

BERKSHIRE HILLS REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Great Barrington

Stockbridge

West Stockbridge

MONUMENT MOUNTAIN REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE (SBC) MEETING

In-Person/Virtual

January 17th, 2024 – 5:30 PM

In-Person Location : District Office Professional Development Room, 50 Main Street, 2nd Floor, Stockbridge, MA

Virtual Location: (Public attendance) Zoom (details provided on meeting agenda)*

Attendees

SBC Members:

Present: **Stephen Bannon**-School Committee Chair, **Stephen Boyd**-Community Member, **Peter Dillon**-Superintendent, **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, **Daniel Bailly**-Community Member, **Diane Singer**- School Committee Member, **Amanda Timpone**, Community Member **(SBC Member?)** (virtual), **Sharon Harrison**-Business Administrator,
Absent: **Kristina Farina**-MMRHS Principal, **Jamie Goldenberg**-Community Member, **Lily Haskins-Vaughn**-Student, **Kate Van Olst**, Community Member

Other Attendees (virtual):

Sarah Bourla-School Committee (virtual) **(SBC Member?)**, James (no last name presented), THE NEWSletter, Corinne (no last name presented)

Owner Project Manager (OPM):

John Benzinger, Ben Murphy (virtual), Nick Lobik, Victoria Clifford, (Skanska USA Building, Inc.)

Meeting Opened: 5:30 PM

Steve Soule opened the meeting and asked for the Skanska team to begin with the first agenda item.

Skanska Update

- **Designer Selection Process:**
 - Nick Lobik, Skanska, gave a recap of the MSBA Designer Selection Panel meeting this past Tuesday:
 - MSBA reviewed proposals the 2 design proposals,
 - MSBA wanted to ensure that the District was comfortable with only receiving 2 proposals.
 - The District explained that they were satisfied with the number of proposals due to these two firms excellent reputations.
 - Next Steps:
 - The MSBA will hold interviews for the two firms on 1/30/2024
 - The MSBA DSP will have 13 votes, and the District will have 3 votes, to select the Designer
 - Once selected, we will enter contract negotiations
 - Skanska presented advantages and disadvantages of each firm identified by the MMRHS Designer Selection Subcommittee:

- DiNisco Design:
 - Advantages:
 - o Extremely strong and complete drawings.
 - o Excellent MSBA Experience.
 - o Strong subconsultants listed for the project.
 - o Worked with Amherst following a fail vote to pass a project.
 - o Consulting Architect William Rawn Associates for their High School Experience.
 - o Not a joint venture, DiNisco is the only firm that will be contracted with.
 - o William Rawn has worked in Berkshire County.
 - Disadvantages:
 - o Extremely strong and complete drawings.
 - o Excellent MSBA Experience.
 - o Strong subconsultants listed for the project.
 - o Worked with Amherst following a fail vote to pass a project.
 - o Consulting Architect William Rawn Associates for their High School Experience.
 - o Not a joint venture, DiNisco is the only firm that will be contracted with.
 - o William Rawn has worked in Berkshire County.
- DRA:
 - Advantages:
 - o Extensive vocational experience.
 - o Completed multiple high schools in Berkshire County.
 - o Worked with Central Berkshire Regional School District and understand the unique challenges of a Regional School District.
 - o Strong & complete drawings.
 - o Limited change orders.
 - o Acknowledged the challenges with smaller schools and has experience designing them.
 - o Proposing a local Civil Engineer, Hill Engineering, Architects and Planners.
 - Disadvantages:
 - o Subconsultants are slightly different than Taconic & Wahconah.
 - o Concerns regarding MMRHS having it's own identity from Wahconah and Taconic.
- o John Benzinger, Skanska, noted unfavorable experience with DRA's proposed electrical subconsultant. John expressed this to DRA and they would plan to change the electrical subconsultant if selected.
- o Peter Dillion added that both firms are great and felt that the MSBA doesn't favor one over the other. Peter expressed that the committee can't go wrong, but is trying to figure out where we could go better.
- o A committee member asked if there would be value in the committee making a recommendation tonight?
 - Jason St. Peter answered that the subcommittee wants to know what the full committee's impressions are to help guide the selection process.
 - A committee member suggested we keep open minds until after the 1/30 interviews

