



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: May 21, 2015 @ 6:30 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#8)

ATTENDING:	Mark Schiek,	SBC Chair, Lanesborough
	Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown
	Hugh Daley	Williamstown Selectman
	Carolyn J. Greene	MGR School Committee Chair
	Jesse Wirtes	MG facilities supervisor
	Mary MacDonald	Principal, MGRHS
	Chris Galib	Lanesboro Finance Committee
	Thomas Bartels	Williamstown
	Trip Elmore	D&W OPM
	Rachel Milaschewski	D&W OPM
	Bob Bell	Design Partnership
	Dan Colli	Design Partnership
	Kris Bradner	Birchwood Design Group

-
1. **Call to Order at 6:35 PM by M. Schiek with 8 voting members in attendance.**
 2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - a. A short overview of the May 14, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

Motion to approve the May 14, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daly. VOTE: 7 approve, 1 abstain (C. Galib).

Discussion: No discussion.

3. **Invoices Submitted for Approval:** *No invoices submitted for approval.*
4. **Existing Site Conditions Update**

D. Colli of DPC updated the SBC on the Existing Conditions activities. The Geo-environmental phase 1 survey is now complete and the report is expected shortly, there are areas that will need to be investigated on the site in the Phase 2 activity. A proposal to perform the Phase 2 investigation has not been received yet. The Existing Conditions Report will be an attachment to the PDP submission. DPC has provided the District with 2 binders of the Full Report which can be placed in each community for public viewing.

PROJECT MANAGERS
ARCHITECTS

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

www.doreandwhittier.com

D. Colli of DPC provided the Committee with a handout of the Base Repair and Renovation Overall Cost Summary (see attached), He stated that the Summary and Pricing of the Existing Conditions that will be included with the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) submission to the MSBA are almost complete.

After development of pricing with a cost estimator, DPC reported that the Base Repair price tag is estimated to be \$58 Million. Dan clarified that the price for Base Repair is high due to the large amount of floor and roof square footage, and the amount of old mechanical equipment in the building. He made it clear that "Base Repair" simply brings the building up to code, and does not move any walls or change the design of the building, and the timeframe in which Base Repair can be completed is similar to the timeframe of other Add/Reno and New Building options, including phasing. At this price, he suggests that Base Repair may not be the best option.

A member of the Committee asked if it is possible that the Base Repair option is chosen by the community. DPC and DWMP stated that it is a viable option if it meets the Program needs of this school. If the Base Repair does not meet the Program needs, the MSBA will not participate. If this is the case, the Community will be responsible for 100% of the costs associated to repair the school over time.

5. Working Group Member Update

Finance: The current leader of the Finance Working Group, H. Daly, reported that John Benzinger, Nancy Rauscher (Assistant to the Superintendent), and Steve Wentworth (Lanesborough Finance Committee) have agreed to join the group. Sheila Hebert of the MG School Committee will also tentatively be joining.

Sustainable Buildings: In addition to Jesse Wirtes (MG Facilities Supervisor), T. Bartels of the Committee has agreed to be a member of this working group, as well as Dan Clowes, an employee of Thomas'. Thomas is also waiting to hear back from another individual who may be interested in joining. D. Vogel of the Committee will also tentatively be joining.

T. Elmore of DWMP reiterated that Working Groups are not responsible for making any decisions, nor should they have enough Committee members to make a quorum. These groups are simply created to give members of the SBC and Community an opportunity to meet with experts/consultants and report back to the SBC with their findings and recommendations.

Please see the attached Working Group Member Spreadsheet for a full list of group members.

Community Outreach: P. Consolini gave handouts (see attached) of the project highlights and opportunities, as well as gave an update from the Community Outreach Working Group,

recapping that the printouts and highlights of each design option will be available for public viewing in the town Libraries. There will also be a notebook available with the design options of Community members to make comments and suggestions. In addition, this information will also be available on the Mount Greylock website.

A reminder was made of the May 28th 7PM Design Review at the Lanesborough Elementary school, of which fellows from Design Partnership and Dore & Whittier will be present.

6. Design and Site Option Review

After the Chair introduced the Designer to the Audience, B. Bell of DPC opened with a report of the feedback received at the May 15th Design Option review. After hearing comments and suggestions from the community, the 10 options that had been previously presented have been refined and modified to 15 options – 7 of which are Add/Reno, including one option with 3 different alternatives, and 5 of which are New Construction options.

Bob gave an overview of the extensive visioning process that they went through with the Community and Educational Working Groups to develop a program which understands where the community wants to go with learning at the Mount Greylock School. He stressed that adaptability and flexibility are key to creating a building that is suitable for the long-term future.

A committee member asked if DPC could clarify what an Add/Reno looks like both inside and outside in comparison to a base renovation or new construction. DPC responded, pointing out that an Add/Reno vastly differentiates from a base renovation by moving walls (removing and raising new), replacing systems, windows, roofs, insulation, etc., as well as incorporating site modifications, a new building envelope, new finishes, new lockers, etc. He mentions that an Add/Reno has the same 50 year life goal as any new construction might; the benefit to an Add/Reno is the ability to re-use a portion of the buildings existing square footage.

B. Bell gave a handout of each option to the SBC and community members who were present, then proceeded to go through the highlights of each option. In addition, D&W/ M. Shiek provided an Option Cost Summary which illustrates the **estimated** project cost and **potential** district share comparison for each option (see attached).

M. Schiek, Chair of the SBC, gave emphasis that these numbers are **early estimates** and may fluctuate based on a few different factors, and are presented only to give an idea of potential project costs. T. Elmore of DWMP followed up with clarification of these factors, and how he used them to determine the potential district share costs illustrated on the handout. He stated that the MSBA requires that the options submitted in the PDP must go through a rigorous evaluation process to determine the District Share. The MSBA offers incentive points for associating certain elements into the design of the building, some being the re-use of existing square footage, energy efficiency, and construction delivery method, etc. The district share costs fluctuate based on the amount of incentive points an option receives, which is reflected in the District's reimbursement rate. T. Elmore states that this year's base

reimbursement rate is 53% (which changes annually), but the actual reimbursement rate for the project may change, taking incentive points into account, as well as the District's economic standing. In addition, the MSBA also sets a cap that they will not reimburse beyond. That being said, these numbers are based off of the "knowns" and ***potential*** incentive points that may be offered for these Design Options.

Following DPC's presentation, M. Schiek mentions that after the meeting adjourns, the SBC and audience members will be given the opportunity to repeat the "dots" exercise that took place at their last option review. In this exercise, everybody is given 2 different colored dot stickers which they can place on the displayed printouts of their 1st choice New Construction option, their two 1st choice Add/Reno options, as well as their second place option of each (Pictures attached).

7. Other Business not Anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting:

The Chair of the Committee gave a summary of the upcoming project deadlines, which are as follows:

June 11, 2015: Preliminary Design Program (PDP) submission to the MSBA, which includes a Base Reno summary, Educational Program, Existing Site Conditions narrative, and presentation of 2 Add/Reno design options and 1 New Construction design option.

August, 2015: Submission of the Preferred Option and project cost estimates to the MSBA

8. Next SBC Meeting(s) and times

- a. Thursday, June 4th, 2015 at 5:30 PM

9. Adjourn

***Motion to adjourn by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daly. VOTE: unanimous to approve.
Meeting adjourned at 8:40 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.