

**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 15, 2023

**ATTENDEES:**

- Bldg. Committee:**  Ana C. Riley (AR)                       Frank Caliri (FC)                       Kate Michaud (KM)                       Michelle King (MK)  
 Tim Sweeney (TS)                       Steve Contente (SC)                       Edward Tanner (ET)                       Adam McGovern (AM)  
 Aaron Ley (AL)                       Dennis Morrell (DM)                       Tara Thibaudeau (TT)                       Nicole Lyons (NL)  
 Steve Calenda (SCA)                       Danielle Carey (DC)
- PMA:**                       Chad Crittenden (CJC)                       Chris Carroll (CC)                       Walter Hartley (WH)                       Nicholas Hull (NH)
- PE (Designer):**                       Joe Drown (JD)                       Mark McCarthy (MM)                       Lisa Pecora (LP)
- Others:**                       Nicky Piper (NP)                       Keri Cronin (KC)                       Matthew Cabral (MC)

**GENERAL**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:01	SBC	<b>Open Meeting: Update 06/15/23:</b> Attendance noted above, <b>12</b> members present. Meeting called to order at 8:33 by AR.
05/31/23:02	SBC	<b>Public Comments: Update 06/15/23:</b> None.
05/31/23:03	Record	<b>Introduction:</b> All team members introduced. Confirmed that all in attendance are on the building committee roster. <b>Update 06/15/23:</b> Introductions were made for everyone present in conference room.
05/31/23:04	SBC	<b>Approval of Minutes Update 06/15/23:</b> Approval of minutes from 5/31/23 tabled until the next meeting. PMA to add approval on 5/31 and 6/15 minutes to 6/29 agenda. <b>Motion:</b> Motion made by <b>Blank</b> , Seconded by <b>Blank</b> <b>Discussion:</b> None. <b>Vote:</b> All in Favor (0 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain)

**DESIGN**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:05	Record	<b>Stage I Recap: 05/31/23:</b> CC presented a general recap of the Stage I submission. This included discussion regarding the initial facilities review completed by Colliers on behalf of the state. Perkins Eastman will be assisting in providing responses to the Stage I open comments as part of the Stage II submission.
05/31/23:06		<b>Stage II Update: 05/31/23:</b> CC presented an overview of the stage II process. JD presented further detailed what to expect as part of the Stage II work process. It was discussed that Mt. Hope HS is the priority but that all other schools are being considered and reviewed as part of the scope. AR advised that no matter what decision is selected to move forward by the School Committee and the Building Committee, that RIDE approval is the deciding factor for reimbursement. It will be consistent review during the next few months to make sure RIDE is on board with where the potential project is heading. PMA presented comparative cost analysis information on how the repair/renovations, addition/renovation, and new construction stack up against each other. PMA advised the committee that these are not detailed design estimates and that they are for comparing the options on a level playing field. CC reviewed the “bonus” funding availability and AR added that the initial bonding scenarios were calculated at a safer number of around 77-78%. PMA advised that there are ineligible costs that RIDE does not participate in and that during the project scope and budget development, PMA will be working with the guidelines to identify these and work to maximize the districts reimbursement level. AR advised that she send the legislature to the SBC for green building to share. <b>Educational Planning: 05/31/23:</b> JD presented information on programming and visioning. JD advised that creative planning and programming will assist in maximizing educational effectiveness and opportunity. The SBC asked how the visioning sessions went yesterday. AR advised that there were about 20 people present and there was a lot of discussions about what the educational program would look like and what a facility would look like to allow for the delivery of that program. This was specific to middle school. AR also spoke about a possible grade reconfiguration to a 5-8 middle school. This could add a lot of benefits to the educational program and how it is delivered. There was also discussion about how there is a desire for soft spaces in a new building. This is something that does not exist in the current facilities. There are no

group project areas or gathering areas in common locations to be utilized and it would be something that the group would like to see.