- o It was asked what the benefit is for DiNisco bringing on Consulting Architect William Rawn Associate.
- o John Benzinger answered that William Rawn is well known for creative designs. Believes he was brought on due to his HS experience, and DiNisco's lack there of.
 - A Committee member added that they like the idea of having a distinctive design and feels that the DiNisco/William Rawn partnership may be able to deliver a more creative building.
- o A committee member asked what John's experience with Williams Rawn at the Tanglewood Linde Center was.
 - John answered that Rawn did not have the tightest documents, but DiNisco is known for having extremely tight documents, so feels this could be a good partnership.
 - John noted that he did speak to DiNisco and expressed that cost will need to be tightly managed.
- o Amanda Timpane added that we need to be price conscious. There is a big concern of the tax burden for Great Barrington residents. We should aim for a beautiful design that is economical.
- o Steve Soule asked who the educational planners were for both projects.
 - Both using the same educational planner, New Vista.
- o A committee member brought up concern of DiNisco's lack of Vocational experience.
 - John noted that DESE will have a separate approval of the vocational spaces and these spaces are highly prescriptive of DESE's requirements.
- o Daniel Bailly asked if Skanska was concerned with increased change orders on the DiNisco/Williams Rawn partnership.
 - John answered that since these two firms have worked together on other non-MSBA projects, they may have worked those kinks out. Both DRA and DiNisco have low change order rates.
- o Skanska confirmed both firms attended the Designer Site Walk.
 - A committee member asked if Skanska has worked with these project team leads before.
- o John and Ben from Skanska, have worked with DRA or DiNisco on other projects, but not the exact project teams proposed. All positive experiences with both firms.
 - Victoria Clifford, Skanska, added that in the interviews, the Architect presentation styles will be an important factor when considering community buy-in. We will want to select a team that can connect to your community and be an asset in building consensus.
- o It was asked which firm has more work?
 - Nick, Skanska, answered that both have 5 active projects. Similar capacity to take on this project.
- o It was asked who makes up the MSBA DSP?
 - Half MSBA staff, half private consultants
 - The District will have an opportunity to make a compelling argument on their preference, the MSBA will then vote, and the District votes last.
- o Stephen Schatz, noted that he would lean towards DiNisco due to the design forward approach.
- o Steve Shatz, noted he would lean towards DiNisco for their focus on the design focus and fresh perspective on HS design.
- o Dan Bailey asked what we know about these firms experience with renovation projects. It seems although we've only considered new construction.
- o Peter agreed and added that he'd like to know more about their experiences with sustainability.
- o A Committee Member (name not recorded) added that they lean towards DRA due to vocational experience.
 - Sharon Harrison agreed. Would lean towards DRA due to vocational experience.

● **Schedule Overview:**

Eligibility – Module 1	
Statement of Interest Accepted	March 2022
MSBA Accepted MMRHS into the Feasibility Program	June 2023
Forming the Project Team – Module 2	
OPM Hired (Skanska USA Building, Inc.)	September 2023
Design Team Selection (TBD)	February 2024 *YOU ARE HERE
Feasibility Phase – Module 3	
Feasibility Study Development	February 2024 – December 2024
Preferred Design Program (PDP) Report due to MSBA	July 2024
Preferred Schematic (PSR) Report due to MSBA	December 2024
MSBA PSR Approval Meeting	January 2025
Schematic Design Phase – Module 4	
Schematic Design Development	January 2025 – July 2025
Schematic Design (SD) Report due to MSBA	July 2025
MSBA Project Scope Budget Approval Meeting	August 2025
Funding the Project – Module 5	
District Debt Exclusion Vote	Fall 2025, Date TBD
Detailed Design – Module 6	Fall 2025 – Summer 2026
Construction – Module 7	Fall 2026 – Summer 2028

- Skanska to provide a copy of the meeting materials to the committee.

Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

- Motion by Bill Fields to approve the 11/1/2023 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded by Daniel Bailey. Peter Dillion called a roll call vote. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Communications

- Victoria Clifford, Skanska, reviewed a draft table of contents for the forthcoming Comms Plan. Victoria noted that the Comms Plan is not a MSBA deliverable, but is meant to be a working document for the Project Team and the SBC to help align internal and external communications. Most importantly this will be the groundwork for the community outreach strategy.
- Victoria asked the District for an update on their re-branding and website efforts.
 - o Peter Dillion wandered that a new branding and website for the District will be launched this summer. Peter suggested we start to add project content to the website now, with the

understanding it will be restricted and more user friendly come the summer update (last two weeks of July).

- o Amanda added that the community needs to start understanding why there is a need for a new school.
- o Sharon added that we need the community to understand the why the building isn't serving the educational program, and sell this project as a educational center.
- o It was brought up that we need to engage the senior community and explain the value to the community and to them.
- o It was also added that we need to be cost conscious for the tax payers,.
- Victoria suggested publishing a press release on the designer selection once the contract is negotiated to help spread the work on selection and next steps of the project. Victoria noted that we will review the work plan with the selected design team and identify key times to schedule community forums. Victoria also noted adding content to the website now that she will work directly with Peter on.

New Business

- Next Meeting: 2/1/2024

Motion by Bill Fields to adjourn. Motion seconded by Daniel Bailey. Peter Dillion called a roll call vote. Motion unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.