



MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

**MGRSBC & SC MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE OF MEETING:** November 19, 2015 @ 5:30 P.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#19) JOINT with School Committee

<b>ATTENDING:</b>	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
	Wendy Penner	School Committee
	Gary Fuls	School Committee
	Trip Elmore	D&W OPM
	Rachel Milaschewski	D&W OPM
	Dan Colli	Design Partnership
	Jim Liddick	Turner Construction Company
	Mike Ziobrowski	Turner Construction Company

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 5:35 PM by M. Schiek with 11 voting Members in attendance.**

**Call to Order of SC Meeting at 5:37 by C. Greene with 4 voting members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

a. A short SBC review of the October 29, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

***SBC Motion to approve the October 29, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by H. Daley.***

**Discussion:** C. Greene reported that the School Committee had already approved the October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Meeting Minutes at the last SC Meeting.

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

**VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

**3. Invoices Submitted for Approval: No invoices submitted for approval.**

- a. DWMP September Invoice No. 9, and October Invoice No. 10 in the total combined amount of \$40,000.00 for OPM Services

**Motion to approve DWMP invoices 9 and 10 in the total amount of \$40,000.00 by D. Dias, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

- b. MGRSD PO No. 360318 issued to Turner Construction Company in the amount of \$25,000.00 for Pre-Construction Services

T. Elmore of DWMP introduced Jim Liddick and Mike Ziobrowski of Turner Construction Company, stating that after they were selected as the CM, they have done an outstanding job jumping in to the schedule and estimates, and meeting with the District.

**Motion to approve PO# 360318 in the amount of \$25,000.00 by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

- c. MGRSD WilliNet Invoice in the amount of \$200.00 for video coverage of the October 8, 2015 and October 22, 2015 SBC Meetings

**Motion to WilliNet invoice in the amount of \$200.00 by D. Dias, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

- d. Cost Update: MGRSD Building Project Clerk Pay History Reports for pay periods beginning on 9/29/2015 through 11/12/2015 (Reports attached)

**Motion to approve MGRSD Building Clerk Pay History Reports by D. Dias, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

- e. Design Partnership Invoice No. 11034 in the amount of \$95,200.00 for Design Services provided in the Schematic Design Phase

**Motion to approve the Design Partnership Invoice No. 11034 in the amount of \$95,200.00 by P. Consolini, 2nd by R. Cohen. VOTE: 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain.**

**4. Working Group Update**

**a. Community Outreach**

P. Consolini mentioned that they are continuing to give building project updates to the public and handout trifold project information flyers. The group will continue to look for

more events where they can give project updates as they go along, and are open to suggestions.

**b. Green Working Group:**

W. Penner reported that they have created another working group whose plan is to focus on the enhancement of energy efficiency and the carbon footprint. She added that Williams College is interested in helping the community to reduce the carbon footprint, and they are currently looking for ways Greylock can achieve that.

**5. Discussion on Relocation of Shared Radio Tower (R. Wnuk)**

R. Wnuk, AV Director at the Mount Greylock Regional School, introduced himself and raised his concerns toward the relocation of the shared radio tower at the school. He mentioned that he noticed no funds were built into the preliminary project budget estimates, and explained that the radio equipment is important for the use of the MG Radio and Weather Stations, and the tower is also used as a resource for safety and security purposes by the Williamstown Fire and Police Stations. He went on to give an overview of the proposals he received from Pittsfield Communications Systems to implement the work required for the equipment to perform properly (letter and proposals attached), which comes to a total of \$5,573.40.

T. Elmore mentioned that the most recent and reconciled cost estimates include \$5,573.40 for the relocation of the radio tower.

No committee members were opposed to keeping this number in the project budget, and M. Schiek thanked R. Wnuk for his efforts.

**6. DPC Design FF&E and Technology equipment review (DPC)**

D. Colli drew the attention to the Furniture Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) and Technology cost estimates that were provided by their consultant in the meeting packet. He mentioned that these estimates will be included in the Schematic Design submission to the MSBA, as the MSBA expects to see what FF&E and Technology will be going into the school.

Based off of these estimates, the current cost for FF&E is approximately \$930,050.00, considering the District does not reuse any of their furniture, which they are anticipating. The MSBA's allowable reimbursement for FF&E is \$1,200 per student, putting the FF&E around \$300,000 over the MSBA's allowable reimbursement.

