



MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, LLC

MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

DATE OF MEETING: June 4, 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#9)

ATTENDING:

Mark Schiek,	SBC Chair, Lanesborough
Paula Consolini	SBC Co-Chair, Williamstown
Gordon Noseworthy	Interim Superintendent, MGRSD
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 – Arrived at 6:15 PM
Dan Colli	Design Partnership – Arrived at 6:15 PM

-
1. **Call to Order at 5:40 PM by M. Schiek with 9 voting members in attendance.**
 2. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - a. A short overview of the May 21, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

Motion to approve the May 21, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2nd by M. MacDonald VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain (G. Noseworthy).

Discussion: A member of the committee pointed out the misspelling of a working group member's name in section 5 of the meeting minutes. The meeting minutes will be updated and saved for record.

3. **Invoices Submitted for Approval:**
 - a. DWMP invoice #5 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM services (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the DWMP invoice #5 in the amount of \$12,000.00 for OPM services by P. Consolini, 2nd by H. Daley. VOTE: 9 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 #10987 in the amount of \$77,097.00 for design services applied to the feasibility phase (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the DPC invoice #10987 in the amount of \$77,097.00 for Architectural Design services by P. Consolini, 2nd by G. Noseworthy. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- c. WilliNet invoices for services on April 16th and April 30th in the total amount of \$200.00 (Invoice attached). Vote Expected.

Motion to approve the WilliNet invoice in the total amount of \$200.00 for services on April 16th and April 30th by T. Bartels, 2nd by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

- d. Cost Update: MGRSD Building Project Clerk Pay History Reports for pay periods beginning on 9/1/2014 through 5/24/2015 (Reports attached).

The Chair of the Committee pointed out that the Building Project Clerk has already been paid for this time, and the pay report is included as an update of the cost applied to the project budget to date. He also added that this is a non-reimbursable cost.

T. Elmore of DWMP gave a brief overview of the budget summary provided in the meeting package, focusing on the added section which clarifies the costs that are eligible for reimbursement, and which are not.

4. Existing Site Conditions Update

T. Elmore then goes on to discuss the completion of the Existing Conditions report, which is in the Dropbox for the Committee to access. He states that this is the copy of the report which will be authorized by the SBC in this meeting to be included in the Preliminary Design Program (PDP) submission to the MSBA.

a. Design Partnership Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Proposal for Continued Site Investigation

Following, DWMP gives an overview of the suggested geo-environmental tests included in the proposal submitted by DPC. Trip states that the proposal is based on the Phase 1 report, and suggests completing 8 more potential scope items. Of these 8 items, he recommends that it is important to proceed with the Well #3 Testing (Item 5) and the Water Quality Testing (Item 8) to get an idea of the type of water that is on site.

In addition, H. Daley of the Committee suggested to proceed with the Concrete Slab Moisture test (Item 6), as well, based on the condition of the building, and its history of moisture problems. The Committee agreed.

D. Colli points out that the cost of item number 8 is included in the cost of item number 5, as these tests go hand in hand. He also points out that the items in this proposal are considered as a *continuation* of the Phase 1 Investigation, and the letter that follows this proposal in the meeting package addresses the need for a Phase 2 investigation, as well as the estimated costs associated. Dan clarifies that although the Testing of Well #3 is listed in the Phase 2 description, he added it to the Phase 1 continuation work, due to the importance of completing this test.

M. Schiek points out that the combined cost of items 5, 6, and 8 is low, at a total of \$4,451.00, which is listed in the proposal. After discussion, the Committee agrees to follow through with Items 5, 6 and 8.

Motion to approve Item 5: Well #3 Testing, Item 6: Concrete Slab Moisture, and Item 8: Water Quality Testing by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

5. Working Group Member Update

Sustainable Buildings: C. Greene introduces School Committee member, Wendy Penner, who has agreed to join the Sustainable Buildings Group. Wendy thanked the Committee for creating the working group, and reported that a couple of the members have already met to discuss the process going forward. She indicated that the group is currently working on a vision statement for clarity, which they plan to bring to the next SBC meeting. Wendy believes that there is a good range of expertise throughout the group.

T. Bartels made mention of a “Green Charrette” to focus on LEED opportunities. T. Elmore explained that a Green Charrette is responsible for identifying sustainable design opportunities and goals, including site possibilities, and any possible requirements to reach LEED Silver. He states that a Green Charrette is necessary, and the achievement of LEED Silver merits 2 incentive points from the MSBA.

Wendy added that while LEED Silver is their goal, it shouldn’t be their ceiling, as they hope to achieve a higher LEED certification if it is possible.

