

BERKSHIRE HILLS REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Great Barrington

Stockbridge

West Stockbridge

MONUMENT MOUNTAIN REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE (SBC) MEETING

In-Person/Virtual

February 27, 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)*

SBC Members:

Present: Stephen Bannon-School Committee Chair, Stephen Boyd-Community Member, Peter Dillon-Superintendent, Eric Gabriel- Community Member, 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, Ananda Timpone, Community Member (virtual), Sharon Harrison-Business Administrator
Absent: Jamie Goldenberg-Community Member, Lily Haskins-Vaughn-Student, Kate Van Olst, Community Member, Bill Fields-Retired Teacher/School Committee, Diane Singer- School Committee Member, Kristina Farina-MMRHS Principal

Other Attendees (virtual):

Jim Shuttleworth, THE NEWSletter, Andrew Corcoran, Liz Bondaryk

Owner Project Manager (OPM):

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

DiNisco/WRA (Design Team):

Donna DiNisco, Jeff Oxsalida (DiNisco Design, Inc.), Sam Lasky, Andy Jonic (William Rawn Associates)

Meeting Opened: 5:30 PM

Jason St. Peter, SBC Chair, opened the meeting and opened up introductions for the committee.

Meeting Minute Approval

- **Motion by Steve Soule to approve the 2/1/2024 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded by Sharon Harrison. Jason called a roll call vote. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.**

Skanska Update

- Nick Lobik, Skanska, gave an overview of the schedule, including target deadlines for MSBA submissions and Board Meetings.
 - Donna DiNisco, DiNisco, noted the importance of getting the Educational Program right. Depending on how the Educational Programming process goes, it may be in our best interest to delay the deadline for the PDP submission and pick up the schedule in the SD phase.
 - John Benzinger, Skanska, asked what Peter Dillion's preference was.
 - Peter answered that his preference would be to start fast, slow down later if needed. Feels confident that we can get the Educational Plan completed on schedule.

Ananda (joined virtually at 5:37 PM)

Design Update

- MSBA Process
 - o Preliminary Design Program (PDP):
 - Educational Program and Space Summary
 - Existing Conditions Report
 - Establish design parameters
 - Develop and evaluate alternatives
 - o Preferred Solution Report (PSR):
 - Summarize the process and conclusions of the evaluations of alternatives
 - Cost comparison table
 - Document District's selection of preferred option
 - o The SBC determined they would like to do the fast-track schedule to meet the MSBA's October 2024 Board Meeting for Project Funding Agreement approval.
- Educational Program overview:
 - o Identifies special education programs offered District-wide
 - o Identifies program to be offered within the "new" Monument Mountain High School
 - o Identifies programmatic needs
- Opportunities for innovation:
 - o Future ready teaching and learning
 - Understand wants and needs for flexibility and future needs
 - o New directions in career tech
 - Peter noted we are having ongoing conversations with DESE to add additional voc. tech programs.
 - o Flexible, adaptable and inspiring spaces
- Visioning Sessions overview:
 - o Will set goals and priorities
 - o Visioning sessions with survey all user groups and community
- Establishing Working Groups (Subcommittees):
 - o Donna recommended the SBC organize working group/subcommittees to make progress on the following topics during the process. The following were recommended:
 - Outreach
 - Sustainability
 - Site Design
 - Exterior building Design
 - Health/Safety/Wellness
 - Visual/Performing Arts/Library (Library added by Committee)
 - Chapter 74 (added by the Committee)
 - o Discussion:
 - A committee member suggested adding the athletic director, park and rec. director, students, community users, to the site design subcommittee.
 - A committee member asked that we keep in mind the goal for the school to be a shelter.
 - It was asked if subcommittee meetings fall under Open Meeting law and need to be publicly posted. Peter answered, yes.
 - Victoria Clifford, Skanska, added that Skanska has participated on communications/outreach subcommittees on other projects, and it has been very helpful in taking the load of SBC members to coordinate community outreach.

