

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

Minutes of the Building Committee 2/13/17

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

- Meeting began at 7:09 p.m.
- A motion was made by Mr. Zawatsky to amend the January 30, 2017 minutes to include the comments made by Mr. Hervey and approve the minutes with the edits. Edits were as follow – “Mr. Hervey asked why the baseball field was listed as an add-alternate. He noted it was part of a grant-funded project. He said he believes the Town should not lose an existing recreational facility and the field should be in the base bid.” Also, “Mr. Hervey said the Town has not yet agreed to waive the building permit fee, which the cost estimate assumes.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Clancy to approve the minutes which include the edits. Motion carried.
- Mr. Tavares reviewed the Geo-Technical report. The update report was issued on February 3, 2017. The report was put together by combining Phase 1 that was done March, 2016 with the borings and test pits that were performed in December, 2016. They did more test pits compared to borings the second time. They did shallow test pits – five to six feet deep where the building to verify what was seen in the boring. GEO tech engineer recommendation is that the land will be able to support a shallow foundation. OPM will be meeting with the team to go through the report to make sure there is no further testing needed and what they are recommending we understanding on the scope of the project and the cost associated with it.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that the original report was not very clear. He asked if a meeting has occurred between the GEO tech and the structural engineer. What are the Structural Engineer’s comments on how it relates to their report.
- Mr. Tavares stated that there was a meeting in the fall with Civil Engineer, Geo tech, OPM to discuss the findings of the original GEO tech analysis. They did a deeper dive with the GEO tech team to make sure that the concerns that were being brought up regarding the land and building on were not the case and that their report was accurate. The main concern being the water table. At the time of the original report it was determined that more test pits needed to be done. These tests were done during the Christmas break and we now have a new report and we will have a follow up meeting with the Geo tech personnel. Mr. Tavares does feel that the reports still are a little unclear on the excavation that needs to be done.
- Mr. Zawatsky wanted to know where are we with the cuts and fills analysis? There was a significant portion of the site work was excavating the site. He is unclear on what level it was being excavating down to. He doesn’t feel that the question was answered in terms of what was covered in the original schematic design estimate. He feels that we don’t know anything more

now than we knew in November. The next estimate is going to be critical to the success of this project. We are going to have a vote in March with recommendation to the community where Mr. Zawatsky and this concerned need to be addressed.

- Mr. Trim addressed his concerns that the new round of test pits and boring the Geo-tech report gave choices. The Structural Engineer feels comfortable with the choices that they made however they are anxious to talk as a group to clarify some things.
- Mr. Tavares stated that there is a kick off meeting at KBA this Thursday with the entire project team. This is the kick off for the Design Development phase.
- Mr. Zawatsky inquired how much higher is the finish slab of the first floor of the new building going to be from the existing first floor of the current building. Mr. Trim and Mr. Tavares confirmed it is almost 3 feet higher than the grade that is on the site now and that grade has actually sunk so it will be elevated and be almost level to where it is now.
- Mr. Zawatsky feels that the communication to the community and the stakeholders and the people that need to make representations to the community. Having this type of information as to where we are and as the drawings start to progress. He feels it is critical to more community engagement and acceptance to the project. Knowing all the information especially the water table, the elevation for the bottom of the footing will relieve a lot of the committee's concerns for building on this site.
- Mr. Tavares stated that the Geo-tech dropped the monitoring well so they are able to get better verification on the water table.
- Mr. Hervey asked if this is the biggest unknown for this project. How have you factored in the uncertainty?
- Mr. Tavares feels that at this time this is the biggest unknown. We learned that the cost estimator identified several categories where there were allowances built in to site preparation, site excavation, building foundation etc. As Mr. Zawatsky mentioned it was worked in up to millions of dollars. Mr. Tavares feels comfortable to make sure there was adequate budget that was put aside.
- Mr. Zawatsky requested a timeline when we might receive a completed cut and fill analysis.
- Mr. Bradner mentioned that we will probably not see a completed report until after DD.
- Mr. Tavares stated that there was an auditorium design meeting with Administration, KBA and chairs of the building committee as well as school personnel on January 31st. He felt it was a good meeting. They took out several good conversation and feedback for the designer to go back and redo the design for the auditorium which will be an ongoing process.
- Mr. Zawatsky questioned the latest drawing that was distributed to the committee. He noticed light locks. They are on both sides of the entryways. This is new to the drawings. He is concerned that this is an auditorium for a Middle School and there seems to be things in the auditorium that

are needed. He doesn't feel the designer for the auditorium fully understands what this community is looking for and is able to afford.

