

**BRISTOL WARREN SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**PROJECT:** Bristol Warren Regional School District  
**LOCATION:** Reynolds Building, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room

**MEETING DATE:** June 29, 2023

**ATTENDEES:**

- |                          |   |  |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| <b>SBC (Voting):</b>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ana C. Riley (AR)     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adam McGovern (AM) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tara Thibodeau (TT) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Frank Caliri (FC)   |
|                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Contente (SCo)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kate Michaud (KM)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michelle King (MK)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dennis Morrell (DM) |
|                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Danielle Carey (DC)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tim Sweeney (TS)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ed Tanner (ET)      | <input type="checkbox"/>                                |
| <b>SBC (Non-Voting):</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Calenda (SCa)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Ley (AL)     | <input type="checkbox"/>                                | <input type="checkbox"/>                                |
| <b>PMA:</b>              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chad Crittenden (CJC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Chris Carroll (CC)            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Walter Hartley (WH) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nicholas Hull (NH)             |
| <b>PE (Designer):</b>    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Drown (JD)        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark McCarthy (MM) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Pecora (LP)    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robert Bell (RB)    |
|                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Manuel Cordero (MC)   |  |   |   |
| <b>Others:</b>           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Justin Pacheco (JP)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ethan Hartley (EH) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Cabral (MC) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anthony Cherry (AC) |
|                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kerri Cronin (KC)     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nicky Piper (NP)   | <input type="checkbox"/>                                | <input type="checkbox"/>                                |

**GENERAL**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:01	SBC	<b>Open Meeting:</b> <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Attendance noted above, 14 members (12 voting) present. Meeting called to order at 8:34AM by AR.
05/31/23:02	SBC	<b>Public Comments: Update 06/29/23:</b> None
05/31/23:04	SBC	<b>Approval of Minutes: Update 06/29/23:</b> Approval of minutes from 5/31 and 6/15. <b>Motion: SCa Seconded: AM Discussion: None. Vote:</b> All in Favor (12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)

**DESIGN**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:06	PMA	<b>Stage II Update: Update 06/29/23:</b> No issues, RIDE Stage II progressing through designer workplan and master project schedule. Next RIDE check in is on 8/3. On target for 9/15 submission.
06/29/23:01	PE	<b>Educational Programming: Update 06/29/23:</b> BB presented the initial Colt Andrews programming model. This included potential space utilization of current unused spaces. SC advised that all day classrooms in a basement are not desirable, and team should look to avoided. PE advised that currently, this is capacity/utilization check and will be reviewed as the phase progresses. BB presented the initial Guiterras and Rockwell programming model. BB advised there are very few spaces not in utilization. 5-year projections do not show additional spaces needed at Guiterras and Rockwell, other than in special education support. If 5 <sup>th</sup> grade were to move, the Guiterras school could be emptied, and that Rockwell could continue in operation at a better capacity and utilization. Art/Music would need to be shared as they currently are. BB presented the initial Hugh Cole programming model. There are 3 classrooms available, as some rooms are being utilized for co-teaching. 5-year projections show that potentially 4 rooms could be available, but 1 of the pre-k would need to be moved to the Rockwell facility. BB presented the initial Kickemuit programming model. The 5-year projections show there could be 14 rooms potentially available. If 5 <sup>th</sup> grade moved a lot of these spaces would be occupied. MM presented how a 5/6 academy and a 7/8 academy could be created in the existing spaces. CC advised that the goal is to maximize use and take advantage of the RIDE program newer and fewer incentive.
06/29/23:02	PE	<b>Educational Visioning: Update 06/29/23:</b> Results shared from the elementary school visioning sessions. Highlights were presented as educational goals, program goals, and project goals. All visioning sessions are complete and will be formalized as part of the RIDE Stage II submission.
06/29/23:03	PE	<b>Existing Condition Evaluation: Update 06/29/23:</b> LP advised that a few smaller consultants still need to visit the sites. Draft reports are forthcoming, and most should with PE tomorrow. PE will begin to digest and review this information as it is received. The traffic study and Demographics report are ongoing as well. PE and wetlands expert will be onsite walking the HS site today. PE meeting with RI DEM to review the sites and discuss potential projects. Depending on decisions made today by SBC PE would have Geotech engineer on site to begin Geotech study of selected site.
06/29/23:04	PE	<b>Mt. Hope FCI Score Review:</b> There was a question regarding the FCI score for MHHS being below the score that would enable 5 bonus points. AR advised that the team could review with RIDE and specifically with Mario to see if there could be a priority review given to MHHS that would possibly provide a revised rating that could potentially allow for more bonus points. PMA advised that this should be brought up with RIDE on the Thursday 6/1 call. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Not discussed during meeting. needs to be reviewed further once all existing conditions reports are finalized by PE.

