

**BUILDING COMMITTEE  
BARRINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
BARRINGTON, RI 02806**

**Minutes of the Building Committee 3/30/2016**

Present were, Mr. Zawatsky, Mr. Messori, Dr. Anderson, Mr. Brenner, Ms. Clancy, Mr. DePasquale, Mr. Fahey, Mr. Feeney, Mr. Finn (8:15), Ms. Jacobs, Mr. Learned, Mr. Terrell and Mr. Tarro. Absent were Mr. Carroll, Mr. Cregan, Mr. Guida, Mr. Hervey, Mr. Jacques, and Ms. Ottone.

Meeting began at 7:32 p.m.

- Motion was made by Ms. Clancy to approve the February 29, 2016 minutes. Seconded by Mr. Feeney. Motion carried. Mr. Brenner abstained.
- Mr. Zawatsky gave background on the process of obtaining an OPM (Owner's Project Management). The Sub-Committee met and reviewed the proposals that were submitted and interviewed the firms. The Sub-Committee ranked the Peregrine Group to be the firm that would be in the best interest to the community. The Sub-Committee went back to the Peregrine Group to request hourly costs with caps and design thresholds.
  - An OPM is an Owner's Project Manager. They are the community's champion. They work closely with the Building Committee. They work with the Building Committee to make recommendation to the School Committee. They interface with the Architect.
- Mr. Brenner made a motion that the Building Committee recommend to the School Committee to contract with the Peregrine Group for Owner's Project Management Services consistent with the report from the Building Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Terrell.
- Mr. Fahey inquired how much would be payable before the referendum. Mr. Zawatsky explained that this would be determined by the School Committee. There are two options that we are looking at (A new building or an Addition/Renovation Project). The OPM has included in their proposal two cost estimates. One not to exceed \$50,000 and the other not to exceed \$110,000 depending on the will of the School Committee and the available finances. In the next phase of this project the OPM will help make this project more cost effective.
- Mr. Fahey is concerned about moving forward and spending money before the referendum.
- Mr. DePasquale stated that the School Committee would have the responsibility to decide on the financial aspect going forward. Mr. DePasquale stated that at the last Building Committee meeting it was voted on by the Building Committee to move forward with the project and the recommendation to the School Committee

- Mr. Zawtasky confirmed that Mr. Guida did make a motion that the committee would move forward for reasons that the cost of the project would not be going down (inflation and construction escalation) and that we would be first in line.
- Mr. Zawatsky reiterated that there are three services that we will need to have in place for this project. The architect, OPM and the Commissioning Agent. These three services are needed to support RIDE, Barrington and the School Committee.
- The motion for the OPM was voted on and was approved unanimously.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that the Sub-Committee approved an RFP to obtain Commissioning Agent Service. The Sub-Committee reviewed and evaluated the 4 proposals that were received. The firms were ranked and Horizon Engineer Associates from Canton, MA was the firm chosen as the best firm for this project. Horizon has a history of several successful projects with the Peregrine Group. The Horizon proposal provided the committee with estimated hours along with milestone dates. Mr. Zawatsky requests that the Building Committee recommend Horizon to the School Committee and allow the School Committee to negotiate a contract with Horizon Engineers similar to the one they will be entering into with the Peregrine Group.
- Mr. Brenner asked a summary on how the Sub-Committee determined Horizon as the vendor to recommend and not possibly Colliers Group.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that looking at Colliers and analyzing the time that they were going to apply to the project. The Sub-Committee had a higher comfort level with Horizon. Horizon had a higher hour timeframe of approximately 800 hours and they were offering a Field Engineer rate of \$95.00 an hour with Colliers being \$130 an hour. The Sub-Committee knew that there will be several hundred hours that we would need the Field Engineer to validate all the field work.
- Mr. Brenner asked if the Sub-Committee felt that Horizon Engineers were the more experienced group as compared to the others and in the long term they would be cost effective than the others.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that from an experience level the Sub-Committee believed that all four firms that were evaluated were more than capable in doing the project. It came down to the approach on how the firms would handle the project. Horizon was giving us a lower cost for the field work and then the office work was compatible.
- A motion was made by Mr. Brenner to recommend to the School Committee to enter into a contract with Horizon Engineer Associates for the Commissioning Agent Service consistent

with the materials from the Building Committee. Seconded by Mr. Learned. Motion passed unanimously.

- KBA presented to the committee an update on the RIDE Stage II application. The application was submitted on time (March 14, 2016). On March 25, 2016 the district (RIDE) shared with KBA a request for more documentation that they need clarification on. KBA is working on collecting the additional information for the deadline on April 1, 2016.
- Mr. Zawatsky asked for KBA to share what the additional documentation was that RIDE was looking for. The information included project priorities, enrollment projection and project alternatives which included the cost estimates. Secondly, they were asking for the Green Tool documentation that needed a signature and lastly, the schematic costs and projections.
- Mr. Tarro stated that the district has gone back to NESDEC and the Cropper Group to run a second check on the projections for enrollment.
- Mr. Brenner had a concern that the design process is based on a 900 student enrollment however the projections that we have been given have the enrollment in the range of 700 – 750 enrollment. How do we justify a 900 student school design?
- Mr. Tarro stated that based on the projections prepared by the Cropper Group the projected enrollment is more in the 850 range. The projections also went to the year 2020. The predictive liability diminishes. This is why the district is having them run “what if” scenarios. The 900 enrollment was used as an estimate so KBA could have a starting point. This number will need to be revised.
- Mr. Zawatsky also mentioned that with the cluster program you still need the same number of classrooms even if we did not have the 900 student enrollment.
- Mr. Zawatsky asked KBA that we have gone through several phases of this project. Over the last several months they have gotten a lot of feedback from the committee and the community. Mr. Zawatsky feels that the committee has been very clear that they want KBA to look at how they can bring down the costs, improve efficiency and be more respectful to the abutters and maximize the use of the field area.
- KBA added that they had one of their site designers looking at the concerns of the abutters. They have found some solutions and some things they can adjust. When it is time to start the next phase they will present some of the solutions to the concerns. KBA has a list of all the comments from the last few meetings and stated that they are working on reducing some of the black top on the site. They are also looking at what happens when you move certain things in the design. They will have this list ready for the next phase of the process.

