



PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Filing Data Code 1-04

Est. 1935
AUSTIN
COLLEGE STATION
DALLAS
FORT WORTH
HOUSTON
MIAMI
MIDWEST
PHOENIX
SACRAMENTO
SAN ANTONIO
SAN MARCOS
WACO

Project No.:	170-10792-000		
Project:	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD 2013 Bond Program Management		
Client:	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD (GCCISD)		
Conference Time, Date:	11:30 AM, April 17, 2014		
Conference Location:	3401 N. Main Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Pete Alfaro	Dr. Salvador Cavazos	JP Grom / LAN
	Michael Beard	Randal O'Brien	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Angela Chandler	Ray Brown	Bill Cabrera/LAN
	Judge Don Coffey	Margie Grimes	Downen Sims / LAN
	Dickie Woods	Shirley Mosley	Olivia Hamel / LAN
	Chet Theiss	David Fluker	Malek Bekka/EMA
	Tim Covington	Bruce Riggs	Keith Hickman / KAH
	Manuel Escontrias	Matt Flood	
	Daryl Fontenot	Tom Ortman	
	Brennon Marsh	Brenda Garcia	
		Kathy VanDerBeek	
		Brenda Villanueva	

Routing	

Purpose:	CBAC Meeting
<p><u>Welcome/Previous Meeting Minutes</u></p> <p>Committee Chairman Pete Alfaro called the meeting to order and welcomed all for attending. He stated there were enough members present for a quorum. The quorum then approved last month's meeting minutes. Next, a picture of the committee was taken.</p> <p><u>Agenda</u></p> <p>1. LAN Team Leader JP Grom began the PowerPoint presentation by discussing the change in how the agenda had been constructed. He stated the new agenda progresses from Construction Progress, Technology Bond Issues, Design and then to Planning, basically stating the work is moving from most completed to least completed.</p> <p><u>Construction Progress</u></p> <p>1. Mr. Grom next discussed the construction progress of the 3 elementary schools. He stated that the pictures shown compared prior month status to current month status, the same format as the previous month.</p> <p>A. Mr. Grom then showed a classroom slide from Dr. Bañuelos. He pointed out that the ceiling grid and windows had been installed.</p> <p>B. Next, a hallway slide from Alamo was shown. Mr. Grom pointed out that the hall now had sheetrock, wall tiles and a ceiling grid.</p> <p>C. For Clark Elementary, he showed slides of the chiller. Mr. Grom explained that the chillers are very close to becoming complete. He explained this was a great stride in progress because once completed, the buildings will have use of air conditioning, leading to much more interior development.</p> <p>D. Mr. Grom pointed out construction is on track for the 3 elementary schools.</p>	

2925 Briarpark, Suite 400
Houston, TX 77042
TEL 713.266.6900
www.lan-inc.com

PLANNING

(continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

2. Next Mr. Grom discussed the 3 Week Look Ahead. He stated all those items that were promised to be completed last month, had been, and then some. Mr. Grom noted the 3 week look ahead includes taping and floating, A/C start up and some hard finishes such as porcelain tile.

Master Schedule

1. Mr. Grom then spoke about the Master Schedule presentation slide, explaining the green bars to signify where work has begun and the blue bars to signify what work is scheduled for the future. He reminded the Committee that some blue bar items are contingent on the funding and cannot begin work until the funds are received by the District.
2. Mr. Grom concluded the Construction Progress portion of the presentation and gave the floor to Mr. Alfaro. Mr. Alfaro asked for questions/comments. Dickie Woods stated he appreciated the safety reports included in the presentation hand out.