- It was asked how many per group.
 - 10 max recommended.
 - Peter noted that we may want to do outreach to ask for volunteers to serve on subcommittees.
 - All three towns should be represented on the subcommittee.
 - Donna recommended outreach and sustainability start soon, the others can hold until further into design.
 - The design team and Skanska will help manage the meetings and posting agendas.
 - Design team to provide Peter with subcommittee descriptions and suggested start dates.
 - John Benzinger, Skanska, cautioned that certain subcommittees, sustainability in-particular, could have a lot of sway without the full perspective of the project budget and decision making.
 - John Benzinger recommended a including a Chapter 74 subcommittee.
 - Peter noted there are also groups formed outside of the SBC for voch tech.
 - Steve Boyd noted that he has served on the Chapter 74 and it's been successful
 - Dan B. noted that many local committee meetings can start off hot, and then fissile off.
- o Kara Staunton-Shron when is the visioning happen and how is faculty involved:
 - Donna pulled up schedule and is recommended visioning sessions in March and April
 - Separately, for the educational program effort, will be scheduling programming meetings with faculty departments.
- o SBC chairs will participate in all committees as needed.
- Committee members were asked to volunteer for their preferred subcommittee:
 - o Exterior Building Design:
 - Stephen Shatz
 - Ananda Timpane
 - o Visual /Performing Arts/Library:
 - Kara Staunton-Shren
 - o Site Design:
 - Bill Fields
 - o Chapter 74:
 - Eric Gabriel
 - Dan Bailly
 - o Wellness:
 - Ananda Timpane
 - o Outreach:
 - Steve Boyd
 - o Sustainability:
 - Steve Soule
- SBC chairs will participate in all committees as needed.
- PDP Existing Conditions:
 - o Will include existing building and system review.
 - o Donna reported that their team is reviewing consultant proposals for the existing conditions study.
 - o Design team reviewed images and findings of initial existing conditions walk.
 - o It was noted that the auditorium could be a renovation opportunity.
 - o Peter voiced that the auditorium is used for large town meetings. Current capacity is 580.
 - o Steve S. added we would like to evaluate pros and cons of renovated vs. new auditorium.
 - o Donna noted that due to the location of the auditorium, it most likely won't be the most optimal to renovate due to complications with phased occupied construction.

- o Bill voiced that the community needs to be educated on the pros and cons of additions renovation and code requirements.
 - Donna described how the evaluation process will help establish credibility for the preferred option.
- o Steve B. noted there has been a lot of focus on the need for programs and the workforce, but it is important that the building requirements become known to help guide the project.
 - Donna agreed and added that DESE's review and approval of special educational and voc. Tech. spaces will help ensure this.
- o The design team reviewed a summary from the last SBC meeting, aspirations for the project.
- o John Benzinger asked what the pathway is for visioning sessions.
 - Donna responded that we would review the proposed plan with leadership this Friday.
 - Three district sessions, two community sessions separate from community forums.
- o Peter gave an update on the website progress. Anticipates it going live in approximately 8 weeks.
- Site opportunities:
 - o Jeff Oxsalidad, DiNisco, reviewed options for building massing on the current site and asked that the committee members provide their impressions so that the number of options for further exploration be limited.
 - o Committee members reacted that location close to route 1 would not be palatable.
 - o Steve B. voiced favor for location E, H and B.
 - o Bill voiced favor for and E and G with preference for H.
 - o Peter agreed to keep H, E and G, and wants to keep a Mountain View.
 - o Sam Lasky added that location C would be a great opportunity for connection to nature.
 - o It was noted that the community would be sensitive to losing the location of the field/track.
 - o Steve S. added that the track and tennis courts need to be redone.
 - o Donna asked when track/field was constructed.
 - o Steve S. responded it was in the 80's. Steve to follow up with more information.
 - o Steve B. voiced performing site testing for all, but A and F. Steve noted that we may even need to do testing on A due to high elevation run off. G may have wetland implications.
 - o The design team added that we are using the same Geotech Engineer as the last feasibility study and may be able to pull data from those borings.
 - o Dan noted if the classrooms are oriented North/South will not see the Mountain View's to the East/West.
 - o The committee agreed to remove location A and F.
- Traffic study update:
 - o The design team gave an overview of what the traffic study would cover. It was noted that the Town did perform traffic studies recently and the team can build from that in this study.
 - o Steve S. recommended we look at improving traffic patterns for Muddy Brook.
 - o The committee discussed traffic study implications.
- Next steps:
 - o Schedule site testing/evaluation visits
 - o Schedule programming meetings
 - o Design observations at school
 - o Evaluation of exiting conditions
 - o Donna to provide subcommittee descriptions and proposed meeting schedule
 - o Next SBC meeting 3/27

New Business

- John Benzinger reported that LEED is changing requirements starting March 1st. John recommended that we register the project now so that we can fall under the current requirements. John reported the cost is \$2,000 and the Committee would need to vote to approve the expenditure.
- **Jason recommended that the SBC vote to approve costs associated with LEED registration. Motion by Bill Fields. Motion seconded by Daniel Bailly. Jason asked for a roll call vote. The motion passed unanimously.**
- Dan Bailly asked what the MSBA's reimbursement rate is for LEED.
 - o Donna answered that the MSBA recently changed requirements, LEED silver is required at a minimum, no additional points for higher certifications. Eligibility for three additional points for going all-electric. One additional point for indoor environmental air quality.

Motion made by Steve Soule to adjourn. Motion seconded by Sharon Harrison. Jason called a roll call vote. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously. Unanimous approved.

Meeting adjourned 7:34 PM.