- Mr. Tavares feels that the notes from the January 31st meeting should be shared so that other committee members can see what has been talked about. It has been a concern from the beginning that this is an over design space with a lot of expensive pieces. Mr. Tavares walked away from the January meeting that this is not an over designed space. That this space is a multi-purpose space that needs to serve a variety of uses.
- Dr. Anderson gave his opinion of the meeting in January. There was a very detailed conversation. The biggest conversation was what is this auditorium going to be used for? (Music, Productions or Both). He feels that the needs at the Middle School is a combination however the emphasis is on Music. This really set the design for the stage. Also, knowing that we do need the auditorium for some performances throughout the year. He also recognized that anything that the Middle School gets with the new school will be much better than what they have now. He left the conversation with the designer knowing what the needs are and that no frills were added. The light lock conversation was not a big focus it was more of items being shown.
- Mr. Zawatsky also commented if you got the room why can't the control room be on the first level rather than the second level which will help the gallery space. This is a potential saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars.
- Mr. Trim stated that the control room on the same level doesn't really work. This is a shallow pitch from the back all the way to the front doesn't work for the views. Once they looked at raising the room. The light locks are basically a pass because the seating are ahead. They can't use the control room for teaching space. Also get access for handicap seating with the control room on the other level. Mr. Trim feels there are a lot of plus for the control room being on the second level.
- Mr. Tavares stated that their report is at a high level with cost estimates. KBA has put out a more detailed based on what type of conversations with the consultants.
- Ms. Clancy stated that March 2nd will then be a meeting with Food Service and the Auditorium.
- Mr. Trim put together a calendar for the rest of the year. KBA sat with the OPM to give a detail schedule. They identified design planning meetings with the Administrations and then meeting with the Building Committee/School Committee and identified bi-weekly meeting. Also on the schedules are meetings with NECHPS, Safety, and Bob Speaker.
- Ms. Clancy asked why CRMC is involved is it because of the creek going down the side. Mr. Trim confirmed that yes any water ways that contribute to the bay are referred to CRMC.
- Mr. Tarro also wanted to remind the committee that they are invited to any of the meetings. We do need to keep the process moving but everyone is invited to come. However we cannot have a discussion like a building committee meeting because we will not be posting them.
- Mr. Hervey asked if the OPM has developed a process for the pre-selection of contractors.

- Mr. Bradner stated that he wants to sink the selection with the short list that is 1-2 weeks prior to the bid documents.
- Ms. Clancy also asked about the interviewing with the project manager and the clerk of the works.
- Mr. Zawatsky would prefer to hold off discussion on the project manager and the clerk of the works until it is on the agenda.
- Mr. Tarro stated that he will put it on the agenda for next meeting.
- Mr. Zawatsky would also like to hold on the Clerk of the Works until we get closer to the start of construction. He feels that they come and go based on availability and if the project actually starts in January instead of March it could be a different person.
- Mr. Guida is going to leave it up to the OPM to identify qualified Clerk of the Works based on their availability for our project.
- Mr. Trim stated that KBA and the OPM had a meeting with Administration on Friday, February 10th to review some plan design. Mr. Trim gave an overview of the changes that have been made to the design plan thus far.
 - On the main level plan they were able to get more square footage saving. They removed the material from behind the lockers and pulled the walls in that add a good 1400 square feet. They are back to reviewing a need for a stairway and they are working to come up with strategies to eliminate this stairway. Right now the plan has three stairs.
 - There were two toilet rooms in the western side of the corridor. They pinched the return tray window for food waste. So they were able to pinch the building to put a bathroom on each side which created a more defined opening for the cafeteria. There is still an egress for this portion of the building however instead of taking up a whole bay for access to a small entry they now have the entry coming right from the cafeteria to the outside saving some square footage.
- Mr. Zawatsky questioned about the 5 toilet fixtures and want to know if they are code required.
- Mr. Trim stated they are looking into code requirements. The building is design for current use but if they follow some of the rules he feels that they should be able to reduce the count.
- Mr. Zawatsky feels that 10 fixtures would be a lot and he doesn't feel that we would need that many at that area. He does understand from a design point however he doesn't feel that there is a need for that many fixtures.
- Mr. Trim stated you need to go into a deeper dive to know what the minimum code is. Right now it meets the code to the letter. There is some room to reduce the count by making a case to the State on why we don't need that many.
- Mr. Guida stated that his point was that you could have more so this is a minimum.