Technology Bond Purchases

1. The next part of the presentation was led by Matt Flood where he discussed Technology Bond Purchase Recommendations.
 - A. Mr. Flood referred to the first page of a packet that had been distributed to go over each project. The first was Goal #7, Safety and Security Systems, at a cost of \$2.1 Million.
 - B. The next item on the list was Goal #11b, Mobile Devices for Jr. High Schools, at a cost of \$480,000.00.
 - C. The third item on the list Mr. Flood discussed was Goal #11c. He stated there had been a change on this item when presented to the Board on 4/14/2014. Originally, Goal #11c, with the initial bond, was to provide "1 to 1" for 12th graders and grades 9-12 would get mobile carts in classrooms. He stated that had been re-evaluated on what had been done at the Early College High School and it was discovered that now "1 to 1" can be done for all grades 9-12. Not just 12th graders.
 - D. Mr. Flood then went over the Growth Goal item, which is to provide all 3 new elementary schools with new technology items.
 - E. Michael Beard made a comment that some of the goals seem to be close on budget. Mr. Flood concurred, saying the District tried to use every dollar possible on safety. He then explained that the budget for the iPads for the High Schools is primarily to get started. He said there is a contingency if iPads need to be replaced in the future. Mr. Beard asked Mr. Flood if replacement cost were included in this budget, to which Mr. Flood answered no. He explained that the cost on the handout is the initial cost.
 - F. Randal O'Brien then brought up a lease program the District might use in the future, rather than purchases every item, such as iPads, outright. Mr. Flood stated the District had spoken to Apple and explained a lease would eliminate the up-front cost and allow payments to be spread out over a couple year period. Mr. Beard stated he suspected the lease option would be more expensive, to which Mr. Flood stated it would, but not significantly.
 - G. Mr. Alfaro asked if there were any questions/comments. There were none. He then asked Mr. Flood if he was seeking endorsement, to which Mr. Flood replied yes. Mr. Flood clarified that he was seeking endorsement for all the above stated goals, at a total of \$10.4 million. The Committee took a vote in favor of the endorsement and all were in favor.

Design

1. Mr. Grom described activities categorized under the design heading, which he explained is a process where an architect is hired under contract and begins activities by preparing drawings and studies. Mr. Grom went on to introduce Keith Hickman from KAH Architects to discuss Security Vestibules, Access Points and Perimeter Fencing.
 - A. Mr. Hickman began his presentation by explaining that he had picked Harlem Elementary as an example school for his presentation on Basic Principles.

2925 Briarpark, Suite 400
Houston, TX 77042

TEL 713.266.6900

www.lan-inc.com

PLANNING (continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

- B. He began by speaking about Card Access Points within the District's schools. He stated that either a vestibule will be created or modified, depending on what the school already had. Mr. Hickman explained that once school started for the day, a person would need card access to gain entry due to all the other doors being on lock down.
- Ms. Angela Chandler asked Mr. Hickman if the vestibule walls, the window walls, would create a bottleneck when used for a fire exit. Mr. Hickman replied no, that the window walls were functioning doors. Dr. Salvador Cavazos asked how wide the window wall doors were, to which Mr. Hickman replied that the width would be the same as the other doors. Dr. Cavazos pointed out that the gym is adjacent to the lobby at Harlem creating a need for large traffic exits and Mr. Hickman stated double doors are a possibility.
 - Mr. Alfaro asked Mr. Hickman if he had consulted any principals with this project, to which he answered not yet. Dr. Cavazos stated that principals need to be involved. Mr. Grom stated that this is just an example of one school and how the basic principles of design will be applied to this project. Mr. Hickman stated he will create design, and then meet with principals for their input and any changes. Judge Don Coffey stated that he thought Dr. Cavazos was suggesting having Mr. Hickman meet with the principals prior to creating the design. To which all the Committee and Mr. Hickman agreed. Dr. Cavazos stated that the design of the schools is close to the community and these changes will be big, so keeping the community involved is an important step. Mr. Hickman agreed.
- C. Mr. Hickman went on to discuss lockdown buttons. He stated that if anyone saw any unusual activity on the surveillance cameras, one button could be pushed to lockdown the entire school. Mr. Beard asked if one could get out from the inside once the lockdown button was pushed. Mr. Hickman replied that anyone will always have the ability to go from inside to out, due to fire exits. Dr. Cavazos wanted to discuss who would be responsible for pushing the button. Mr. Hickman responded that the button would likely be placed in the reception area.
- D. Next Mr. Hickman discussed Security Cameras. He showed areas on a slide where a camera would be placed in order to view the entire front of the building, as well as a camera to view persons within the vestibule.
- E. Mr. Hickman's next slide displayed a sequence of how one would enter through the security vestibule, to the school's offices, and then into the school itself. Mr. Beard stated his concern for all the traffic that flows through school back doors on a daily basis. Mr. Grom responded stating that as part of the future meetings with the principals, each school will be evaluated for its needs, based on activity.
- F. Mr. Beard asked if any of the same technology used in hospitals for lockdown had been looked at for this project. Matt Flood responded that different technologies had been looked at for locking down the doors; however, he stated that it will be difficult at the high school level.
- G. Mr. Hickman then pointed out some areas on the presentation slide where there would be bullet resisting, not bullet proof, glass, primarily vestibule and entry areas.
- H. Next Mr. Hickman discussed the use of fencing by stating that typically there would be aluminum 6' fencing at the front of the school, and coated chain link fencing around the perimeter. He displayed a slide with examples of each type of fencing and explained that the use of aluminum would be stronger than steel in the long run, due to the salty environment.
- I. Mr. Hickman closed by stating that he will be happy to meet with principals prior to creating solutions/drawings. He made note that sometimes it might be easier for principals to see a design and then edit that design for specific needs. But if the Committee and District prefer, he would be more than happy to meet with the principals prior.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

