



MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: September 3, 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#14)

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek,	SBC Chair, Lanesborough
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown
	Douglas Dias	Superintendent, MGRSD
	Nancy Rauscher	Bus. Manager MGRSD
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown Selectman
	Carolyn J. Greene	MGR School Committee Chair
	Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Chris Galib	Lanes. Finance Committee
	Bob Ericson	Lanesborough Selectman
	Rich Cohen	School Committee
	Trip Elmore	D&W OPM
	Rachel Milaschewski	D&W OPM
	Bob Bell	Design Partnership
	Dan Colli	Design Partnership
	Michael Walsh	MEP Consultant, CES

1. **Call to Order at 5:42 PM by M. Schiek with 11 voting members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

a. A short overview of the July 30, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

SBC Motion to approve the July 30, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by D. Dias. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 2 abstain (H. Daley and C. Galib).

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

3. **Invoices Submitted for Approval:**

a. DWMP invoice #8 in the amount of \$16,400.00 for OPM services and Cost Estimating (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the DWMP invoice #8 in the amount of \$16,400.00 for OPM services and Cost Estimating by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

- b. DPC Invoice #11004 in the amount of \$66,951.00 for completion of Design Services applied to the Feasibility Phase

Motion to approve the DPC invoice #1104 in the amount of \$66,951.00 for Design services by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- c. DPC Invoice #11007 in the amount of \$4,114.00 for the completion of the wetlands and survey work in the Feasibility Phase

Motion to approve the DPC invoice #11007 in the amount of \$4,114.00 for the completion of the wetlands and survey work by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- d. MGRSD Invoice #0715107892 from The Berkshire Eagle for RFQ Advertisement in the amount of \$127.43

Motion to approve the MGRSD Invoice #0715107892 from The Berkshire Eagle for RFQ Advertisement in the amount of \$127.43 by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- e. MGRSD Invoice from WilliNet for Local Broadcasting of SBC meetings held from 6/4/15 through 7/30/15 in the amount of \$500.00

Motion to approve the MGRSD Invoice from WilliNet for Local Broadcasting of SBC meetings held from 6/4/15 through 7/30/15 in the amount of \$500.00 by D. Dias, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- f. MGRSD Invoice #32 from Richard A. Jette for services provided to the Finance Working Group in the amount of \$440.00

Motion to approve the MGRSD Invoice #32 from Richard A. Jette for services provided to the Finance Working Group in the amount of \$440.00 by H. Daley, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

4. DPC proposal for additional Geo-Tech exploration at the selected building site

D. Colli of DPC explained that in order to have more information for the Schematic Design of the preferred option, it is necessary to request more geo-technical exploration within the selected option's footprint which will give them a better idea of what structural systems will be needed to support the building. D. Colli clarified that this test is different from the geo-environmental testing, as geo-technical only reveals what is underground, i.e. ledge, etc. He also added that this test is not disruptive to the site, and currently they only plan on

performing the amount of testing recommended by the geo-technical engineer. If the test uncovers “bad” material, they will then recommend more testing.

Motion to approve Design Partnership Proposal for additional Geo-Technical Exploration in the amount \$7,612.00 by R. Cohen, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

5. Update on the Adams-Cheshire outreach

C. Greene, Chair of the School Committee, pointed out that Douglas Dias, Kim Grady, and Mary MacDonald gave a public presentation on August 26th on the educational program and student experience at Mount Greylock. Following, C. Greene mentioned that there was a presentation on August 27th, 2015 at the Hoosac Valley School to explore the possibility of Lanesborough leaving the Mt. Greylock Region and tuitioning its grade 7-12 students to Hoosac Valley instead.

C. Greene added that there are currently no actual proposals that have been sent to Lanesborough or the Mount Greylock School Committee for a district change, and it is very important that the Mount Greylock Regional School Project continues to move forward. Furthermore, the MSBA is paying attention to these developments, and they want to know that the District will be able to convey the sentiment of the Town of Lanesborough during the FAS meeting on September 9th, 2015.

