

**BERKSHIRE HILLS REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
*Great Barrington Stockbridge West Stockbridge*  
**BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING September 27, 2023 5:30PM**  
*(Monument Mountain Regional High School Building Project)*  
In-Person/Virtual  
*In-person: 50 Main Street 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Stockbridge*  
*Virtual (Zoom): <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86199415698?pwd=vazpMkodOPBk00TTb6Gzesb5BvQVqq.1>*  
*Meeting ID: 861 99415698 Passcode: qeQNY8 Phone: 301 715 8592*

---

**Present:**

**Members:**

**Stephen Bannon**-School Committee Chair, **Stephen Boyd**-Community Member, **Peter Dillon**-Superintendent, **Kristina Farina**-MMRHS Principal, **Bill Fields**-Retired Teacher/School Committee, **Eric Gabriel**-Community Member, **Sharon Harrison**-Business Administrator, **Steven Soule**-Director of Operations, **Kara Staunton-Shron**-Teacher/ Librarian, **Stephen Shatz**-Community Member, **Jason St. Peter**-Building Committee Chair/School Committee, **Ananda Timpone**, Community Member

**Absent:** **Daniel Bailly**-Community Member, **Jamie Goldenberg**-Community Member, **Lily Haskins-Vaughn**-Student, **Diane Singer**- School Committee Member, **Kate Van Olst**, Community Member

**Other Attendees:**

Corey Sprague-School Committee; Sarah Bourla-School Committee; John Benzinger-Skanska, Project Director; Ben Murphy-Skanska, Senior Program Manager; Nick Lobik-Skanska, Program Manager; Peter Socha-Skanska, Site Representative; Dale Caldwell-Skanska, Vice President

---

Jason St. Peter opened the meeting at 5:30PM.

**Skanska Update**

- The team discussed the following items that were on the agenda circulated prior to the meeting. The following notes describe these discussions:
  - o **Introduction** – Both Skanska and the Monument Mountain High School SBC introduced themselves and described their roles on the project. Skanska noted that Victoria Clifford could not attend the meeting tonight due to a previous commitment.
  - o **Client Expectations** – Several members of the SBC discussed their expectations for the project and the OPM.
    - The project should follow the district's mission statement which is: ***“To ensure all students are challenged through a wide range of experiences to become engaged and curious learners and problem solvers who effectively communicate, respect diversity, and improve themselves and their community.”***
    - The community has a strong devotion to education. The SBC’s consensus from the first Feasibility Study that was performed is that the project needs to emphasize the educational component and that the design needs to be utilitarian.
    - The health and safety of staff/students and the learning environment are the district’s highest priorities.

- Security for staff and students. The current building has far too many doors and entry points.
  - Building plans must be tied to the educational vision and needs of the school. The last design did not always do so, which was partially the reason it failed.
  - Sense of community that is tied into the curriculum and the building plans.
  - Transparency by the whole team with the public. Important for a positive vote.
  - New/ renovated school needs to be a valuable asset to the district and community as a whole. It needs to be a state-of-the-art, well-constructed facility that will last for generations.
  - The building should be adaptable to changes.
  - The team needs to get the students involved with the planning and the project, so it reflects their needs and desires. Discuss the possibility of having a student representative on the SBC and other subcommittees.
  - Simplicity of Electrical and HVAC systems. They understand the need for technology but do not want the building systems to be overdone and difficult to operate.
  - Agility of the team to adapt to the potential for the different enrollments and different designs.
- o **Project Schedule Overview** – Skanska handed out a schedule overview for MSBA Modules 2 and 3. The next task at hand is to Draft a Request for Services (RFS) for the design team, get it approved by the MSBA, and advertise the project. In summary, the schedule for the RFS discussed was:
- Submit RFS to MSBA for review – 10/10/23.
  - Submit Advertisement to Central Register - RFS 10/19/23.
  - Advertisement appears in Central Register - 10/25/23.
  - Receive RFS responses - 11/22/23.
  - MSBA DSP Proposal Review meeting - 12/19/23
  - Potential DSP designer interviews - 1/16/24
  - Engage Designer - 1/20/24.
- o **SBC Meeting Schedule** – Skanska asked if the SBC was on a regular meeting schedule which they are not. Skanska suggested monthly meetings starting in October. The team discussed Wednesdays at 5:30 PM. Skanska and BHRSD will coordinate and establish a schedule.
- o **Agenda Posting Requirements** – BHRSD stated that they must follow the 48-hour posting requirement for meetings and agendas. Skanska should coordinate with Doreen in Peter's office.
- o **Voting and Approval Process** – Skanska stated that there will be many instances when will have to formally vote on certain items and submit notarized documentation of vote outcomes to the MSBA. Skanska stated that they were very familiar with these requirements and would ensure that voting occurs as needed. It was noted that it will be important to ensure that a quorum is available when items need to be voted on to avoid delays.
- o **Meeting Minute Responsibility** – It was agreed that Skanska would take notes and prepare meeting minutes for all SBC meetings. Doreen will finalize and post the minutes on BHRSD letterhead. Skanska will also document any other meetings that are held.
- o **Budget Tracking and MSBA Pro Pay system** – It was agreed that Skanska will manage the budget tracking and the MSBA Pro Pay system. BHRSD is paying for the feasibility study so there will not be any reimbursement for this phase, but the team believes it still will have to submit all invoices for the MSBA's review.