Est. 1935
AUSTIN
COLLEGE STATION
DALLAS
FORT WORTH
HOUSTON
MIAMI
MIDWEST
PHOENIX
SACRAMENTO
SAN ANTONIO
SAN MARCOS
WACO

- J. Mr. Alfaro stated that as a general rule, the Committee prefers principals to have been consulted on projects before they are presented, unless it is just a “for information only” item. He asked that if it is “for information only”, to just clarify that before to the presentation. Mr. O’Brien then stated that he and Mr. David Fluker had met with the principals, however Mr. Hickman was not that far along in the project yet. Mr. Alfaro said that they key to any school is the principal and thanked Mr. Hickman for his presentation.
- 2. Next Mr. Grom referred back to the Design slide to discuss the project of installing Fire Alarm/ PA Systems and Emergency Lighting in several schools. He stated the project is underway and would be out for bid in the next week, and that late May was the time frame to look for bids coming in.

Planning

- 1. Next in the presentation Mr. Grom discussed Planning. He clarified that planning involved items that were seeking architects, negotiating with architects or items involving internal work. He then explained each bullet on the Planning slide. They are as follows:
 - A. Architect Selection for Transportation Center – During the 4/14/2014 Board meeting, the recommended firm was approved. Mr. Grom then reminded the Committee of the steps to follow. The Administration has been delegated to do negotiations with that architectural firm, which will go on for a few weeks, and then the negotiated contract will go back to the Board.
 - B. Architect Selection for Data Center – Mr. Grom stated reviews of statements of qualifications for firms that have been proposed on that job will happen later today.
 - C. Architect Selection for Goose Creek Memorial Expansion – Mr. Grom said that this project had received statements and qualifications on 4/14/2014, which will likely be reviewed later today as well.
 - D. Architect RFQ for Elevators – He then stated that the last Board meeting gave approval for District to get RFQs for architect for elevators. He explained that an RFQ is a Request for Qualifications to select professional design services.
 - E. Architect RFQ for Winnie Brown Gym Flooring at Sterling High School – Mr. Grom explained this was the same status as the RFQ for Elevators.
 - F. Architect RFQ for Bleachers at Lee High School - Mr. Grom explained this was also the same status as the RFQ for Elevators.
- 2. Next Mr. Grom introduced Mr. O’Brien to discuss his presentation on Land Options for the Transportation Center. Mr. O’Brien explained that his presentation could possibly go before the Board and he wanted the Committee’s help to critique the information.
 - A. Mr. O’Brien stated the District’s objective is to find a site that is approximately 40 acres and able to accommodate 250 buses, administration, training and driver offices, employee parking, contain multiple egresses, and have a central location. He explained the District wants to accomplish this while remaining mindful of the community impact and also considering growth needs.
 - B. Gentry is the first site Mr. O’Brien discussed. He explained that Gentry is 66 Acres and currently owned by the District, however there are some neighborhood concerns. He stated the potential Gentry Site is not in a flood zone; only a driveway that leads to Gentry Junior School is in a flood zone. His summary stated the Gentry Site is suitable, but not recommended as preferred by the CBAC. Mr. O’Brien clarified that suitable means meeting the minimum requirements.
 - C. The next site Mr. O’Brien discussed was the Lynchburg-Cedar Bayou at N. Main Site. He said this site is 34 acres and cost \$3.3 million, it has a central location off Main St. and an adjoining District owned property. Mr. O’Brien’s summary stated that the CBAC has some concern due to a high cost for a less desired size and could add to existing congestion.
 - D. Mr. O’Brien’s next site discussed was the N. Main at Archer Site. He said this is 40 plus acres at a cost of \$3.9 - \$4.4 million, pending location. Mr. O’Brien explained that the District could purchase 40 acres close to Main St. for a higher price, or the District could

PLANNING (continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

purchase 40 acres further back from Main St. at a lower price. He pointed out there is roughly 100 acres to map out the 40 needed. He noted egresses would be something to think about if the site was chosen further from North Main. He said it is very centrally located, however the cost is the most expensive of the choices and it is raw land.

