



PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

Project No.:	170-10792-000		Routing			
Project:	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD 2013 Bond Program Management					
Client:	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD (GCCISD)					
Conference Time, Date:	4:00 pm, February 26, 2015					
Conference Location:	Facilities Maintenance Complex Baytown, TX 77521					
Attendees:	Committee Members		District		Out of District	
	Daryl Fontenot		David Fluker		Erwin Enojado / LAN	
	Michael Beard		Margie Grimes		Van Franks / LAN	
	Dickie Woods		Ray Brown		Olivia Hamel / LAN	
	Angela Chandler		Kathy VanDerBeek		Bill Cabrera / LAN	
	Judge Don Coffey		Bruce Riggs		JP Grom/ LAN	
	Tim Covington		Carl Burg			
	Chet Thiess		Brenda Garcia			
	Tony Krause		Rick Walterscheid			
			Shirley Mosley			

Purpose:	CBAC Meeting
<p><u>Welcome</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Daryl Fontenot began the meeting by asking if everyone had a chance to look over the minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Michael Beard made a motion that the minutes be approved. Mr. Dickie Woods made a second motion, the Committee took a vote and the minutes were approved. Mr. Fontenot then turned the meeting over to Mr. JP Grom with LAN. <p><u>Construction Progress</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Grom began the presentation by discussing the Fire and Life Safety project, explaining the project includes 12 schools. He noted 3 of the schools are complete, in regards to Life Safety, and 3 are underway. Mr. Grom explained this project will extend into summer 2015 at Lee High School. Next Mr. Grom said the contract for the Lamar roofing project will go to the Board March 9th. Mr. Fluker stated that the CSP contract for the Elevator project had already been approved at the February 9th Board meeting. <p><u>Completed Projects</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Grom then stated the Hopper Chiller installation was complete. Mr. Grom next said all 3 new elementary schools are 99% complete with the punch list, noting the marquee and thresholds were the only things lacking. Mr. Grom also said the 3 elementary schools are currently being monitored by the District for warranty work order items. 	

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

Technology Progress

1. Mr. Grom made note that Mr. Matt Flood was not able to attend; therefore, no update was available at the time.

Design

1. Next, Mr. Grom began discussing the projects currently in the design phase. He started with the Goose Creek Memorial (GCM) addition, being designed by Huckabee Architects. He said Huckabee is currently working on new plans based on curriculum changes for the addition. Mr. Grom explained the previous design included more space for cosmetology, and now there will be more of a focus on processing, instrumentation and welding.
2. Mr. Grom then said the Data Center, also being designed by Huckabee Architects, is in the schematic design phase. He noted Huckabee and the District leadership were working with Mr. Matt Flood on design and cost options. Mr. Grom explained that the District hopes to present more definitive information to the Committee at next month's meeting.
3. Mr. Grom said the bids for the Security Vestibules project, being designed by KAH Architects, had been received. He noted the GMP will go to the Board March 9th.
4. Next, Mr. Grom stated the bids were received last Friday for the Robert E. Lee Windows project, contracted to Pfluger Architects. Mr. Grom pointed out the Windows project will also go the March 9th Board meeting.
5. Next, Mr. Grom introduced Mr. Matt Brown, from JMB2 architects, to discuss the Transportation Center.
 - a) Mr. Brown noted the basic design of the building has mostly remained the same, but wanted to point out the changes that had been made, due to public input.
 - b) He noted the main change was moving the Transportation Center away from the front, east part of the property with a short drive, to the back of the property with two long drives. He explained one drive will strictly be for busses, and one strictly for civilian vehicles. He noted the drive for civilian vehicles will also double as a stacking area for Gentry, along with added extra parking at Gentry. Mr. Brown noted the bus drive would be on the west side of the property, as far from Gentry as possible.
 - c) Mr. Brown stated the outdoor classroom will remain in place and pointed out the fuel area is now located as far from the east side of the property as possible. He noted there is a no reverse parking layout for the buses. Mr. Brown also pointed out the berm and planting buffer surrounding the Transportation Center. He said the track would need to be re-located to the other side of the property as well.
 - d) Mr. Michael Beard asked if the same amount of bus parking spots were kept, to which Mr. Brown confirmed. Mr. Brown also noted that a less expensive surfacing area had been chosen to accommodate overflow parking. Mr. Rick Walterscheid confirmed all the amenities from the previous design were still included in the new design, just with a different property layout.
 - e) Mr. Brown did note he reduced the height of some of the building to save on cost.
 - f) Mr. Woods asked where the water in the detention pond would go, to which Mr. Brown stated it will be surfaced drained. Mr. Woods then asked about possibility putting the detention pond on the front of the property for a better value, to which Mr. Fluker responded the District wanted to keep the front of the property open for a possible elementary school in the future.
 - g) Mr. Beard asked the amount of acreage the Transportation Center would occupy, to which Mr. Brown confirmed around 40 acres.
 - h) Ms. Angela Chandler asked what happens to hydrocarbon waste from the detention pond. Mr. Brown stated there would be a grease trap and filter system.
 - i) Judge Coffey asked what size the roll-up doors were, to which Mr. Brown answered 14' x 16'.
 - j) Mr. Fontenot asked how the changes affect the cost. Mr. Brown stated that he thought the last total project cost presented in November, was \$13.4 million. Mr. Brown now shows a total project cost of \$16.6 million. He explained the extra \$2.7 million cost came from addressing public comments.

