

MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: April 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#6)

ATTENDING:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mark Schiek, | SBC Chair, Lanesborough |
| Paula Consolini | SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown |
| Gordon Noseworthy | Interim Superintendent |
| Carolyn J. Greene | MGR School Committee Chair |
| Chris Dodig | MGR School Committee |
| Jesse Wirtes | MG facilities supervisor |
| Mary MacDonald | Principal, MGRHS |
| Chris Galib | Lanesboro Finance Committee |
| Thomas Bartels | Williamstown |
| Trip Elmore | D&W OPM |
| Bob Bell | Design Partnership |
| Joe Drown | Design Partnership |
| Dan Colli | Design Partnership |
| Kris Bradner | Birchwood Design Group |

-
1. Call to Order at 5:37 PM by M. Schiek.
 2. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. A short overview of the April 16, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

Motion to approve the April 16, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib.

Discussion: Edit the minutes to include Gordon Noseworthy as a part of the focus group in item 6 on page 3 of the meeting minutes.

VOTE: 8 approve, 1 abstain (T. Bartels).

3. Invoices Submitted for Approval:
 - a. DWMP invoice No. 4 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM Services (Invoice attached).

Motion to approve DWMP invoice No. 4 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM Services by P Consolini, 2nd by M MacDonald.

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

Discussion: the committee asked how the value is determined for the invoice, the OPM responded that it is representative of the effort and progress for the phase.

VOTE: 9 yes to approve the motion, 0 not in favor of the motion.

- b. Design Partnership Invoice #10980 in the amount of \$52,500.00 for the feasibility study. (Invoice Attached).

Motion to approve Design Partnership Invoice #10980 in the amount of \$52,500.00 for the feasibility study by P. Consolini, 2nd by C Galib.

Discussion: None

VOTE: 9 yes to approve the motion, 0 not in favor of the motion.

- c. MSGRSD Purchase Order No. 350608 for "Story of a Building" Course registration through the Massachusetts Certified Public Purchasing Official (MCPPO) Program for incoming Superintendent and Assistant to the Superintendent in the amount of \$300.00 (Invoice attached).

Motion to approve MSGRSD Purchase Order No. 350608 for "Story of a Building" Course registration through the Massachusetts Certified Public Purchasing Official (MCPPO) Program for incoming Superintendent and Assistant to the Superintendent in the amount of \$300.00 by G Noseworthy, 2nd by P. Consolini..

Discussion: A question was raised as the nature of the course by a SBC members. C Greene responded that the course was put together by the Inspector General's Office to inform community representatives about the MCCPO procurement procedures.

VOTE: 9 yes to approve the motion, 0 not in favor of the motion

- d. MGRSD Food Service Statement from M. MacDonald for Educational Working Group meeting lunches in the amount of \$140.00 (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve MGRSD Food Service Statement from M. MacDonald for Educational Working Group meeting lunches in the amount of \$140.00 by C Greene, 2nd by P Consolini.

Discussion: The cost represented 3 Student educational working group meetings.

VOTE: 8 yes to approve the motion, 1 Abstain (M MacDonald), 0 not in favor of the motion.

4. Budget and Schedule Update

DWMP Provided Budget Summary Sheet and Schedule Updates.

Included in the meeting packet was a copy of the current budget summary page. The spreadsheet was explained in detail how the tracking document provides complete transparency and accountability of all costs that are applied to the project. The discussion included how the funds are moved from one budget line item to another line item through the Budget Revision Request Document (BRR), thus enabling the owner to authorize movement of funds within the project budget. As funds are approved for payment and recorded in the meeting minutes, the OPM records these expenditures in the budget document to stay current with the approved values.

The OPM distributed a separate Schedule handout and explained that the schedule will be a document that is updated on a regular basis. The OPM pointed to line 31 and mentioned that the following 10 line items give the SBC members a view of the activities in the near future. The OPM further advised that the schedule of events may change as the need presents itself and the OPM identified that a schedule change was discussed with the Arch. earlier that day which will be addressed later in the meeting.

a. Budget Revision Request No. 1

As Identified in the budget review, the 1st BRR was included in the meeting packet for the SBC to see and for the MGRSD to sign and forward to the MSBA. The OPM explained that the form showed that \$66,957.00 is being moved from line 3 in the budget to line 2, which will fund the Architects amendment #1 for the same amount.

5. SBC Project Goals Update

The SBC Chair described the process that the Goals Focus Group followed that consolidated the individual bulleted goals. He noted that in the meeting packet there was the Design Partnership grouped bulleted goals and also the 1 page goals consolidation write up that included both the School Building Committee Charter as well as the Goals Statement.

The Chair asked the SBC focus on the Goals Statement as he would like to get consensus and acceptance in this meeting. The Committee proceeded to discuss items that could be edited to included statements that put focus on energy efficiency, building aesthetics, site specific design, and grammatical corrections. In the meeting the 5 bullet items were edited by the chair to gain consensus of the committee on the Goals Statement.

It was mentioned by committee members that the charter statement was redundant and might be better used as a part of the community communication messages. The SBC agreed to remove the charter statement from the Goals Statement.

Motion to accept the Goals Statement, with an understanding that they might be further edited later if the SBC was in agreement, by G Noseworthy, and 2nd by C Galib.

Discussion: None.