06/29/23:05	Closed	<p><b>Mt. Hope Enrollment:</b> There was a question regarding what the enrollment size for a potential MHHS would be and whether it was too much square footage or not enough. JD advised that the demographics study is ongoing that will guide the square footage requirements for a 5-year projection. This was a requirement to be completed as part of the Stage I response from RIDE. RIDE only allows the square footage/size to be built based off the demographic/enrollment projection. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Record item being discussed and reviewed further as part of the demographics study. Item closed.</p>
06/29/23:06	Closed	<p><b>Mt. Hope Acreage:</b> There was a question from the committee regarding what acreage would be needed for a new MHHS. PMA/PE/AR advised that they believed it was roughly 7 but they would double check what the rough acreage was believed to be needed. It was later confirmed that it is believed to be 7 acres. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Record item, no further discussion.</p>
06/29/23:07	Closed	<p><b>Mt. Hope Fields/Track:</b> There was a discussion regarding the fields and track. The track cannot currently host state events due to the size. AR advised that it would be a goal of the project to solve this issue. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Record item, no further discussion.</p>
06/29/23:08	Closed	<p><b>Alternate HS Sites: Potential Site Options: Update 06/29/23:</b> Ride does not participate in purchase of non-district owned land and the schedule would not permit purchase of potential options that would work; however, none were identified that satisfied the needs.</p> <p><b>Elmwood Drive, Bristol:</b> 8.25-acre parcel. Poor accessibility and some wetlands. DEM restriction on it. Also has powerlines running through it. Open space property and would have to be paid back. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> This site was discussed and eliminated by the building committee on 6/15.</p> <p><b>Roosevelt Drive, Bristol:</b> 19.59-acre parcel. The site has some wetlands and one of the members mentions this site may be an old dump. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> This site was discussed and eliminated by the building committee on 6/15.</p> <p><b>Asylum Rd, Warren:</b> 11.75 Acres. Zoned R20 residential. Issues with access and is also located right next to the Hugh Cole School (parents typically don't like high schools and elementary schools close to each other). Some wetlands are located on the site also. Programming challenges with this for all athletics. Thinking about bringing baseball back to campus. Compare the costs of this option vs the existing Mt. Hope site. CCR also mentioned the issue with HS and ES on the same site and some food for thought on the visioning sessions. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> PMA team visited the site following the 6/15 meeting. PMA witnessed multiple and large wetland areas. A creek was running parallel to the bike path. The creek has buffer zones associated. A wetland scientist would flag these areas and the setbacks. PMA presented the site constraints with the setbacks and an overlaid similar size high school. This fit did not work without infringing in all the buffer zones. PMA recommended that this site be removed. SBC agreed and eliminated the site on 6/29.</p> <p><b>199 Chestnut (Existing High School Site):</b> 43.5 Acres. PE notes part of their design for the high school included looking at the water issues with the creek. Kate Michaud question about the Creek and potential dam: JD spoke about renovating and improving the creek. Also talked about the use of the creek/dam as an educational resource. Also noted that civil engineer and wetland scientist is looking at these. MM noted this would be part of the discussion of all new vs. renovation/addition option. Needs to be discussed further in design. SC notes that the auditorium does not have drainage issues and the creek only overflows in the hallway areas. Gym and auditorium are not really affected by the creek. Another member notes that there are some erosion issues from the creek on one side of the auditorium. SC also notes there is major issues with the science building, storage beneath is unusable because of water issues. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> This is the remaining site and will be discussed further as the type of preferred solution (reno/repair, add/reno, or new build). Item Closed.</p>