The SBC also asked about the legislative enabling act, specifically about the elementary school children required to go to school within the town they reside in. AR advised that this is being and will be reviewed as part of the visioning sessions. Discussion will continue for this item as needed as there is a big opportunity for newer and fewer schools bonus points.

**Existing Condition Evaluation: 05/31/23:** JD presented information on what to expect and what will be studied as part of the Stage II submission. This included base repairs, renovations, new construction, and hybrid (add/reno). Site analysis will be taking place regarding runoff, flood plain, wetlands, and other variables. J presented very high-level options regarding new construction, renovation, and hybrid options.

**Mt. Hope FCI Score Review:** 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.

**Mt. Hope Enrollment:** 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.

**Mt. Hope Acreage:** 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.

**Mt. Hope Fields/Track:** 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.

**Update 06/15/23:**

**Stage II Update:** CJC notes there has been a lot of building tours to date and provided a list of dates/activities completed since last meeting. Weekly meetings between PMA/PE continue to review different action items and their status. PMA advised the team met with RIDE on June 1<sup>st</sup> and has another check-in on 8/3.

PE provided an update on the progress they have made.

**Evaluating Existing Buildings:** Engineers and subs have gone through all the buildings and are working through existing building condition reports. PE is currently modeling existing schools in CAD and Revit and notes they are 75% complete. PE notes they are looking into reconfiguring grades and moving schools as well. Once these are completed, a new FCI can be calculated and should be reviewed with RIDE to evaluate potential bonus reimbursement points.

**Visioning:** Two visioning sessions were hosted for the middle and high school. The last visioning session is scheduled for tonight and is for elementary schools.

**Educational Programming:** Working with the existing program now and are working on fine tuning the enrollment numbers. The demographer is currently working on this enrollment figures. Hope to have an update by Mid-July. AR notes Ride uses the numbers from 2028 (five years out).

The traffic study was completed this week and equipment was removed. PE notes there is a meeting to discuss high performance goals soon. Historic commission meeting is scheduled for 7/6.

PE notes they have looked at some potential site options for the new building options. LP notes they met with the planning board to go over the zoning process and will continue to work with them throughout the process, will also meet with RIDE along the way.

**Alternate Sites: Discussion:** CJC notes we are required to investigate alternate sites per RIDE program. LP notes once the site is picked then PE can identify the different options for that specific site. CJC notes we need the decision by the next meeting to stay on track. CJC notes PMA ran through the districts database to search for available parcels. CJC notes 27 potential Bristol/Warren owned sites that are 8+ acres (which is typical for what we look for to build a high school) were identified and 4 potential sites were earmarked. Three are in Bristol and one in Warren. Regarding the Warren site, TS asks if the district would have increased costs for bussing if the location of the high school were changed. AR states they pay per bus per day so this would not be affected. CJC notes for the 8 acres, we are assuming you would be using some of the town fields because there is not enough room to build them all on the 7-acre site. A 7-acre site would fit a high school building and most of the parking needs for the school. It would not fit all athletic fields. CJC also notes you would need close to the current high school site (43.5 acres) to fit all the athletic field needed on it. AR notes no private property has been looked at because there is no reimbursement on

purchased land. AR also notes a new build option, or a renovation that tears down the gym and auditorium, they would likely not be able to build the same size spaces within the RIDE funding requirements. AR notes they could build a bigger gym/auditorium if needed but RIDE would not reimburse anything above their guidelines for size. CJC notes the auditorium size is chosen by the square footage/student. PE notes it is also dependent on the theatre/band programs as well as the capacity. AR notes they can fit the entire school population in the gym while the auditorium holds only 2 grades at a time. NP asks if a renovation is chosen, are the gym and auditorium reimbursable? Yes, RIDE will participate in the renovation if the size is above the projected 2028 enrollment. SC asks if the current gym meets the structural codes? CJC notes structural codes have changed over time and there could be structural upgrade requirements necessary. This is all dependent on the structural engineers existing conditions report. AR also notes they would like to keep the high school and the fields on the same existing site. AR notes the preferred site would be the existing high school site. SC would like to investigate the high school site as well as the Asylum Rd site and see what the different costs would be. CJC notes some parents do not like having elementary schools on the same campus as the high school site. PMA plans to visit the Asylum Rd. site following the meeting.