PLANNING (continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

- k) Mr. Beard asked if the \$16.6 million included the “anticipated off-site improvement costs” (turn lane & water, storm, SS, data extend to site) of \$615,895. Mr. Brown stated he did not have good answer at this time, since he did not know if the off-site improvements would be necessary. Mr. Beard then noted that would make the additional cost closer to \$3.3 million, to which Mr. Brown confirmed.
 - l) Judge Coffey pointed out that some of the cost was improving the Gentry site. Mr. Fontenot stated that in the voted on propositions, there was \$5 million allotted to improving Gentry. Mr. Fontenot asked how much of that was for parking improvements. Mr. Grom stated that data can be gathered. Judge Coffey stated if the District could break out the cost of the Gentry improvements from the Transportation Center, the District would have a better chance of completing the scope of work. He noted it was just coincidental that the projects merged.
 - m) Judge Coffey asked what the \$5 million allotted to Gentry was originally for, to which Mr. Fluker said over \$2 million for the HVAC renovations, some for the new front end and score boards.
 - n) Mr. Grom noted that the project grouping slide on the presentation showed an amount of \$4.9 million for site category for the entire program. Mr. Carl Burg pointed out just the MEP for Gentry is around \$4 million.
 - o) Mr. Beard asked what the big dollar items were for the Transportation Center, to which Mr. Brown replied the two long concrete drives, extending utilities and moving storm water. Mr. Beard asked if concrete costs would increase before construction began in the fall. Mr. Brown confirmed.
 - p) Mr. Brown also pointed out that getting cost estimates from contractors that do not perform school construction, may bring in a better price. He noted that the site paving portion of the project was extensive and that a paving contractor may provide competitive pricing if bid separately. Mr. Brown also noted that the building itself was not complex and there were many capable contractors in the market who do not typically build schools and who should provide additional competitive pricing.
 - q) Mr. Fontenot noted he did not care for the cost, but he did like the design and concept.
 - r) Judge Coffey asked if the additional cost, from the public concern issues, would be enough to buy a different 40 acre property next to a road and keep the same design. Mr. Brown stated the most that could be saved; about \$1 million would come from the concrete drives. Judge Coffey noted that would not be enough to buy the needed 40 acres.
6. Next, Mr. Grom discussed the Stallworth structural handrails project, designed by Matrix, stating it will go out to bid next month.
 7. Mr. Grom said the Lamar carpet project is currently out for bid and bid openings are expected March 4th.
 8. Mr. Grom said the bids for MEP packages 1-3, by Estes McClure, have been received. He noted the contract for MEP package 1 (Lee High School) will go to the Board March 9th. Mr. Grom stated MEP packages 2 & 3 will be recommended for evaluations at the March 9th Board meeting.
 9. Mr. Grom noted the same Sound System package, also by Estes McClure, is currently in the design phase.