<p>06/29/23:09</p>	<p>SBC</p>	<p><b>Preferred Solution &amp; Recommendation: Update 06/29/23:</b> PMA advised that the goal is to review a recommendation from the SBC today with the SC. PE presented the potential Mt. Hope options/solutions. The renovation option was presented first. PE advised this would be a potentially 4 phase projects, inclusive of mini sub-phases in each. PE noted concerns with student experience of living through a construction project. CC advised that RIDE made it clear that the project must be a 50-year building. CC noted that this could be incredibly difficult to achieve without significant cost added in. MM presented the existing site at the high school and the existing athletic facilities and their status's. MM presented a comparison of the existing gymnasium and what would be funded by RIDE. This needs to be discussed further as spring sports utilize the gym. The SBC could recommend building a bigger gym but building above RIDE guidelines would include ineligible square footage. MM presented the auditorium and compared it to RIDE guidelines based on expected enrollment figures from the demographics study. The sizes were 9K SF to 8K Sf and seating would go from 600 to 500. PE's opinion is that it is not as big a difference as gymnasium. The current auditorium is not ADA accessible and would very likely need to be updated to meet building and ADA codes and renovation of the auditorium could lead to a very inefficient space that may not even be as large as a potential new auditorium. PE presented the following options:</p> <p><b>Option A:</b> Hybrid/Existing gymnasium 2 story. Relocate softball, tennis, and 1 practice field.</p> <p><b>Option B:</b> All new Construction, 2 story, Relocates Softball, Tennis, &amp; 1 practice field. Less phasing.</p> <p><b>Options C:</b> All new construction, 3 story, keeps softball field, relocates tennis and 1 practice field. There is a zoning height issue with 35' and needs to be reviewed, this may not be achievable but needs to be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Option D:</b> All new construction, 3 story, keeps existing softball, new baseball field onsite, new competition track, and turf field, eliminates 1 practice field, relocates tennis. Many advantages to turf but there is a cost.</p> <p><b>Options Review &amp; Vote:</b> SCo made a motion to remove renovation due to site limitations, schedule, and cost, FC seconded. Discussion: None. All in Favor (12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)</p> <p>SC: made a motion for a new building and not to save. TS seconded. Discussion. Gym is big piece. KM asked for confirmation that the school representatives agreed and thought it made sense. AR and MK agreed with the motion. FC amended the motion to include the discussion and reasons for new construction. All in favor (12 yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)</p> <p>CCr: Asked if the committee was comfortable providing directions on 2 story vs. 3 story building.</p> <p>SC made a motion that PE provide elevations for 2 story and 3 story options to be reviewed at the next meeting. AR seconded the motion. Discussion: MM noted that PE will begin these immediately and will present them at the next meeting. PE also mentioned that they will get in touch with the Town Building and Zoning to discuss any potential limitations to a 3-story building. All in favor (12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain).</p>
		<p><b>Comparative Cost Estimates Analysis:</b> CJC says this comparative cost analysis presented includes modular classrooms. PMA also notes repair/renos is typically a longer schedule because the kids still need to be in the spaces that are being used and they must do big ticket items like kitchens and gymnasiums during the summer breaks. CJC notes higher contingency is carried on a add/reno or hybrid vs. the new build. PMA shares pie charts with the different costs for each of the three options. KC notes a new building would be much less disruptive to the current population of students. TS is worried the enrollment will drop if you put kids in modular classrooms. CJC notes the add/reno and hybrid options typically come out to around the same costs as a new building. CJC notes the MSBA has similar processes, and they closed their hybrid/repair program recently because of issues with buildings around students and schools. CJC notes your repair/reno does not necessarily address the educational program. JD notes these numbers are just a comparative cost analysis for the purposes of selecting a solution. These are developed from historical data to compare the different options. These costs are not the actual cost of each of the options. The comparative costs displayed are for decision making and where the costs are being spent. AR notes timelines will be important on this project. Notes people are going to vote for a new high school if the timeline is shorter and could help support the project. CJC shares the cost/sf costs of each of the options and notes the hybrid options are the highest cost/sf. AR notes they do not get rental use on their facilities now because of the shape that it is in. JD notes the more you can invite the public into the school to see the condition the more inclined they may be to vote for the project. SC notes there was significant RIDE money used on the fields at the high school to help solve the drainage issues. Used 800K in DP Rec Grant. PMA to investigate any potential RIDE claw back costs for this. PMA notes we would like to see a preferred solution identified in the next meeting. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> PMA advised that comparative cost analysis has</p>

		been updated into the numbers. PMA presented the updated breakdowns on construction cost efficiency. PMA presented the overall comparative cost analysis of the total project cost. Presented the difference in contingency and swing space and why it is higher in add/reno as opposed to new.
--	--	---

