



MGRSBC MEETING MINUTES

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 25, 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#10)

|                   |                     |                             |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>ATTENDING:</b> | 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 |
|                   | Bob Ericson         | Lanesborough                |
|                   | Rich Cohen          | Lanesborough                |
|                   | Trip Elmore         | D&W OPM                     |
|                   | Rachel Milaschewski | D&W OPM                     |
|                   | Joe Drown           | Design Partnership          |
|                   | Dan Colli           | Design Partnership          |

-----  
**1. Call to Order at 5:45 PM by M. Schiek with 9 voting members in attendance.**

*The Chair of the Committee thanked Dave Vogel, Chris Dodig, John Goerlach, Lynn Basset and Gordon Noseworthy for their time on the Committee, as they have stepped off, and welcomed Bob Ericson, Rich Cohen, Nancy Rauscher and Douglas Dias as new members who have been approved by the School Committee.*

**2. Approval of Minutes:**

a. A short overview of the June 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes was provided by the Chair.

***Motion to approve the June 4, 2015 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Consolini, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Galib. VOTE: 7 approve, 0 against, 2 abstain (B. Ericson, R. Cohen).***

**Discussion:** *None.*

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

**4. Review of Upcoming Meetings & SBC Member Availability**

M. Scheik pointed out the timeline attached in the minutes which maps out the next 3 SBC meetings and the series of events that are required to take place between now and the vote in August to approve the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) which is due to the MSBA on

8/5/15. He stated that member involvement is important for the upcoming meetings, as this is a crucial time to receive committee feedback on the design of the building. Due to the season, there is a concern that there will not be enough member availability for these meetings.

Mark pointed out that it is important to receive feedback from as many SBC members as possible, as everybody brings different expertise to the table, adding that they should not rush to make any large project decisions, such as the PSR vote, without the proper feedback throughout the process.

T. Elmore of DWMP states that the timeline of events may have to be altered if few members will be able to attend the upcoming meetings. If the committee is unable to submit a PSR in August, it will delay the project by 2 months due to the MSBA Board Meeting Schedule, which could result in other project delays down the road.

P. Consolini suggested moving the meeting dates around to accommodate the most members if it is possible, which the Chair agreed was an option. Paula also pointed out that any members who may not be available for certain meetings can watch the Willinet videos that are posted online to keep in touch with the project, and continue to offer feedback.

Design Partnership and DWMP both stated that they can be flexible if there are any changes to the upcoming meeting schedule.

After discussion, the committee agreed to do their best to stick to the current meeting schedule, with the option to move the meeting dates around slightly to accomplish the most member participation.

## 5. Working Group Member Update

**Community Outreach:** P. Consolini began by thanking the media outlets for the coverage on the project thus far. She pointed out that the group is working on an article for an online newsletter, giving an update on the narrowed group of design options. Paula added that they are maintaining updates on the project Facebook page and the website. The suggestion boxes are still located around town, and the group is still welcoming feedback from the community.

**Finance:** H. Daley stated that things are moving along quickly with the Finance Group. The members held a conference call last week, and they are currently creating a spreadsheet forecasting estimated debt service based on the estimated project costs they currently have for each option. They are in contact with the Treasurer to get information on interest rates, and amortization schedules for possible borrows. The group is also working on a tax impact sheet. Hugh mentioned that the group members have been very helpful so far.

**Sustainable Buildings:** Wendy Penner spoke for the group, pointing out that they are exploring possible dates and locations for the Green Charette. She hopes the Charette can convene by the second week in July, and plans to set a date soon.

**6. DPC Presentation on a Renovation Project**

D. Colli began the presentation with before-and-after images of past renovation projects to illustrate what a possible renovation may look like. Following, he gave an overview of the options submitted in the PDP to the MSBA and their evolutions thus far. He pointed out that the evolution of Option R1c is working out really well, and they have begun to plan phasing for this option. Dan went through the phasing process, explaining the use of old space while new areas of a building are constructed to eventually reach a finished product.

He went on to present options R1c.2 and R1c.3, which have come into fruition throughout the ongoing design development. Since options R1c and R7 in the PDP are vastly different, they thought it would make sense to create a "middle ground" alternative which includes the better aspects of both R1c and R7, thus making R1c.2 and R1c.3 hybrids of the two.

The committee was interested in the hybrid options and offered their feedback on the designs, pointing out what comes as a concern, and which elements they would like to see further evolutions of. A few members also stressed the importance of getting a cost estimate for this design.

