

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, April 20, 2017		
Conference Location:	FMC 3401 N. Main St. Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Michael Beard	Dr. Anthony Price	JP Grom/ LAN
	Angela Chandler	Brenda Garcia	Erwin Enojado/ LAN
	Steven Gonzalez	Kathy VanDerbeek	Clem Medina/ LAN
	Ronnie Hotchkiss	Bruce Riggs	
	Brennon Marsh	Ray Brown	
	Chet Theiss	Tom Ortman	
	Dave Smith	Carl Burg	
	Steve Fess	Matt Flood	
		LeAna Dixon	
		Shirley Mosley	

Purpose:	CBAC Meeting – The purpose of the meeting was to update the Citizens Bond Advisory Committee (CBAC) on the status of the renovations, repairs and new construction projects funded through the 2013 Bond Program.
-----------------	---

<p><u>Welcome</u></p> <p>Mr. Brennon Marsh asked the CBAC members if everybody had a chance to review last month's meeting minutes. There were no corrections or additions to March 23rd meeting minutes, so the vote was taken and approved.</p> <p><u>Design</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Mr. JP Grom began the presentation with the Technology Center as this project will be seeking an endorsement. 2) Mr. Grom stated that Technology Center has been in the works for quite some time and finally reached the point where the project meets the needs of the district. He also stated that we will discuss the financial standpoint and the work that it has been through to get to this point of making this endorsement recommendation to this committee. 3) He explained back when the bond was organized and formulated, a budget was established at \$7,161,000 for this project. Very quickly as the project entered and began to scope the project with Mr. Matt Flood and his team (Technology Department), it was decided what the needs were and what the district was trying to fulfill. It was then very clear that the funding was not adequate. 4) Therefore, at that point a rough estimate was developed for a budget that could be achieved for \$10.9M. This budget was carried forward to the Board of Trustees and was explained to the Board of how the additional project cost was going to be paid by looking at the entirety of the Bond. The Board approved the adjusted budget of \$10.9M to proceed.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

- 5) Mr. Grom explained that as the design went on, additional requirements were learned about and had to be enforced as completing this building according to the performance requirements and the design was bid out and the bid numbers came in high. The design was revised for the second time and bids came in high again. It was redesigned for the third time. Now, on the third bid with Durotech, their bid ended up with \$11,799,000.00, which was still higher than where we wanted to be. Mr. Grom went on to explain that fortunately, with Durotech, they have a great background doing these types of facilities and were able to negotiate with them. The changes of some elements of scope, elements of material changes and Durotech's subcontractors cost changes achieved a savings of \$1,052,000.00.
- 6) The final Value Engineer (VE) Construction cost is \$10,746,000.00 with a total cost of \$13,302,486.00 including contingency cost.
- 7) The budget is \$10,954,000.00 making it a difference of \$2,300,000.00.
- 8) Mr. Grom said, like we've done before with this committee when the project really struggled to match the scope to the funding, the overall bond was looked at and additional savings were identified.
- 9) Mr. Grom explained that there were two locations that were identified in broad categories to cover the over budget cost. The first is the Technology budget. As Mr. Flood worked through all the technology scope, as far as classroom technology, instructional technology and backbone technology, Mr. Flood has completed the majority of the technology work at 82%. The Technology budget has remaining money left over to help fund the construction project.
- 10) Mr. Grom said that on the other part of the ledger, the remainder part of the bond program that is non technology savings. Where we derived those savings is from ongoing projects where contingencies are not required to be spent. The remaining projects were also looked at and problems were solved in a more efficient way.
- 11) The Technology Center Project reached to a total of \$13.3M with the original budget of \$10.9M, there being a difference of \$2.3M. Mr. Grom explained how to close the gap coming from 2 sources, Technology Bond Budget and the remainder of the Facilities Conditions Assessments types of projects. The total Bond budget brings us to a point where the bottom line says a positive \$979,000. Mr. Grom said that the way we're able to do that is we've had projects that were under budget with savings that had been realized along the way representing savings. This is how we're able to recommend and seek an endorsement from this group today for Technology Project.
- 12) Mr. Grom further explained the bid history. Jumping back, Bid 1 in May 2016, Bid 2 in August 2016 and Bid 3 was back in February 2017. Each time along the way, one can see the ranges of prices. He highlighted that the cost moved from \$389 to \$397 down to \$335 on the third bid. He stated that we've done good work as we moved from expensive options down to where we were back in February 2017.
- 13) Recapping, Mr. Grom showed the request for endorsement, that this committee approve the expenditure of \$13,301,486.00 to construct the Technology Center Project.
- 14) What happened to the Teal bid? Mr. Grom explained that the project was bid out as a Competitive Sealed Proposal (CSP). CSP is received with a dollar figure and qualifications based selection criteria. How many projects like this have they done, what's their safety record, what's their performance record on time projects. When we received these proposals, Durotech was the number one ranked firm from that stand point. The other company did not have quite as much or any experience doing a Technology Center like this project and that was an important consideration for the district and certainly did not want to award the project to the low bidder and then realize that they couldn't actually do the work. As we worked through the bids and did the evaluation, they ranked the highest and that's by law we must first begin our negotiation by the way and start with Durotech and that's how we ended up at this point recommending Durotech as the contractor to receive the award.
- 15) Ms. Brenda Garcia added that there was a quiet of point difference between bidder number one and bidder number two.
- 16) Mr. Michael Beard asked what's not going to happen then out of technology since money will be pulling out.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