o **Designer Selection Process / Designer Selection Subcommittee –**

- Skanska stated that the MSBA Designer Selection Panel (DSP) is comprised of 16 members who all get a vote in the selection process; 13 members are selected by the MSBA and 3 members will be from BHRSD. The Superintendent of Schools and the SBC chair should be part of the district's 3 votes.
- Skanska indicated that the DSP is likely a two-meeting process. The first meeting is to review the proposals as a group and vote to rank the submissions. The second meeting is an interview with the shortlisted firms, usually 2 or 3. A final vote to select the design team follows the interviews.
- Selection subcommittee – Skanska stated that the SBC should select a subcommittee that will be charged with reviewing the submissions and forming an opinion on who the district thinks would best fit their needs. Skanska informed the group that being part of the subcommittee is a bit of work and will require the members to spend a fair amount of time in a two-week period to review all the proposals and attend a review meeting. Skanska stated that they would call references and prepare a summary spreadsheet that the MSBA requires. BHRSD SBC selected and voted on the following subcommittee:
  1. Steven Soule
  2. Peter Dillon
  3. Jason St. Peter
  4. Stephen Bannon
  5. Sharon Harrison
  6. Kristina Farina
- Communications – The team discussed the various methods of how to share information about the project to the community. Skanska recommended setting up a website, possibly linked to the district's website which then can be populated with information regarding the project, including but not limited to meeting minutes, schedules, studies, drawings, renderings, Etc. Skanska has also used Facebook, Twitter, and other social media platforms to get the word out.
- Vote Yes Committee – The team briefly spoke about the need to form a Vote Yes committee to help get the message out. These committees are typically populated with people outside the SBC. Employees of the district have restrictions on what they can say or do and typically are not part of such committees. Skanska stated that there is a resource at the State level who can come speak with the SBC to inform them what is allowable and what is not.
- Chapter 74 Programs – Peter stated that MM currently has 3 Chapter 74 programs – Automotive, Horticulture, and Early Childhood Care and they are looking to add 3 additional programs as part of the project.
- Phases of Feasibility Study – Skanska briefly reviewed the 3 major phases of the Feasibility study and the schedule for these phases. They indicated that a formal submission to the MSBA is required to complete each phase and to move on to the next.
  - o PDP – Preliminary Design Program – This phase includes educational planning and visioning, development of options, engagement with staff and faculty to understand the desires for the new school, cost estimates, and logistics planning. Skanska stated that they are required to study new construction, addition/renovation, and a base repair of the existing building.
  - o PSR – Preferred Schematic Report – During this phase, the various options developed during the PDP are further explored and narrowed

down. At the end of this phase, the SBC will select a single option to move forward with.

- o Schematic Design – During this phase, the single option that was chosen is developed so that detailed cost estimates can be created which will be used to form the Project Scope and Budget. This is what will be voted on by both the community and the MSBA. If the votes are successful, this design will be turned into biddable construction documents in subsequent phases.

### **Upcoming Meetings**

Motion to adjourn by Jason St. Peter

Motion unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Meeting Minutes respectfully submitted by, John Benzinger, Skanska.

---

signature