VOTE: 9 yes to approve the motion, 0 not in favor of the motion.

6. Existing Facilities Update

J. Wirtes explained that the Architects' consultants have been busy investigating the site and building. The Hazardous Materials Consultant, Site Borings activity, and Surveyors, as well as the architects' team have been working with him on the campus to complete the existing conditions evaluation.

D. Colli explained that the actual existing conditions report is currently in the project drop box for all to view. There are a few additions from the site work investigation activities last week to complete this document but the draft is roughly 95% complete. The file is in excess of 75 pages so a paper copy of the draft is not being circulated to all SBC members, however DPC does have a paper copy that they would leave at the school for SBC member or community review. This document is a part of the Preliminary Design Document (PDP) submission to the MSBA in early June which requires a vote by the SBC to submit.

The OPM suggested that if there are any questions by the SBC members it is important to review the details as they are developed because the PDP is likely to be a 3 inch thick document and is overwhelming to review in one sitting.

7. Educational Programming Update

M. MacDonald commented that draft 3 of the educational program document that was put in the drop box last Friday is fundamentally complete, as it could get an edit to the introduction. All other program elements are complete from a content standpoint, while it needs to be proof read and edited for readability. If the SBC members have any comments or corrections M MacDonald would like to receive the comments to edit the document. She will circulate a word version of the document to the SBC Members so they can make any edits and return the word files back to her with a comment deadline of May 7th, 2015.

Committee members raised various comments, such as the term "model" school reference might be better termed "Lighthouse", a beacon for education as an example. The SBC was asked if there were any significant comments or corrections as this document will be the foundation of space needs for the options being developed currently. The committee did not have any content comments and acknowledged that this educational program is the driving document for many of the space requirements being developed.

The Architect is therefore approved to use this document as the basis for their space summary and room count development. This process is now on-going and it is important to understand that the decisions on the building options will directly come back to the Goals and Educational Program that have been developed to date.

The current schedule shows that there is a community meeting in Lanesborough on May 5th, another community meeting on the 12th, a SBC meeting on May 21st, and a SBC meeting on June 4th. After reviewing the agendas for these meetings, the OPM and Designer team think that the community meeting on the 5th is a good communication opportunity in Lanesborough, however the meeting on the 12th is not going to be necessary as we will have already covered the topics in both communities. The discussion about the options is now scheduled to occur in 2 meetings which may not give everyone enough time to discuss the options. We recommend that the SBC meet on May 14th to see the options for the first time, meet again on the 21st to comment further on the option presented the week before, it will be an opportunity to eliminate some of the less desirable options. Then on June 4th, pick the preferred new building option and 2 addition/renovation options to be submitted to the MSBA. The SBC agreed that the revised schedule would give them more time to review the options and there was a suggestion to include the community for comments on the May 14th and 21st meetings. The SBC to make the May meetings a combined SBC and Public Participation meeting to get as much public feedback as possible.

8. Site Program and Options

Discussion of the various areas around the site was led by Kris Bradner, Birchwood Design Group. Kris explained that the team had met with many stakeholders impacting the exterior of the building including MGRHS Athletics, Facilities, Maintenance, Food Service, as well as watching the bus and drop off sequences around the site. They have to develop details once potential sites are selected. They have put 7 site locations together which was included in the meeting packet and was also displayed on the meeting room screens. Each of the 7 schemes was reviewed for location, pro's and con's perceived by the design team. After the schemes were presented, the committee discussed their individual impressions until the chair requested a "straw poll" to see if there were schemes that had stronger support than others.

The OPM recorded the raised hands by scheme:

Scheme 1 – 6 in favor
Scheme 2 – 7 in favor
Scheme 3 – 2 in favor
Scheme 4 – 0 in favor
Scheme 5 – 7 in favor
Scheme 6 – 1 in favor
Scheme 7 - 1 in favor

After the poll of the site options, it was clear that scheme's 1, 2, and 5 were the favored locations for a potential new building site. It was explained that when the PDP was submitted, there would be only 1 new building scheme, thus only 1 site location. The architect's team will now focus on these 3 site locations for further consideration and ultimately selection of 1 site location in the coming month.

9. **Other Business**

Community Communication update by P Consolini included:

- a request that the SBC members spread the word that the SBC outreach effort would like community members to “friend” the Mount Greylock Facebook page so they can get information about the project;
- a statement that information will be placed in the libraries and town halls in each town.
- a reminder that additional suggestion boxes that can be placed in either town if anyone sees a good spot for one.

Other members of the SBC commented that there might be opportunities to piggyback off other local events to “actively” get or seek “live suggestion” from community members.

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

- a. **7PM, May 5th** at Lanesborough Elementary School, Public Presentation
- b. **5:30 PM, May 14th**, MGRHS, SBC and Public Comment Meeting to introduce the Architects’ Option development
- c. **5:30 PM, May 21st**, MGRHS, SBC and Public Comment Meeting to further review options and begin to eliminate less desirable options
- d. **5:30 PM, June 4th**, MGRHS, SBC meeting to decide on the 1 new building option and 2 addition/renovation options to submit in the PDP to the MSBA on June 11th.

11. **Adjourn:**

*Motion to adjourn by C Galib, 2nd by G Noseworthy. VOTE: unanimous to approve.
Meeting adjourned at 8:02 PM*

DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC

Trip Elmore

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, 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.