

Mount Greylock Regional High School Building Committee
March 14, 2005

Present:

Irene Addison, member
Thomas Bartels, member
Jack Hickey, member
Andy Hogeland, member
Nat Karns, member
Ann McCallum, member

Greg Shine, member
Bill Travis, prospective MGRHS supt
Jonathan Dowse, Williams student
Clara Hard, Williams student
Sarah Johnson, Williams student

Absent (Excused):

Beth Goodman

1. Each committee member introduced themselves. Nat Karns specifically noted that he was serving on the Building Committee as a private citizen rather than as a representative of Berkshire Planning. For any issues that go before Berkshire Planning, he will recuse himself from his Berkshire Planning position during that process. Several students from an Environmental Planning class from Williams College were also in attendance and will provide assistance to the committee during the semester.
2. A. Hogeland noted that we would be working under the Open Meeting Law. A handout was provided detailing the requirements. In general, minutes must be prepared, the meeting must be posted two days in advance, the meeting is open to the public, and executive sessions are an option for sensitive business. E-mail should only be used for scheduling rather than conducting business. Subcommittees are also subject to the Open Meeting Law.
3. A handout provided the charge from the MGRHS School Committee. Initially we are to consider only the current location. The charge includes considering green building options; it is assumed that this is intended to be primarily energy-based issues. We will need to focus on the open process and communication with the users and the public at appropriate points.
4. November 2006 is the target for the final recommendation. There is a moratorium on school funding until July 2007, so that target date would provide sufficient time for local review and approvals before the project is submitted to be placed in the queue. SBA is expected to issue new educational facility regulations in summer 2006.
5. Handouts were provided that details the process for state funding.
6. The studies that were previously completed were provided as handouts. The ADA survey is 13 years old. It is also known that some of the work has been done from the Facility Audit. A future meeting will need to provide an update of these reports from school administration.
7. The 05/06 MGRHS budget request will include \$35,000 in funding for architectural support work. The general consensus of the group is that this is appropriate timing. Care will need to be taken in the preparation of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the feasibility study so that a conscious decision is made whether the architect will be eligible to continue as the designer. Committee members will gather samples of RFQs. The committee will also need to build the requirements and the goals of the feasibility study.

8. It was discussed how the Williams Environmental Planning students could participate. They have approximately two months left and will prepare a final product for their class that is targeted to be beneficial to the Building Committee. The items that were identified for their possible efforts were to coordinate focus groups with faculty, students and staff, gather data about “green” building elements, consider open space/recreation/community needs, consider various options for the water contamination, gather current energy consumption data, and recommend potential layouts within the existing site including the athletic fields. The existing parcel characteristics can also be identified—wetlands, wellhead, endangered species.
9. Lessons learned from other building projects and considerations for this project were discussed:
 - a. Insufficient communication and community outreach caused problems in the approval process. This project will be particularly challenging with dual communities.
 - b. This project does not appear to have a time pressure from enrollment, although we will need to focus on the school enrollment projections as there will be a huge impact if they are not accurate.
 - c. Dr. Travis brings building experience which will be valuable throughout the process.
 - d. During the Williamstown Elementary School (WES) project, the community skills were tapped. The committee compiled offers from volunteers and developed subcommittees at appropriate times.
 - e. In Lanesboro, there is a perception that there were key things left out of the project.
 - f. The importance of communication with all of the stakeholders and ensuring that the initial RFQ for the feasibility study is complete cannot be overemphasized.
 - g. We need to include the faculty and staff throughout the process.
 - h. The PTO will need to be included in the process as appropriate. The group is about one year old and very active.
 - i. The WES project had some representatives that were not working a full-time job which provided benefits in the time-consuming activities of the project.
 - j. Lanesboro appears to be under-represented on the committee.
 - k. The school facility is available 24/7 and secondary uses for the facility should be considered that maximize the building usage. We need to look beyond the school needs to the community and industry as there may be potential sources of funding if the building use could be extended.
10. A facility tour will be set up. A. Hogeland will send out a series of dates for consideration.
11. The meeting schedule was discussed. We will target the second and fourth Mondays with Tuesdays as an alternate. Next meeting will be March 28 at 7:30 PM.
12. Potential discussion points for the next meeting:
 - a. RFQ models
 - b. Facility discussion based on review of survey handouts

- c. Public outreach plan
 - d. Timeline of project milestones
13. Future meeting agenda items
- a. Update from administration on work completed in surveys
 - b. Other thoughts on facility not included in surveys