- Mr. Zawatsky recognized the School Committee members in attendance. (Kate Brody and Anna Clancy). Ms. Brody stated that it is incumbent upon the School Committee to insure that we have a very clear and consistent and comprehensive communication plan as we continue with this project.
- Mr. Feeney asked that with the list of concerns that the abutters and the committee had, is there a plan to work with the Administration to work with the items on the list and prioritize and formalize the design objects. To make sure the Administration understands the weight of importance. Does KBA have that type of plan?
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that we have a chore to bring the OPM up to speed. To make sure that they have all the information necessary that will enable them to be very efficient to communicate with KBA and to act as our foil. Here are the goals how do we solve competing what appear to be potential or mutual inclusive events. How do we get the parking and the ball park space? Those are the challenges and we are going to leave it up to those professionals to toil with those professionals to come up with ideas and concepts and then come back to us.
- Mr. Feeney does not want to leave it up to the design professionals. The architect has their expertise, the OPM has their expertise and that the important of the design objects that the Administration buy into it and realizes the importance of it in terms of formulating an effective plan. The Owner (the Administration) needs to be part of the project and the community understands the design perspective.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that KBA has a design matrix the DDM where you have identified all the issues and how to address it and what challenges and potential solutions there are. It would be helpful to utilize the DDM to make sure we are addressing all the issues and that we are doing it in a constructive way.
- Ms. Jacob stated from a design perspective if you have already concerns you do need to take it to the Owner and have the Owner understand the concerns before the design is changed. If you wait then there would be a lot of cost associated with that.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that we have engaged these professionals to provide us there best professional advice. To follow best practices and then to make recommendations to us. Along the Stage I and Stage II and conceptual plans we have pushed back, we have challenged them at each and every stage along the way. That process will not end because we are now engage with a professional. The OPM and Architect are going to work closely together and then bring the recommendations back to us.
- Mr. Fahey asked if the DDM is being shared with the Building Committee and the School Committee.

- Mr. Zawatsky stated that it would be. It is a working document.
- Mr. Zawatsky opened up for Public discussion.
- Robert Donohue, 3 Rosedale Avenue. Mr. Donohue stated that the new building will take 20 – 24 months to complete along with the complete demolition. The addition/renovation would require minimal structure revamping and this would cost more money and would take more time to complete. He doesn't understand how this could possible be.
  - When did the design phase begin - (KBA stated the design phase has already begun - about 9 months ago).
  - Concern that it sounds like that the committee is only considering the new option and not the ad/reno options
    - Mr. Brenner explained that the committee had originally looked at 10 options
  - Mr. Donohue feels that an addition would be a better option to look at
    - Mr. Zawatsky explained that the committee did look at the ad/reno but the length of time and the cost associated were too high. Also considered was the impact on the students, the teachers and the community. Safety of the students and staff will be there number one objective. Also, the ad/reno did not match up with the educational program that needs to be done.
    - Ms. Clancy stated that the space does not meet the educational program to bring the school into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
  - Is there an itemized list.
    - Yes, it is posted on the Middle School Project website The is a conceptual cost list.
  - If the 35% reimbursement does not happen?
    - Mr. Zawatsky stated that the project cannot go forward without the reimbursement.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that one of the responsibilities for the OPM will be to work with the Architect to try and bring the cost of the project down.
- Terry Devine, 14 Robert Avenue – What are the logistics going forward. Ms. Devine stated that she feels this building will need to be flexible for the future use of students.
  - Mr. Tarro stated that there will be a follow up meeting for the abutters with KBA present. At the meeting KBA will present the list of concerns they have received by the committee and the community and have solutions that they have been working on.
- Mr. Jie Wang – requested time on the agenda to present his traffic study. The Traffic Study that was presented on 3/7/16 he felt was very disappointing. He has monitor traffic many mornings.
  - Mr. Messoro stated that he will have an opportunity at the next abutters meeting to present his findings.
- Edgar Adams, 15 Peck Avenue - wrote a letter to the committee giving his comments on the internal site circulation. He feels that the committee is looking to fit a rural suburban circulation pattern onto a very small and constrain site and he is very concerned that we are spending a lot of money building internal roadways/sidewalks and that money could be better utilized if the roadways were kept on the outside of the site and the interior site be used for pedestrian traffic.

- Ms. Jacob asked for a timeline for the committee for future benchmarks.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that we will need some feedback from the School Committee and the professionals.
- Mr. Tarro will work with KBA to come up with a timetable on what the benchmarks and the critical points are that the committee will need to fit into their schedules.
- At 9:04 p.m. a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Fahey. Seconded by Mr. Feeney. Motion carried.