- 17) Mr. Matt Flood responded that they will meet every objectives of the bond. What's questionable is the \$14M cabling that's in the facilities plan committee that technology put we pulled out a long time ago that was never approved in the bond to begin with. We were able to get federal funding on some of the equipment that saved us \$3M and through aggressive negotiations on all of our projects and were able to save \$100k here and there.
- 18) Mr. Beard asked the cost of the wiring. Mr. Flood said the wiring that we projected was \$14M to do districtwide. Re-pull all the cabling to all schools. Going through the bond history, originally done in 1994 at those facilities that were built. The newer facilities have newer cabling. It's going back and retrofitting the old cabling at older schools. That was the item that the Board took out as part of the \$75M that was removed from the original scope of the bond. Mr. Flood said we are meeting full scope. For example, the network printers, we had \$380K projectile on this project. And came to you guys and though it would be \$330k. Actually spent \$216k because HP had a rebate on the printers when it was bought and they lost money on the deal. So, on this one project, we saved \$170K. E-rate funding was done for Goal 1 and Goal 2 which was the access points and network infrastructure and received about \$3M of federal funds that was used to buy the equipment and not use bond funds.
- 19) Mr. Hotchkiss asked how much were you projected for you to spend if you have \$3M? Mr. Flood replied, for those projects we were close to \$8.5M and received \$3M of federal funding.
- 20) Ms. Angela Chandler asked, for the cabling, assuming you want that to happen in another bond cycle, is all that going to be compatible with everything t we're doing in the Technology Center? Mr. Flood said yes. We do have \$1.7M in network cabling for the bond that was part of the package and so our goal then we bought patch cables our plan is to provide replace fiber plant. It's the copper cable. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if any equipment that's not working because of the cabling at this point? Mr. Flood said no. We're not having any current issues with the cabling but some are old and may need to replace one or two cabling here and there like Sterling HS. In 1994, it was CAT 4 cabling that did split pairs and did some funky stuff that may cause noise and issues that needed to lower the speed connection or do half duplex instead of full duplex to make that connection work but haven't had a lot of issues having to fix these ones with problems.
- 21) Mr. Hotchkiss asked if you had isolated problems that you were able to work around. Mr. Flood said that this is not a new problem for 2017, it's been a problem for years. The cabling was from 1994 so the standards that were pulled at that time to now are different.
- 22) Mr. Beard stated that that was a big deal that it was pulled out of the bond because it should have been done. It is going to affect your networks and at some point and the very near future and you've installed stuff that's not going to run with our cable.
- 23) Mr. Flood agreed and said we can't go up to the next level. Video streaming is not going to happen. We're running 1 gig connection, mostly from our desk top back to the switches, and will definitely not support 10 gig.
- 24) Mr. Beard asked to point out where the big numbers are coming from on the Bond budget sheet. Mr. Grom pointed out that the cost savings are coming from the MEP projects and also from conveyances.
- 25) Ms. Garcia said that the \$1.1M savings is not coming out of one particular project, it's a combination of all cost saving projects. Mr. Grom pointed out that the total bottom number is at positive \$979K.
- 26) Mr. Beard asked where we at on the total percent spent of the bond budget. Mr. Grom replied in the mid 70's.
- 27) Mr. Grom stated that we will have every project in the Bond awarded and under construction within the next couple of weeks with an exception of one or two small projects. We're in pretty good shape in terms of knowing where our financial picture is on this project.
- 28) Mr. Beard asked what big projects are left and Ms. Garcia said the GMP for the second phase of the FCA Projects. The cafeteria is on target there. MEP 4 and Ag are on target. These are the only really big ones left. Small projects are the only ones left.
- 29) The Stuart Career Center is in good shape and is a GMP project.
- 30) Mr. Hotchkiss asked the Stuart Career & Kilgore Repurpose and asked us a couple of meetings ago and asked for \$1M to put in chillers but you got \$2.8M worth of savings and why did you ask

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

us for to approve that if you still had money unallocated for the Stuart Career & Kilgore Repurpose. My question is why were the RTUs not just incorporated in the savings that's already there? Ms. Garcia said that the reason we had to ask for that was because the RTUs were never part of this scope of work. It was something that came after the fact of the repurpose project. It was determined that 8 RTUs were needed to be replaced in order for that building to be completely renovated.

- 31) Mr. Beard made a motion to approve the resolution and Mr. Hotchkiss second the motion. Mr. Brennon Marsh asked the CBAC members if all in favor and the vote was taken and approved the Technology Center to move forward.

