Motion to adjourn by D. Dias, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM

SC Motion to adjourn by S. Hebert, 2nd by W. Penner. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:55 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.