C. Greene indicated the Mt. Greylock School Committee is working with the Lanesborough Elementary School Committee to address issues regarding the future of the region and to demonstrate continued support for the building project. D. Dias then stated that both the SC and the SBC cannot allow themselves to get distracted, and after all the effort that has put into the project thus far, it is important that they stay the course.

P. Consolini also pointed out that a year ago, both communities voted overwhelmingly to fund the feasibility study of this project; M. Schiek, Chair of the SBC, then added that it is their job to move forward, and that this project is best suited for Mount Greylock. He said that there will be a lot of political issues, but he encourages the committee to stay focused.

6. Working Group Member Update

Community Outreach: P. Consolini mentioned that the group continues to hold public gatherings for project updates, and they may hold more with other groups alike. She encourages that anybody from the community who may have experience with school building projects to help or provide knowledge of recent projects in the area; the group hopes that this could yield possible opportunities for building tours, etc.

Facilities Working Group: T. Elmore of DWMP pointed out that the Facilities Working Group will be asked to be very involved in the next month or so, as the building systems will need to be selected and specific elements will be determined and clarified as a part of this

project or not. He added that if there are additional SBC members that are willing to participate in this process, now is a critical time to be involved, as the systems are clarified and selected.

J. Wirtes stated that Rob Wnuk, a MG Faculty member, should be added as a member, and a few other members of the committee said that they would reach out to individuals in the community or Williams College staff members for their involvement.

Establishment of Additional Working Groups: T. Elmore also pointed out that though they are not a requirement, there is a possible need for additional working groups moving forward to provide input and assist in the decision making of both the interior and exterior finishes with Design Partnership throughout the design process.

B. Bell of DPC clarified that these working groups could work as an advisory, and remind everybody of the overall project goals, as well as offer an opportunity to provide community input.

Establishment of Interiors Working Group: M. MacDonald agreed to lead the working group, and will reach out to the faculty, students, and parents for other involvement.

Establishment of Exteriors Working Group: M. Schiek agreed to lead the working group. Other community members will be invited to participate, and they will be identified once they agree to participate.

7. **CM at Risk qualification process update (D&W)**

DWMP gave an update on the Construction Manager Selection process and pointed out the Inspector General had approved the Mount Greylock Regional District's application to move forward with the CM at Risk construction delivery method (Letter from IG attached).

T. Elmore of DWMP added that they have drafted both a Request for Proposal (RFP) and construction contracts (General Conditions and Owner / Construction Manager Agreement) for the District to review and approve for the next phase of the CM at Risk process.

DWMP pointed out that they have received qualification submissions from nine construction firms, which are as follows (In no particular order):

- Gilbane
- Consigli
- Turner
- W.T. Rich
- Shawmut
- Hutter
- PC Construction

- PDS Engineering and Construction
- The Pike Company/D.E.W Joint Venture

After reviewing each submission, the CM Selection Committee then scored them based on the size of each firm, the location of and amount of school building experience, references, and their financial capacity. The Committee then eliminated 5 firms based off of their scores and information received that they did not believe would be best suited for this project.

The Selection Committee determined that the four firms who offer the most advantages for the District are (in no particular order) Gilbane, Consigli, Turner, and Shawmut, which they recommended to the SBC as the short list of firms who should receive the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Motion to accept the CM Selection Committee's recommendation to invite Gilbane, Consigli, Turner and Shawmut to submit proposals for the Mount Greylock Regional School Project by P. Consolini, 2nd by R. Cohen. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

T. Elmore of DWMP then recommended that the same Selection Committee does the proposal review, but interviews with each firm will be open to the Committee for attendance.

8. MSBA update on PSR Review (D&W)

T. Elmore pointed out that the MSBA has responded with their feedback on the Preferred Schematic Report (see letter attached) which was submitted at the beginning of August. The letter pointed out the areas of the report where there may have been typos/missing details or information that they want corrected/site clarifications, etc.

