

SOUTH KINGSTOWN SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Kate Macinanti
Chair
Brian Mahoney
Vice-Chair
Brian Silvia
Member
Lucas Murray
Member
James Manni
Town Manager



Terry Lynch
Member
Chip McGair
Member
David Palazzetti
Member
Michael Podraza
Superintendent

Visit Our Website: <https://skschoolproject.com>

EVENT DETAILS

TOPIC:	School Building Committee - Regular Meeting
DATE/TIME:	February 20, 2025 – 6:00 PM
LOCATION:	Town Council Chambers, 2 nd Floor, 180 High Street, Wakefield, RI
LIVESTREAM:	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGparMXxFbk
PUBLIC COMMENT:	-

MEETING MINUTES

Item	Topic
1.	<p>Call to Order/Roll Call:</p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM Members present: Lucas Murray, Brian Sylvia, Kate Macinanti, Bob Littlefield, David Palazzetti, Brian Mahoney, Chip McGair, Terry Lynch, James Manni, Representative from Leftfield, Studio JAED & SLAM Collaborative.</p>
New Business Items:	
2.	<p>Public Correspondence:</p> <p>As per the email received from Mr. Beasley, two key questions were raised: 1) When will the schematic design documents be available? and 2) When will the new Gilbane estimate be ready? In response, the schematic design documents will be uploaded after submission to RIDE, and the new estimate will be available at the end of the design development phase.</p> <p>In a separate email from Greg Sweet, he inquired about the current square footage of the building and whether the additional \$2.5M implies that the project budget would increase to \$152.5M. Kate Turner responded that the current building size is 153,000 square feet and clarified that the project budget remains at \$150M. The \$2.5M in Pay-Go funding is a contingency to be used only if needed.</p> <p>Furthermore, there was a discussion on contingencies, noting that several have been built into the project. These include contingencies for the construction manager and owner, as well as escalation, design, and pricing allowances</p>
3.	<p>Discussion: RI Energy New Construction Program</p> <p>Chris had requested this topic, but he was not present to provide details. Kate Turner from Leftfield highlighted that the Rhode Island Energy program offers incentives for the project, targeting potential rebates based on square footage. It is expected that over \$100,000 in rebates will be received at the end of the project. Continuous meetings will address this moving forward.</p>

4.	<p>Discussion: Status Update – Project Labor Agreement (PLA)</p> <p>Lucas Murray mentioned that a presentation on the Project Labor Agreement (PLA) will be made by Dylan Conley (Conley Law & Associates) in March. He confirmed his attendance and will present to the Council what was shared at the last meeting, including an overview of the PLA, the feasibility study, and the recommendations. In addition to that Kate Turner mentioned a memo summarizing the findings that supports moving forward with the PLA. The PLA will be between the construction manager and labor unions, with the town not as a signatory, but it will be referenced in the Gilbane contract.</p>
5.	<p>Discussion/Action: Recommendation – Approval of Commissioning Agent</p> <p>Kate Macinanti mentioned that the committee must make a recommendation to the Town Council for the approval of a commissioning agent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kate Turner notified four bids were received and reviewed by a five-member Review Committee, which included representatives from the architectural team, MEP consultants, LeftField, and the facilities director. - The bids were evaluated based on criteria from the RFQ, resulting in a tie among the top three bidders. - Committee’s recommendation was to proceed with the lowest bidder, Catalyst Commissioning Group, with a base bid of \$114,000 plus \$4,000 for additional security design (total: \$118,000). - David raised concern about the significant difference between the lowest bid and others (ranging up to \$219,000). David asked if Leftfield could share the qualification matrix score excluding the cost. - Kate Turner presented updated scores with costs removed from the evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Catalyst: 49 points o Fitzmeyer & Tocci: 60 points o CES: 57 points o Steven Turner: 63 points (top). - Due to concerns over not checking references, the committee agreed to delay the decision. The item was tabled until the March 6 meeting to allow time for reference checks. - Motion to table the item passed unanimously.
6.	<p>Discussion: Update – Design Development Plans</p> <p>The design team provided the update and aspects of the design development phase, focusing on building efficient design and value management changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-dimensional drawings were presented, highlighting efficiencies achieved in planning while maintaining a world-class educational environment. • Notable changes included a larger three-story classroom component that reduced the building's footprint, improving site efficiency, road networks, and circulation for buses and parents. • The layout includes spaces for athletics, CTE (Career and Technical Education), and enhanced functionality for areas like the nurse’s office and kitchen. • Discussion focused on optimizing classroom and common areas, addressing student traffic flow, and improving community access during after-hours events. • Various building components, including the gym, cafeteria, theater, and classrooms, were discussed with flexibility in mind for educational and extracurricular activities. • The project design ensures that the building remains functional, secure, and welcoming for both students and the wider community. <p>Further details on interior design, color schemes, and specific technical aspects were deferred to later stages.</p> <p>Questions asked by the committee members during the presentations: -</p> <p>Q: What is the role of the nurse’s office in the new design? A: The nurse’s office has been moved to an outside wall with direct access to the lobby space. This allows for easy pick-up of sick students without mingling with the public.</p> <p>Q: Can you explain the changes to the cafeteria and kitchen layout? A: The kitchen has been moved to an outside wall, making servicing easier and more efficient. The cafeteria is centrally located and designed as a social hub, also serving as a study space outside of meal time.</p> <p>Q: Is there a way to improve the media center's view, as it now looks onto a roof? A: The mechanicals will be placed on a lower adjacent roof, which can be screened to minimize visual impact. The design aims to maintain views of the fields and surroundings.</p> <p>Q: Can the roof be used as an outdoor space for students?</p>