**Potential Site Options:**

**Elmwood Drive, Bristol:** 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.

**Roosevelt Drive, Bristol:** 19.59 acre parcel. Site has some wetlands and one of the members mentions this site may be an old dump.

**Asylum Rd, Warren:** 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.

**199 Chestnut (Existing High School Site):** 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.

**Educational Visioning:** The final visioning session is scheduled for tonight and is for Elementary schools. PE notes the visioning sessions are going well. Notes it was a good opportunity to get the people thinking about relocating the 5<sup>th</sup> grade to the middle school. PE also notes it was clear that the people thought the high school was the biggest issue that needs to be addressed. MM notes there is a push for more outdoor activities in the visioning sessions. AR notes they do not currently like the layout of the existing high school with the spokes and the main center area that is all offices. AR would like to see the design be more like a community. CJC notes RIDE really likes to see the districts receive a building that fits their educational planning needs.

**Preferred Solution:** CJC notes it would be great if we could vote on the ideal solution at the next meeting. SBC would vote on the high school being priority number one. CJC says we do not have a design yet, but we are looking at three different options for the high school. It assumes the high school is the same size that it is now. This also goes for the hybrid option. The renovation/repair keeps all spaces that same size. CJC also notes the add/reno process would have to make the school a 50-year school and it wouldn't make sense to bond something for 30 years that would only band aid the existing building.

**Cost Estimates:** CJC says these 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

		<p>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.</p> <p><b>Preferred Solution Process:</b> The SBC makes recommendation for preferred solution. The SC would review and make an approval. When does the JFC come in? When would special meetings be needed? AR to confirm with Tim Sweeney when those meetings would occur. When do polls open? Mid-October. Early voting/ Mail-ins.</p>
--	--	---

**SCHEDULE**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:08	PMA/SBC	<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.</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.</p> <p><b>Master Project Schedule: 05/31/23:</b> PMA has a developed project schedule for Stage II. As the project moves forward and approvals are received, the Master Project schedule will be further developed.</p> <p><b>Update 06/15/23: Overview:</b> CJC runs through the timeline for the project.</p> <p><b>RIDE Stage II Designer Workplan:</b> PE team runs through a timeline of different events to meet the Stage II submission deadline in September. PE also shows timeline progressing into Stage III.</p> <p><b>Master Project Schedule:</b> PMA has a developed project schedule for Stage II. As the project moves forward and approvals are received, the Master Project schedule will be further developed.</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: 05/31/23:</b> CC presented a sample version of the RIDE master project budget and the associated construction costs. PMA spoke again about ineligible costs and advised that as the project develops the Master Project Budget will be developed.</p> <p><b>Ineligible Costs:</b> There was a question from the committee regarding ineligible costs. PMA reviewed the slide and advised that ineligible costs will be identified as the project develops and as the total project budget is developed. The goal of the project is to maximize the reimbursement for the district. AR advised that since this is a HS, that including the central administration building as part of the HS would be reimbursable under RIDE guidelines/regulations and it is something that the district should investigate.</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. <u>Need to confirm this can be closed out?</u></p> <p><b>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</p>

		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 done in 2005.
--	--	---

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Item	Action	Notes
05/31/23:10	PMA/SBC	<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.
05/31/23:11	Record	<b>Public Comment/Questions: 05/31/23:</b> None. <b>Update 06/15/23:</b> None.
05/31/23:12	Record	<b>Adjournment:</b> Meeting adjourned at 9:52AM <b>Next Meeting Date: Thursday June 29, 2023 @8:30AM</b>

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:** Nicholas Hull, PMA Consultants LLC

**DATE:** June 15, 2023