The Technology estimate, which does represent some reuse of equipment, came in at approximately \$678,810.00, with a difference of \$36,810.00 from the MSBA's allowable reimbursement for technology, which is another \$1,200 per student.

D. Colli then went on to explain that these numbers cover everything included in the FF&E/Technology budgets, leaving nothing out. They are also the numbers which have been carried in the project budget to date.

C. Greene asked the committee if they wanted to drop the numbers at all, which a few members were interested in, including B. Ericson. They showed some concern toward the removal of all existing FF&E, and discussed whether or not they get an inventory at this time of what furniture could be reused.

T. Elmore pointed out that there are ways to spend less money on the FF&E/Technology, but asked if they'd rather be conservative in their estimates, since any money not spent within the FF&E/Technology budget would go back to the district. Currently the project budget has an additional \$318,000 in projected FF&E and Technology costs included in it. This amount is 100% non-reimbursable by the MSBA.

D. Colli added that these numbers are estimates right now, meaning the District is not locked into them, and they will go out to bid. He also reassured the committee that these numbers are suggested by their estimator to carry in the budget.

H. Daley pointed out the downside of carrying the high number if they bond for it, is that the District will have to pay interest on it for the length of the bond, though he is fine carrying the overage, as it is just upwards of \$300,000 within the entire project budget.

P. Consolini suggested that there are ways to value engineer the FF&E/Technology lists, and they can put together a working group who can look into what furniture/equipment makes sense to keep.

## **7. Turner's Pre-Construction Phasing and Schedule overview (Turner)**

M. Ziobrowski and J. Liddick of Turner Construction mentioned that since they were selected as the CM, they have done a lot of work with the school to better understand the environment and culture of Mount Greylock, and after meeting multiple times with members of the district and project team, they have created logistics and phasing plan for the construction of the school.

They then went on to explain how the phasing plan has evolved thus far (see attached) to be most efficient, while maintaining the use of the gym and utilities as much as possible.

M. MacDonald commented that the current phasing plan reduces the number of moves, but the school will likely have to take advantage of neighboring spaces/areas, such as Williams College for some events.

T. Elmore added that this plan will constantly be evolving, and the project team plans to update the committee with any changes each time they meet. He also mentioned that the

process and schedule are dependent on the release date to begin the next phase of design, which occurs after the local project approval in Lanesborough and Williamstown.

J. Liddick pointed out that they will need to perform early package work to support the current schedule, and anything that can be done to expedite that process sooner will have positive effects on the construction schedule.

M. Ziobrowski added that they feel very optimistic about where the schedule, budget, estimates, and overall project is going to date.

8. **Reconciled construction estimate, estimated project cost and local share cost range (D&W, Fin. WG)**

T. Elmore mentioned that the Finance Working Group had met prior to the SBC meeting to discuss the cost estimates that were shared by Essential Estimating, and Turner's Estimators on Monday, the 16<sup>th</sup>. He added that both Estimators, Turner, Design Partnership, and DWMP all met on Tuesday to do a line-by-line cost reconciliation of both estimates received, which resulted in final costs that were within 2% of each other.

He reported that they are currently carrying Turner's construction cost estimate of \$52,310,000, since Essential Estimating is still presently finalizing their estimate since the reconciliation, but had reported the morning before this meeting that their number was approximately \$300,000 higher than Turner's number. The estimated construction budget amount of \$52.3M is down from the \$57M amount, which was estimated in August.

T. Elmore explained the difference between soft and hard costs, and how each of them affect the overall project budget. He stated that the OPM, Arch, Insurance, etc. costs are considered soft costs, and the construction numbers are what's considered as a hard cost.

He added that he included Turner's most recent construction estimate, which is the \$52,310,000 value, in the MSBA formatted overall project budget sheet, called the 3011, to get a better understanding of the overall project cost, potential reimbursement amounts, and the District share.

After putting all of the costs together, the overall project cost estimate came in at around \$64.8 Million, which is down from the estimated \$69.5 Million back in August, and an estimated \$8.3 Million of items excluded by the MSBA, which is also down from the \$16.3 Million amount estimated in August, as well.

He mentioned that these numbers will continue to evolve, as this overall project cost is based on his understanding of the MSBA's current reimbursement rates, but that it is in the right neighborhood. He also mentioned that the amount cut from the budget since August affects the local share, which in August was estimated at approximately \$38.1M – \$42.7M, and is now estimated as \$31.9M on the low side, and \$35.8M on the conservative side.