## SCHEDULE

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:08	PMA/PE	<p><b>Schedule Update: RIDE Process Overview: 05/31/23:</b> CC presented a general overview of the RIDE process, Stage I through completion and identified that Bristol Warren is in the early part of Stage II. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> No issues, on target.</p> <p><b>RIDE Stage II Designer Workplan: 05/31/23:</b> JD presented the condensed designer workplan. Meetings are ongoing and the work is already progressing. JD advised that the demographics study and the traffic study are important to get rolling as soon as possible to get accurate information for traffic. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> No issues, on target.</p> <p><b>Master Project Schedule: Update 06/29/23:</b> No issues, on target.</p>
05/31/23:09	ALL	<p><b>Key Dates: 15Sept23:</b> RIDE Stage II Submission Deadline. <b>18Sep23:</b> Board of Elections Approval of Referendum Question(s). <b>07Nov23:</b> Project Funding Authorization Vote. <b>19Dec23:</b> RIDE Stage II Approval Target. <b>30Dec23:</b> Construction Manager Awarded</p>

## BUDGET

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:09	PMA/SBC	<p><b>Project Budget: Update 06/15/23:</b> KC asks if the public will be voting on the 200M for the project or if it is the actual number that will be borrowed. CJC notes it is 200M. Also says that the bond will not be taken for the entire 200M, but rather what is borrowed. Keri Cronin: asked if there will be a detailed cost estimate tied to the budget and the vote. There will be a \$200M on the vote but it will be explained further. Keri Cronin: noted that Joe D. from RIDE spoke about the last bond and then asked about. Bond will be paid in full in 2028. AR noted that they believe it was close to 63% but is not sure and there is a question about it. AR is going to review and provide this information from the last bond. KC noted that there could be a good opportunity for a comparison of the cost and the effect of the Bond that was made in 2005. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> No issues currently, budget will be developed as project scope becomes more defined and available.</p> <p><b>RIEBF:</b> The committee asked if REIBF funding would be a possibility. The committee noted that East Providence received funds through this program for their new school. PMA advised that this will be further discussed and may be discussed with RIDE on the 6/1 Thursday call. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> Item not discussed. To be reviewed at next meeting with RIDE.</p>

## MISCELLANEOUS

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:10	PMA/SBC	<p><b>Project Communication/Community Outreach: 05/31/23:</b> CC presented a high-level overview of the type of communication that has been very successful in other districts (websites/social media/flyers/video/attending events). PMA showed samples of information handouts, setups at community events, and sample tax information that can be interactive via website. <b>Update 06/15/23:</b> PMA provides an update on community outreach. CJC notes community events are a great way to share what is happening with the community. CJC notes we plan on having a presence at the concert series this summer to display information about the project. PMA notes we will start to work on a project website. NP asks if we can provide handouts? CJC shows some potential handouts that we have created in the past. CJC notes we can share flyers/handouts that advise where to go to find the up-to-date information for the project. CJC notes these flyers are great to have for concert series or any in person events, allows people to physically take a paper. NP would like to see a door hanger for some door-to-door work. PMA notes PE and PMA can begin to work on the handouts. CJC notes we don't have solid enough information yet for social media to fire back against the rumors that may be shared. CJC notes we can get this going after the estimates come in. PMA notes the tax impact data really pushes people on social media to start talking. September would be a good time to start the Social Media Campaign. Warren also has a summer concert series, and they will share information with all. <b>Update 06/29/23:</b> AR recommended holding an abutter meeting once the decision on 2 story vs. 3 story building is finalized. AR recommended the team hit the Warren concert series but that the Bristol concert series does not need further attendance. CC advised that the district website has a capital projects tab that has all the documents for the project uploaded. All</p>

		other documentation and FAQ's will be on there as they become available. Team to be on the lookout for forums and abutter meeting once decisions are finalized. Social media tabled until referendum date.
05/31/23:11	Record	<b><u>New Business:</u> Update 06/29/23:</b> None
05/31/23:12	Record	<b><u>Adjournment:</u> Update 06/29/23:</b> Next meeting date is Thursday July 13, 2023 @8:30AM <b>Motion:</b> AM <b>Seconded:</b> MK <b>Discussion:</b> None. <b>Vote:</b> All in Favor (12 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)

PMA Consultants assumes, to the best of our knowledge, that the above content of these Meeting Minutes depicts all that transpired during this Project meeting. All attendees are required to address by memo or via e-mail, any omissions, errors, or inconsistencies in the reporting of these Meeting Minutes, to the writer, within two (2) business days of receipt of these Meeting Minutes.

**PREPARED BY:** PMA Consultants LLC

**DATE:** June 29, 2023