- Mr. Trim acknowledge he was correct however they are looking at reducing the count but it needs to be done with the proper argument which is what they are preparing now.
- Mr. Guida questioned that if the Student union is going to be used for other activities throughout the day will there be sufficient capacity with the restrooms vs. just for the 20 minute lunch period.
- Mr. Trim stated right now it is sufficient.
- Mr. Tavares asked Mr. Trim what he is basing the capability of the restrooms on. Does it relate to other events that might occur or just dining. Confirmed by Mr. Trim is was more for dining.
- Mr. Fahey questioned the 1400 sq. foot saving is this after the latest process and would then be a saving of \$600k.
- Mr. Trim confirmed it doesn't change the cost to create the form work around the building however you will be saving on a bit of finishes but it will not be a lot of savings.
- Mr. Bradner mentioned that the cost will be fluctuating as we go through this process.
- Mr. Fahey asked if this is part of a process – the cost saving analysis.
- Mr. Trim said that they start looking at the programs and also the details on how they are going to construct it. Also, they look at how they are going to construct the firewall and with this level of detail on how they can reduce the cost.
- Mr. Zawatsky asked if the 1400 sq. foot savings, is this reflected in the 143,000 sq. foot footprint.
- Mr. Trim confirmed it is.
- Ms. Ottone asked about the special ed classroom that are right near the elevator and that now that there is not going to be a home ec room will there be a kitchen and things like that put into the special ed. room.
- Mr. Trim confirmed that there will be.
- Mr. Zawatsky stated that there is still a large gathering space for the custodians?
- Mr. Trim stated that they talked about what is a reasonable sq. footage to accommodate the people working in the area. Right now based on the last discussion with Administration and the OPM there will be some changes in the next design.
- Mr. Zawatsky questioned the amount of conference rooms along with the sizes of the Guidance offices. Do we really need to have all the office be the size they are along with three conference rooms?
- Dr. Anderson stated right now the Middle School has basically the same space and they are utilized regularly. Dr. Anderson will be meeting on March 6th with the Middle School community and will discuss this need.

- Ms. Clancy provided an update of the Communication Ad-Hoc committee. They will be updating the website with updated FAQ, poster boards to be placed in the schools, and scheduling a forum for the community.
- Mr. Guida also explained to be as transparent as possible and the explanation that was given at the Town Council meeting on why we needed to do this vote and what the collars were on the amount by which the 4% cap could be exceeded while explained as well as the three categories justifying exceeding the cap that were endorsed and part of the legislation for this process. We want to explain those things to the community. The amount that we can exceed the 4% is limited suggest that the debt service for this project is getting close to be fairly well defined. This are some of the things that we want to explain. This will be done is a two part step process. The forum as well as some written material that will be available electronically and otherwise to the community.
- Ms. Clancy informed the Building Committee that there is tentatively scheduled the forum for March 7th.
- Ms. Clancy asked the committee that if there are any questions that they will like to add to the FAQ please let her know. The deadline for the FAQs is Friday, February 16th.
- Jeff Turner, member of the Parks & Recreation Commission he received an email from Mike Seward with concerns that some of the athletic fields will not make it into the final round of the planning and budget. His first questions is has all the fields made it into the final planning process.
- Mr. Trim stated that right now they are designing these items into the project. There are some items that have cost associated with them.
- Mr. Hervey stated the baseball was in the add-alternate list at the last meeting. Mr. Hervey feels that the baseball field should be part of the base bid.
- Ms. Clancy questioned the dollar value of the baseball field which right now is \$250,000. She wanted clarification how the cost was determined.
- Mr. Trim stated it is on the balance of the field and the items associated with the field (back stop etc.)
- Mr. Tavares said that the figure was an estimate and that it will be refined as we go along in the process.
- Mr. Turner mentioned that the fields are used by the Barrington Little League. There are three teams and at least one AAU group that uses the field. Also the All Stars team play and the other districts Little League come to play. He feels it will be quite a loss for the community if there is no baseball field.
- Mr. Guida explained that the committee is not able to discuss as a group the concerns that Mr. Turner has. The committee can only discuss what is on the agenda. With that said, he could assure

Mr. Turner that the committee hears his concerns. However we can allow our professional to respond to Mr. Turner

- Mr. Trim stated that all the fields are part of the design right now. Such items have been identified the value of it. He has also written down some of the concerns that Mr. Turner has.
- Mr. Tavares stated that this was not identified as a stand-alone item. It was an exercise to bring the project down to the budget. As part of that exercise there were a lot of items (approx..70) that were identified as potential cost reductions, value engineering items, or items that could be added later on in the project. The fields was one that was identified that it could possibly done during construction if there was money available. The fields never left the project but was one that was easily identified as a potential hold it at bay.
- Mr. Tavares wanted to clarify something he discussed earlier. He mentioned that there was a monitoring well however looking back at the Geo-tech report it looks like there may not be. This could be a concern that they have not had the opportunity to measure however it might elevate the other concern that there might not be a problem.
- Mr. Fahey asked if there isn't one, can we put one in. Mr. Tavares is going to follow up with the engineer.
- Mr. Guida wanted Mr. Tavares to clarify what a monitoring well is used for.
- Mr. Tavares explained it is just for the water level.
- Ms. Brody questioned Mr. Trim about the scheduled that he put together regarding the School Committee being present at the meetings. Did he feel that there will be a need for a vote by the School Committee at these meetings?
- Mr. Bradner stated it would just an update on progress and so they would be informing everyone at the same time.
- Mr. Tarro stated that if something comes up and the co-chairs feel that the School Committee will need to be present we will make sure the posting includes the School Committee.
- Mr. Fahey suggested that the committee place first on the agenda the consultant's items that need to be reported out.
- A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m. by Mr. Hervey. Seconded by Dr. Anderson. Meeting adjourned.