H. Daley shared that T. Elmore had walked the finance working group through the “3011” overall project budget sheet line-by-line, where they were able to bring down some of the scope, and update it with the MSBA’s improved \$299 per square foot of construction reimbursement rate, which is up from the previous \$287 and times 132,000 square feet enhances the reimbursable costs by an additional \$1,560,000. This has contributed to the local share reduction.

T. Elmore pointed out that they still have other value engineering opportunities, but both he and M. Ziobrowski agree that these are good numbers.

He went on to explain the next few steps the budget will go through before it is set, which include a series of meetings with the MSBA, where they will be given feedback and multiple opportunities to adjust the budget and come to an agreement with them (the MSBA) in January, 2016.

B. Ericson and a few members of the committee felt as if they should go through the estimates prior to making the vote to submit the Schematic Design Package to the MSBA, as these numbers will be included in the package for their initial review. Though, other members of the committee felt strongly that the schedule and submission dates don’t allow for extra time to review the budget.

C. Greene pointed out that a lot of work has already been done to value engineer the current estimates which reconciled so closely to one another, adding that it is important to carry a conservative number for the job and there would only be one other opportunity to vote for the submission of the Schematic Design before it is due to the MSBA on December 1, 2015. She stated that it is important to recognize the amount of work done so far to cut the number down this much already.

#### **9. Review of the Value Engineering (VE) list (Potential Cost Saving Ideas) (Turner/DPC)**

Turner reviewed the Value Engineering Log that they created with rough order of magnitude items and numbers (see attached) for potential cost savings. M. Ziobrowski explained that it is easier to work certain items out of the design now, if the District chooses to do so, as the drawings are being created, though these design changes could have significant effects on the construction and schedule.

The committee discussed the items listed on the VE log, and R. Cohen added that the items listed are complex, and maybe not worth the effects to the construction and schedule. He commented that to date the group has made decisions that have significantly reduced the project costs (16% on local share) as is apparent with the new numbers and that the list presented tonight only reflects a potential 1% in savings that could have other negative impacts that need to be further investigated.

C. Greene added that the VE done to date does a good job at demonstrating the ability to bring the numbers down further, and there is some credibility in these additional ideas that can be included in the project in the future.

#### 10. Potential acceptance of VE items by the SBC

After reviewing the VE list provided by Turner, the committee did not hold a vote to accept any of the VE items at this time.

#### 11. Potential Vote to Submit the DESE and Schematic Design Package to the MSBA

T. Elmore explained that by authorizing DPC and DWMP to submit the Schematic Design to the MSBA, the committee is not voting *line item* numbers, but they are voting that they are comfortable with the scope and the overall project cost to a point where they want to move forward with the MSBA.

### **VOTE TO SUBMIT SCHEMATIC DESIGN:**

The Chair of the SBC asked for a motion (certified vote sheets attached):

***Motion to recommend to the School Committee to authorize Design Partnership and Dore and Whittier to Submit the DESE and Schematic Design Package to the MSBA by P. Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by H. Daley.***

Discussion: B. Ericson pointed out that he was uncomfortable with submitting the SD without reviewing the number beforehand, while W. Penner of the School Committee made a point that they should not wait any longer to hold a vote, as it is difficult to get both committees together, and there is not enough time prior to the submission date.

P. Consolini added that B. Ericson could continue to look at value engineering opportunities even after the Schematic Design is submitted, as the numbers will still be tweaked.

***The Chair held a roll call vote (vote sheet attached): 11 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. The motion passes unanimously.***

The Chair of the SC then asks for a motion to approve the SBC's recommendation:

***Motion to accept the School Building Committee's recommendation to submit the Schematic Design Package to the MSBA by G. Fuls, 2<sup>nd</sup> by R. Cohen.***

***The Chair held a roll call vote (vote sheet attached): 4 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. The motion passes unanimously.***

#### 12. Other Business not anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting: None.

13. **Public Comment:** *None*

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

- a. Monday, November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015 – Joint Meeting with MG School Committee at 5:30 PM at MGRHS for Vote to Approve Schematic Design Submission to the MSBA
- b. Tentative January 28, 2016 at 5:30 PM – Joint meeting with School Committee

15. **Adjourn**

SBC Motion to adjourn by P. Consolini, 2nd by D. Dias. VOTE: unanimous to approve.  
Meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM

SC Motion to adjourn by R. Cohen, 2nd by G. Fuls. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting  
adjourned at 8:00 PM

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Rachel Milaschewski

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.