- Judge Coffey made the comment that the District will not be able to purchase this particular piece of land due to the owner not selling it for its appraisal value. Mr. O'Brien stated a municipality can only pay for what the land is appraised for. Judge Coffey stated the purchase of this land is only possible if the District uses eminent domain. Mr. O'Brien stated that there have been no negotiations for any of the properties shown. He wanted to make clear the prices were estimates based on the values given to him, and nothing he is presenting is final at the moment. Next, he said that if it does not appraise for the right amount, Judge Coffey is correct in that the District will not be able to purchase the land. A Committee member asked how long the eminent domain process would take. Mr. O'Brien responded by explaining that eminent domain is not something the District would execute. He stated the District wants to keep the community happy and is confident that they can find a site without resorting to eminent domain. Dr. Cavazos said that if the Board decided to look at this site, they would have to go through the appraisal process and it would be up to the owners pricing on whether or not the District could purchase the property.

- E. The final site Mr. O'Brien discussed was the Lee College Site (I-10 and North Main). He described this site as 40 - 126 acres at a cost of \$2.2 - \$6.6 million, very centrally located with multiple egresses. Mr. O'Brien said the cons were a limiting current parcel configuration and added utility cost and road construction. His summary stated this site was recommended as the preferred site by the CBAC. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that the parcel configuration is the basis for appraisal provided to the District by the College, and this could be reconfigured by another appraisal. He said it is possible that all or parts of this site could be for sale. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that a con is that it is currently zoned for residential. However, going to the City to request a re-zoning is not out of the question. Judge Coffey stated that it would take 90 days to re-zone and the shown appraisal was based on the land being commercial. Mr. Alfaro asked Mr. O'Brien to confirm that the appraisal was made based on the land being used for commercial, to which Mr. O'Brien concurred. Judge Coffey stated he thought that since the homes on Sharon Street, west of the property, were Estate homes, that they extended the land to also be for Estate homes.
- F. Mr. Beard asked if there were previous discussions of other schools being built on the Lee College property, to which Mr. O'Brien replied yes. Then Mr. Beard asked if that should be added as a pro, to which Mr. O'Brien replied possibly.
- G. Mr. Alfaro reminded Mr. O'Brien that the CBAC liked the Lee College site due to all the options available to the District once the land was purchased. Mr. O'Brien stated that the Lee College property is a good value. He stated the question is whether the Board will build imminently for future buildings if the Lee College Site was purchased.
- H. Mr. O'Brien asked for any other comments/edits. There were none. He then showed pictures of La Porte's Transportation Center. He pointed out there were 6 bays at La Porte. There was some concern expressed by the Committee on if 6 bays were appropriate for GCCISD, since it is larger than La Porte. Mr. O'Brien clarified the District currently has 3 bays. He then stated that when the time is right, the architect will come in and tell the District how many bays are needed.
- I. Mr. O'Brien then went on to discuss pros and cons of La Porte's tilt wall.

Financial Recap

- 1. Mr. Alfaro brought the meeting back to Mr. Grom to discuss the Financial Recap.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

Est. 1935
AUSTIN
COLLEGE STATION
DALLAS
FORT WORTH
HOUSTON
MIAMI
MIDWEST
PHOENIX
SACRAMENTO
SAN ANTONIO
SAN MARCOS
WACO

A. Mr. Grom explained that all the financial slides were also in the handout, and pointed out that the Series 2014 Bonds were now included. He explained the last page of the handout that displayed Series 2013, 2014A and 2014B cost to date, budget to date and committed cost to date.

LAN Award

1. Mr. O'Brien presented LAN with a Silver Sponsor award for donating to the Education Foundation.

Follow Up Information

1. Mr. Alfaro confirmed with the Committee that all received the safety report information.
2. Mr. Alfaro stated that next meeting, May 15th, will be conducted at Dr. Antonio Bañuelos Elementary. Mr. O'Brien clarified that everyone will meet at FMC at 11:30 to ride a bus to the site. He said sack lunches will be provided. Mr. Alfaro reminded the Committee he will not be attending.
3. Mr. Alfaro asked what the Committee liked about the meeting. The Committee complimented the before and after construction photos and Mr. O'Brien's presentation.
4. Mr. Alfaro asked the Committee what needs to be done different with the meeting. He then reminded everyone about consulting the principals before presenting to the Committee.
5. Mr. Alfaro adjourns.