Planning

1. Mr. Grom stated the Stuart Career Center & Alamo repurpose project had been awarded to Pfluger Architects; however, there hasn’t been any activity to date. He pointed out the District is currently in the process of researching the CTE program for the Stuart Career Center & Alamo repurpose.
2. Mr. Grom next said there are some spaces at Sterling High School that will also be renovated to make way for CTE. He noted these are currently being researched as well, and will move into the design phase as the shape of those programs take place.
3. Mr. Grom said the District met with vendors and have chosen the type of program that will be used for the Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (S.T.E.M.) Labs. He noted Dr. Melissa Duarte would be able to give more detail at a later date. Mr. Grom stated the District is working to get an engineer’s proposal to support the furniture aspect of the project.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

4. Next, Mr. Grom began discussing the project grouping/budget slides of the presentation. Showing the summary of the project groupings and the budgets that go with them. He pointed out that approximately \$5 million remaining from the 3 new elementary schools. Judge Coffey asked what Huckabee was charging the District for the re-design of the GCM addition, to which Mr. Grom answered \$200,000.
5. Mr. Tim Covington asked what changed with the Security Vestibules project to cause such a cost increase. Mr. Grom answered that Sterling was coming in around \$1 for the Security Vestibules project. He pointed out that the Bond proposal wasn't entirely clear on defining the Security Vestibules project. Mr. Grom explained there are plans for bullet resistant glass, card readers, security cameras and several reconfigurations to accommodate those needs.
6. In reference to the over budget projects, Judge Coffey asked if the District has money elsewhere to cover the amount. Ms. Margie Grimes noted some of the projects were to be paid out of available and general existing funds, which she stated the District has done as money was available. She noted the District is also still waiting on Chapter 313 funding to come in. Ms. Grimes suggested that projects were conceived under budget and project priorities could have caused scope to change.
7. Judge Coffey stated his question. He noted concern that the District is making scopes of work for projects without funds in place to cover those projects. Judge Coffey asked what the current, total overage was, to which Mr. Grom answered \$11.4.
8. Judge Coffey asked if there were any upcoming projects that were currently without estimated cost, that have the potential to come in as a big number, possibly over budget. Mr. Grom replied the Stuart Career Center & Alamo Repurpose is a large budget line item with a scope that has not yet been developed.
9. Judge Coffey asked what the next step to a resolution will be, to which Mr. Grom stated the discussion about scope of work needs to continue. Mr. Grom said the District will need to continue to go over the true need of the District versus wants. Mr. Grom mentioned some future projects he hopes to have remaining budgets. Mr. Grom mentioned possible savings with MEP and Stuart Career & Alamo repurpose, noting that it was a repurpose, not a building from scratch.
10. Judge Coffey asked how much, if the board elected to exercise the option, the fund balance could be promised within the next 36 months. Ms. Grimes stated that there is around \$16 million in fund balance.
11. Judge Coffey made note the District should adjust scopes based on whether the Board would approve the use of fund balance monies, since fund balance would be the only source of additional money for bringing scope and budget into alignment. Judge Coffey stated he thought Mr. Fluker should discuss the fund balance issue with Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Fluker agreed.
12. Judge Coffey stated the Board will approve anything the District needs, as long as the District can provide the source of revenue. He stated he agrees the District will need the money, but he was concerned the Board was not on the same page.

Master Schedule

1. Mr. Grom briefly went over the master schedule, stating it presents graphically what had already been discussed thus far in the meeting.

Financial Recap

1. Next, Mr. Grom briefly went over the financial recap from the presentation and pointed out the slides would be easier to read from the handouts.

Future Agenda Items

1. Mr. Fontenot stated the next meeting would be March 26th at 4:00 PM.
2. Mr. Fontenot asked if the Committee had any specific agenda items they would like to have LAN to add for the next meeting. Mr. Beard would like to hear more defined scope for the Data & Technology center.
3. Mr. Fontenot adjourned.