He added that Mark, Carrie, Mary, Doug, Nancy, DPC and DWMP attended a conference call with the MSBA that day to review the MSBA's comments, answer questions, make any clarifications about areas that are or are not eligible reimbursements, and inform the District of what to expect at the Facilities Assessment Subcommittee (FAS) meeting next week on September 9th.

Furthermore, T. Elmore highlighted that the MSBA pointed out that the total Gross Square Footage (GSF) of the preferred option is currently all eligible for reimbursement, and encourages that the design does not change to exceed that limit. He also highlighted that the MSBA complimented the Educational Program from both the District and Designer's point of view.

Lastly, he indicated that the MSBA feedback will be addressed within the 14 day deadline, and again pointed out that the District, DPC and DWMP will be meeting with the MSBA on September 9th, 2015 to review the project details prior to going in front of the Board at the end of the month for the MSBA's approval to proceed with Schematic Design.

9. Design Partnership Review of the design and system decisions required by the SBC in the months of September and October to complete the Schematic Design Documents.

In reference to the decision timeline attached in the minutes, B. Bell of DPC pointed out that they are trying to account for any upcoming critical decisions as early as possible. He stated that over the next three weeks, they plan to refine R1c.3 even more and get into further detail of the design, as well as conduct more use-group meetings (interiors and exteriors), look into Energy Conserving Measures (ECM's), and have their necessary consultants get involved.

DPC emphasized that by October 8th, 2015, they will need a decision on finishes and the selected mechanical systems in order to generate an accurate scope and pricing set for estimators. The cost estimates received from this set will then go through a reconciliation and Value Engineering (VE) process, which will bring the project out to the end of November where both the SC and SBC will vote to certify the Schematic Design Submission which is due to the MSBA by December 1st, 2015; Once that is submitted, the Schematic Design Phase is then completed, then once invited by the MSBA, the project will move into the Project Scope and Budget Agreements and Authorizations with the MSBA.

10. Design Partnership Review of Proposed Mechanical Systems and receive SBC comment

DPC introduced their MEP Consultant, Michael Walsh of Consulting Engineering Services, who then gave a presentation on mechanical systems and discussed options of heating, cooling, geo-thermal opportunities and recommendations for the project. (See the attached presentation.) Interactive discussion with SBC members occurred as each slide was shown to understand some of the important elements of the HVAC choices that must be made, for example should spaces be: ventilated and heated only; ventilated, dehumidified and heated only; or ventilated, dehumidified/cooled(AC) and heated.

After the presentation, the Committee discussed, in-depth, the use of each system, and how they relate to the school's needs and budget. M. Walsh clarified that he will be available for questions, and plans to work very closely with both the Facilities Working Group and DPC throughout this process.

11. SBC Vote to Proceed with Schematic Design Phase

T. Elmore noted that the Designer Contract requires that the owner authorize the designer to proceed into the Schematic Design Phase.

7.4.1 Upon receipt of an Approval to proceed to Schematic Design Phase, the Designer shall meet with the Owner to arrive at a mutual understanding of the requirements of the Final Design Program approved in writing by the Owner and the Authority.

C. Greene acknowledged that Design Partnership's contract requires a vote to proceed with the Schematic Design of the preferred option, and recommended the Committee made the vote that night to stay on schedule for the January 2016 Board Meeting with the MSBA.

VOTE: *Motion to Proceed with the Schematic Design of the Preferred Option for the Mount Greylock Regional School Project by R. Cohen, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 10 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain (B. Ericson).*

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

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

- a. Thursday, September 24, 2015
- b. Thursday, October 8th, 2015
- c. Thursday, October 22nd, 2015
- d. Thursday, November 19th, 2015 – Joint Meeting with MG School Committee
- e. Monday, November 23rd, 2015 – Joint Meeting with MG School Committee

14. **Adjourn**

SBC Motion to adjourn by P. Consolini, 2nd by D. Dias. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:50 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.