	<p>A: It is possible to use the roof as an outdoor space, but considerations for water management and safety would need to be addressed.</p> <p>Q: How will the building accommodate after-hours events for the community? A: The design includes features that allow for easy circulation during events, such as the theater and gym lobby spaces. Academic areas can be closed off, ensuring the rest of the building remains secure while community events take place.</p> <p>Q: Does the design accommodate student collaboration and study spaces? A: Yes, the design incorporates learning commons and open spaces where students can study and collaborate. These areas are like collegiate designs, with technology and seating to support group work.</p> <p>Q: What steps are being taken to ensure access to daylight in visual arts spaces? A: The design includes glass curtain walls to control glare and ensure ample daylight. Rooms are designed with flexibility to adjust layouts for optimal lighting conditions.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Comment</p> <p>At the community meeting, Dorald Beasley mentioned that he was pleased by the design development, having said that he raised several concerns regarding the school building project. He inquired about the total square footage, which was confirmed to be around 152,000-153,000 square feet. Beasley also asked about the gymnasium design, specifically whether the doors would be padded, which was clarified by the SLAM Collaborative representative, who confirmed that the doors would be padded, and the walls would provide complete protection during games. There was a discussion about auditorium design, with Beasley noting the original conical shape, and SLAM Collaborative explained that adjustments would be made to improve the seating layout. On cost, Beasley expressed concern over the rising estimates due to tariffs, as previous estimates from Studio JAED, Stage 2 submissions, and Gilbane were based on differing numbers. He highlighted those soft costs, at 25%, exceeded the 20% reimbursement limit by the School Building Authority, and requested an updated cost estimate. Leftfield confirmed that a new estimate would be provided in May, with the expectation that contingency and escalation costs would be adjusted as the design firm continued development. Beasley also raised concerns over the use of materials like steel plates instead of real brick. On the theater’s fly system, another community member asked if it would be included, and SLAM clarified that while a full fly system would add significant cost, the design would incorporate a platform system with code restraints. The SLAM Collaborative representative reassured the community that the team was actively working with consultants to refine the design and cost estimates, with an updated estimate expected by the third week of May.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Discussion/Action: Next Meeting Dates/Times/Agenda Items</p> <p>- Next meeting is Scheduled for March 6 at 6 PM</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Adjourn</p> <p>David Palazzetti made motion to adjourn at 7:14 PM Seconded by – Lucas Murray Motion passed.</p>