



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSD MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: November 6, 2014 @ 7:00 P.M. in the MGRSD Middle/High School in Williamstown, MA

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

SUBJECT: School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#1)

ATTENDING:

Mark Schiek,	S B C Chair, Lanesborough
Dr. Rose Ellis	Superintendent of Schools MGRHS
John M. Benzinger	Williamstown
Lynn Bassett	Bus Mgr, MGRSD
Hugh Daley	Williamstown Selectman
Carolyn J. Greene	MGR School Committee Chair
Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
Lyndon Moors	Faculty, MGRHS
Chris Galib	Lanesborough Fin. Committee
Thomas H. Bartels, AIA	Williamstown
Dave Vogel	Lanesborough
Trip Elmore	D&W OPM
Rachel Milaschewski	D&W OPM

-
1. **Call to Order: 7:06 PM**
 - a. All committee members introduced themselves.
 2. **Invoices Submitted for Approval:**
 - a. No invoices were submitted for approval.
 3. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - a. October 8, 2014 SBC meeting minutes were included in black binders handed out by D&W. M. Schiek reviewed the topics, to which there was no discussion.

*Motion to approve the October 8, 2014 SBC Meeting Minutes
by: H. Daley, 2nd by D. Vogel. VOTE: 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

4. Introduction of the recommended OPM, Dore & Whittier (D&W).

Trip Elmore explained the D&W background and experience with building schools and working with the MSBA. He introduced Rachel Milaschewski as a part of his team who will be attending various meetings and helping with the project.

M. Schiek gave an update to the committee regarding the review meeting held at the MSBA on Monday, November 3, 2014.

The SBC members who attended this meeting were very grateful when they were commended for their efforts put forth towards selecting and OPM for the project. During their discussion the MSBA raised a few questions for the OPM regarding the change in team members assigned to the project, and staffing concerns about D&W's Architecture side vs. the Management Partners side.

Trip addressed these questions explaining that Steve Brown, Rachel Milaschewski, and himself, have worked as a successful team on other projects. He then added that D&W's Architecture side is there to be used as a resource if needed, however the Management Partners maintain to be their own entity. The district members acknowledged that they were aware that D&W has both architects & OPMs that make up the 60 person firm.

After some further standard discussion, the MSBA gave approval to move forward with D&W as the OPM, and will soon issue a formal letter to the district.

M. Schiek reminded the committee that they have the right to take the appropriate time to make decisions for this project.

5. D&W to review their circulated materials in project binders and Trip reviewed the materials with the SBC.

a. State Ethics online training

The material attached is furnished for your use and it was recommended by D&W that the committee members take the on line course and give the completion certificate to a member of the Regional School District. SBC comment was made stating that it is required by the district to for all school employees to complete this training every three years. M. Schiek requested that all other members of the committee take this course and provide the district with their certificates by the next SBC meeting.

Motion to require all members to take the State Ethics Training Course and submit certifications to R. Ellis or L. Bassett by T. Bartles, 2nd by D. Vogel. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.

b. Attorney General Open Meeting Law Guide

The material attached is furnished for your use and review as there are often questions about this law.

c. Team contact list

The list is furnished as a draft and D&W requests that if there are any incorrect items that you pull the sheet out of the binder and legibly correct the errors and pass up to Rachel. We will reissue this sheet in the next meeting.

d. Working group (WG) description and member spreadsheet

The material attached is furnished for your use and review as there are often questions about the way a committee can get recommendations. The Working Group concept does require that no decisions are made at the WG level, and there is not a quorum of SBC members in the WG and that other NON- SBC members can participate if they are interested in doing so.

There is a recommendation that if the WG format is something that the SBC wishes to use, that the Facilities, Education, and

Public Relations work group be formed. The WG Lead would then schedule, run and report out on any particular progress or meetings.

M. Schiek made the comment that the working groups are not required, and it is up to the committee to decide whether or not they would like to form working groups. The committee all agreed that the working groups were a good idea, and began to discuss which groups they would like to form.

C. Greene made mention of a fundraising group, as a member of the town had contacted her to offer his help for this matter. In an effort to avoid jeopardizing reimbursements for the project, Trip recommended that the SBC checks with council before forming a fundraising group.

The committee decided that they would like to take some time to think about the working groups and contact potential members and revisit this subject at the next SBC meeting, where they will then assign group leaders.

e. Discussion about the drafted Schedule

The draft schedule has been developed for discussion purposes only. We will continue to monitor and revise the schedule as the project progresses. Currently we show the various steps that might be taken and a potential end date of September 2018.

T. Elmore noted that there were 2 handouts in the schedule section of the binder; The first page is a concept representation to illuminate the Feasibility process that will begin once the architect is selected. The process will start with generating documentation on the current condition of the existing facility and to begin generating the educational program documents that the project would need to accommodate.

The second document is a draft schedule that has been developed for discussion purposes only and is intended to illustrate the inherent interdependencies from step to step. One of the items included in the schedule that is NOT decided upon by the SBC is the inclusion of the CM at Risk construction delivery method. This was shown to illustrate that IF the SCB were to want to use this process that the project team would need to begin the CM selection Process at a point in the Feasibility process.

We will continue to monitor and revise the schedule as decisions are made by the SBC and the project progresses. Currently we show the various steps that might be taken and a potential end date of September 2018.

f. Architect Draft RFS

The draft has been edited by D&W and is furnished for the district to send to your Attorney for review and any SBC comments. D&W asked J. Wirtes if there were any existing building drawings, to which he replied that there are. D&W has recommended on other projects that existing drawings be scanned to an electronic format and stored on a File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site for access by the Architects interested in submitting a proposal for the project. The drawings would then be easily available for the selected architect when they get on board. This would be a project cost and would be arranged and paid for by the School District.

J. Wirtes had pointed out that he contacted a local printer where the facilities department has brought the floor plans to in the past for copies. The printer revealed that they have digitized copies of the floor plans, which they can provide back to the district at a fee.

Motion to procure electronic copies of the original floor plans with a not-to-exceed amount of \$1000.00 by J. Benzinger, 2nd by H. Daley. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.

The SBC decided that they will review the Designer RFS as a whole and return their comments back to D&W by Friday, November 21st, 2014. D&W will then generate the final draft based off of the SBC's, MSBA's and the District's Legal Council comments and distribute the Designer RFS to the inquiring Architecture firms.

g. Project Goal recommendation sheet and samples from other districts

The sample documents are furnished as a draft and D&W requests that the SBC begin to think about this topic as it is a very critical step in defending why the final recommendation is the right fit. Over the next 2 meetings we will ask for individual goals for this project and compile a list. After the draft list is complete the committee will have the opportunity to review and edit this list.

All SBC comments are to be forwarded to D&W to be logged into a master list.

6. Selection of an Architect selection committee and selection of the 3 Representatives to represent the district at the MSBA Designer Selection Panel on January 13th in Boston.

Considering the superintendent of school's (R. Ellis) upcoming retirement, it was important that she appointed two designees for her positions as Superintendent and as Chief Executive Officer in the Architect Selection Committee.

After a discussion in respect to electing the appropriate designees, the SBC recommended to R. Ellis that M. MacDonald and M. Schiek represent the District. The SBC also recommended that the School Committee's appointee be C. Greene.

It is anticipated that the committee will be formed at the next SBC meeting.

7. **Other topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to meeting (All for Record)**

The next SBC Meeting has been moved from November 20, 2014 at 7:00 PM to a new time and date of December 4th, 2014 at 5:30 PM

8. **Public comments may be heard by the SBC chair**

9. **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by L. Bassett, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: Unanimous to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

Rachel Milaschewski
Owners 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.