Finance: H. Daley reported that they have finalized the membership of the finance working group, and they held a conference call with DWMP to discuss tax impacts and how to approach each town. He added that it is a good working group and their first meeting was very productive.

Community Outreach: P. Consolini informed that the Community Forum held in Lanesborough on May 28th went very well, with an outcome of about 20-25 community members in attendance. Following the forum, DPC provided the materials to perform the “sticker exercise” once again, for community members to vote for their first and second place Add/Reno and New Building options.

6. Design and Site Option Review

B. Bell reiterated that the contents of the PDP are included in the dropbox, adding that those items “set the program” for the project. The first few slides of his presentation shows a spreadsheet comparing the MSBA Space Standards guidelines to the proposed project. He pointed out that the MSBA recommends that the proposed numbers on the spreadsheet pertain to a New Build project. That being said, the yellow highlighted areas are based on the findings of the program needs, and requirements by the MSBA.

Although there is never a guarantee that the Program will be approved by the MSBA, Bob reassures the Committee that the MSBA is aware of the program plans to date, as they have been actively collaborating with the Designers throughout the design process.

C. Greene of the Committee adds that she was on the conference call with DPC and the MSBA while they discussed these topics, stating that the MSBA sounded supportive, and were happy to answer any questions that were brought up.

Bob went on to present the results of the votes collected throughout the community forums and SBC Meetings in the sticker exercise; This revealed that R7 was the top choice for an Add/Reno with 25 first choice votes, followed by R1c with 21 first choice votes, and the top choice for New Construction was N3b with 22 first choice votes, followed by N4 with 8 first choice votes (see presentation attached).

a. Vote to Select Options for Submission to the MSBA

After DPC’s presentation, the Chair of the Committee gave direction to the committee members on how to vote to select the options that will be submitted in the PDP.

A member of the committee made a comment that R1 is a concern for many reasons, some including health concerns, duration of the project, and how disruptive it may be during school sessions.

DWMP makes it clear that any options submitted in the PDP are taken to another level of understanding, and it would not be a bad idea to further explore this option regardless. M. Schiek then points out that it is permitted by the MSBA to submit more than 2 Add/Reno options and 1 New Build option if the committee has any major concerns. However, DPC and DWMP responded, stating that it would benefit those most to choose only 3 total options, as it will give the Designers more time to fully explore them each individually.

As some of the estimated Add/Reno costs are very close to the estimated New Construction costs, the committee also expressed concerns in regards to possibly moving forward with an Add/Reno if for a fraction of the cost more, they could choose a New Building.

DWMP and DPC agreed that the concerns raised in regards to cost were all good points, but again reiterated that all costs are estimates at this point in time.

After discussion, the Committee went fourth with the voting procedure. Each member was to rate up to 3 top choice Add/Reno options using a point system – 3 being their first choice, 2 as their second, and an optional 1 as their third. The same method was applied to voting the New Building options, 2 being their first choice, and 1 as their second (see voting spreadsheet attached). Once all members voted, the Chair of the Committee went around the table for a roll call vote, collecting the tally. (See tallied vote sheet signed by the Chair attached)

The final results of the SBC vote to select submission options for the PDP are as follows:

VOTE: Add/Reno: First Place R7, Second Place R1c
New Build: First Place N3b, Second Place N4

Motion to submit options R7, R1c and N3b in the Preliminary Design Program to the MSBA by P. Consolini, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

7. SBC Authorize the OPM and Designer to submit the Preliminary Design Program

Motion to authorize the OPM and Designer to submit all documents included in the Preliminary Design Program to the MSBA for the June 11, 2015 deadline by M. MacDonald, 2nd by C. Galib. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.

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

- a) D. Colli mentioned that they have been presented with the opportunity to do a walk-through of the newly renovated Murdock Hall at MCLA to give members an idea of what a renovation project looks like. He plans to set the walk-through up on the same day as the next SBC meeting.
- b) Attached in the meeting packets was the Local Actions and Approval Certification Letter, which T. Elmore explains is a component of the PDP, which states that the SBC has authorized the OPM and Designer to submit the Feasibility Study materials to the MSBA for their consideration, including back-up of all SBC Meeting material since the District has been invited into the Feasibility Phase in July of 2014. This letter will be signed by the Chair of the School Committee, as well as the Superintendent of Schools.
- c) The Committee thanked Gordon Noseworthy for his time spent with the District as the Interim Superintendent, as this was the last meeting that he would be attending as an SBC member. M. MacDonald indicated that the new Superintendent will begin at the end of June.

9. Next SBC Meeting(s) and times

- a. Thursday, June 25, 2015
 - i. 4:00 PM Walk-Through at Murdock Hall
 - ii. 5:30 PM SBC Meeting

10. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by G. Noseworthy, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 7:35 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.