A few questions were raised about the possibility of adding a new option to the mix after the PDP has already been submitted, to which T. Elmore explained is part of the process; rather than labeling it as another option, it is an *evolution* of existing options. Trip expressed that R1c.2 or R1c.3 would not have to be formally submitted to the MSBA as another design option in the PDP, as they expect these options to evolve, and they encourage the use of the best design aspects from the original submission to achieve a desired final product.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to entertain further exploration of R1c.3.

***Motion to move forward in the design evolution of option R1c.3 by C. Green, 2<sup>nd</sup> by P. Consolini. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against. Unanimous to approve.***

In the next meeting, DPC will report out again on the development of these designs based on the continued feedback from the District.

**7. SBC Authorize to have DWMP Estimate PDP Options**

T. Elmore of DWMP points out that the MSBA suggests that the District seeks secondary Cost Estimates for the options submitted in the PDP other than the Estimates generated by the Designer. Trip states that the OPM contract asks for them to supply costs for cost estimating, and the cost of this service was carried in their proposal and falls under "Other Additional Costs" in the project budget.

DWMP has contacted their Cost Estimator Consultant, and received a price of \$5,390.00 for the cost of service to estimate 4 design options, which is under the budgeted amount.

If the committee agrees to follow through with this additional service, the Design Options will be given to the DWMP's Estimator on July 17, 2015, and reconciled with the Designer's cost estimates on July 28, 2015, prior to the SBC Vote on the preferred design option.

The committee agreed that the opportunity to reconcile both cost estimates is worth the price of the additional service.

***Motion to authorize Dore & Whittier Management Partners to provide additional cost estimate services in the amount of \$5,390.00 for Options R1c, R1c.3, R7 and N3b by H. Daley, 2<sup>nd</sup> by P. Consolini. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against. Unanimous to approve.***

8. **Construction Delivery Method Discussion: *Design/Bid/Build vs. CM @ Risk***

Included in the minutes is the handout provided by DWMP of their Construction Delivery Method presentation, which explains the differences between the Design/Bid/Build (DBB) and CM @ Risk delivery methods.

T. Elmore went on to explain each method in detail and pointed out the pros and cons of each, with emphasis on the CM @ Risk delivery method. Trip mentioned that the MSBA offers an incentive point for the use of the CM @ Risk delivery method, which results in a higher reimbursement rate from the State.

He points out that the owner chooses the Construction Manager based on a proposal, rather than a General Contractor being awarded of the project based on a low bid in DBB. Although the initial cost of CM @ Risk is higher than the initial cost of DBB, it is most likely to be the cheaper option in the long run, as costs can be negotiated with a CM, unlike DBB where they can't. Due to concealed costs and the inability to negotiate with the GC in the DBB method, legal issues are also likely to arise.

DWMP and DPC both state that they are advocates of the CM @ Risk method. DPC adds that a CM is on board of the project much sooner, and offers constructability and phasing advice (called pre-construction services), meaning the project is more likely to finish on schedule. Dan then adds that the District does have the option to exercise the DBB method at the end of "pre-construction" with a CM @ Risk if they decide.

The committee discussed the delivery methods, and decided that CM @ Risk seemed more suitable for the project.

**VOTE:** ***Motion to use the CM @ Risk construction delivery for the Mount Greylock Regional School Building Project by R. Cohen, 2<sup>nd</sup> by M. MacDonald. VOTE: 9 approve, 0 against. Unanimous to approve.***

9. **Other Business not Anticipated 48 hours prior to Meeting:**

- a. H. Daley and C. Greene thanked DPC and MCLA for organizing a walk-through of MCLA's newly renovated Murdock Hall.
- b. A public comment was made, stating that the amount of work and expertise that has gone into the project thus far is impressive. They also added that the cost of the project is a substantial factor in the decision of an option, and expressed concern that the project may not be approved by both towns. They expressed the importance of working hard to achieve a reasonable project cost.

The Chair of the Committee and DWMP pointed out that the educational program is what drives the project, which follows a standardized process designed by the MSBA, and the District plans to do whatever they can to meet the MSBA's standards, as well as keep costs down.

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

- a. Thursday, July 9, 2015 at 5:30 PM at the Lanesborough Elementary School.

11. **Adjourn**

*Motion to adjourn by H. Daly, 2nd by P. Consolini. VOTE: unanimous to approve.  
Meeting adjourned at 8:15 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.**