Technology Progress

1. Mr. Matt Flood gave an update on the technology progress. Technology Dept. gave additional GCTV (Video distribution system) training yesterday and delivered carts today. This project is moving forward. There will one more training because 5 campuses were not able to attend the training yesterday. After the training, the carts will be delivered.
2. Work is continuing on the Fax Project. Approximately 75% of the faxes have been converted to the internet base fax and just waiting on 14 lines so that it can be converted over.
3. On the elementary schools, additional APs are being added in every classrooms. Crews are working at nights and have half of the elementary schools are done.
4. Technology Dept. will be gearing up for some projects in the summer.

Completed Projects

1. Mr. Grom stated that the punch list work is on-going at GCM High School New Addition and expecting to complete next month. Also next month, the obstacle course is to start that will be used by the ROTC.

Construction Progress

1. Mr. Grom gave an update on all the construction in progress;
 - A. Security Vestibules Project –Fencing: 5 of 12 campuses are in progress, 4 campuses are complete at this point.
 - B. Transportation Center: Approximately 75% complete.
 - C. Emergency Lighting & Lighting Controls Project: 4 of 13 projects in progress with 4 of 13 are complete.
 - D. 2016 Fire Alarm, Intercom & Sound System Project: 8 of 17 are in progress and 7 of 17 are complete.
 - E. Stuart Career Center & Kilgore Repurpose Project: Kilgore campus is approximately 30% complete and aiming for August 2017 opening.
 - F. Sterling High School Library/Cafeteria/ CTE Expansion Project: The slab is down for the new cafeteria building and structural steel is going up as of this morning.
 - G. Carpet–Districtwide: 4 of 12 are in progress and 6 of 12 are complete.
 - H. MEP Package 4: This project is in contract execution stage and working through legal and should be completed by next week. Target completion date is October 2017.
 - I. AgriScience Center Expansion and Renovation Project: This project is in contract execution stage.
 - J. Specialties- Stallworth Bleachers: Purchase Order execution phase through Purchasing Department.
 - K. Conveyances –Lifts for Physical Impaired: Purchase Order execution phase through Purchasing Department.
 - L. FCA Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades District Wide –Phase 1: Expecting to receive the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) from Comex.
2. Mr. Grom then showed pictures of the Security Vestibules –Fencing, Transportation Center, Stuart Career Center & Kilgore Repurpose Project (Kilgore Campus) and Sterling High School Library/Cafeteria/ CTE Expansion Project (Cafeteria/Kitchen Building). Mr. Hotchkiss asked if

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

there's any intentions to use excess funds (if any) to install a fire suppression system to the remaining side of the Kilgore Campus. Ms. Garcia said that there's not anything in place at this time.

3. Mr. Beard asked what did the Board of Trustees (BOT) approved on the options for the Ag Center Project. Ms. Garcia said that the BOT approved the full concrete drive, concrete parking, classroom partition and the CMU for the hog pens.

Design

1. FCA Renovations, Repairs and Upgrades District Wide –Phase 2: This project consists of roofing repairs, interior, exterior and not MEP type of work. Comex received proposals today and making good progress. This project will move within the next couple of weeks over into construction category.

Planning

1. Green Center Project: The team is still working on some concepts.
2. Lee Drive Transportation: Discussing what the next steps are for this project.

Project Groupings

1. Mr. Grom said that we've looked at this slide already a few times and if you would like to stop and look at it and will be happy to explain any questions that you might have about it. This is also in your packet for better view.

Master Schedule

1. Mr. Grom went over the Master Schedule and pointed out there's been a significant amount of accomplishments. A lot more bars to the left than to the right of the chart. Projects are on tract except for couple of projects that have a little bit of squeezing out into 2018 but done by December 2017, a year ahead of schedule for the entire program.
2. Mr. Grom said that since we are looking at the tail end of this Bond, now is a perfect time to start thinking what are the next things that need to be addressed and Mr. Beard has identified a few things that got left out from the last Bond. We know that as we have been doing our work, there's other items that has come up and could get into this scope of work. We know that there are projects related to growth that are going to require to the district. There are items that got left out at Stallworth Stadium from the last Bond. This may be the time for this committee to start thinking the next steps to organizing a committee or a campaign.
3. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if the team is comfortable with the budget numbers and if the comfort includes going all the way to spring 2018/completion of the projects and the answer is yes.
4. Mr. Grom stated that the major commitments are done and the remaining projects to contract are Green Center, Lee Drive Transportation, and Phase 2 of FCA. In terms of cost accounting, the cost of the Technology Center has been captured in the numbers that were showed on the Project Groupings budget sheet.
5. Mr. Hotchkiss asked to keep in mind not to waste the tax payer's money by spending \$1M towards the Green Center and completely wipe it out on the next Bond. We may be better off explaining why \$1M was not spent of the tax payer's money opposed to trying to explain why \$1M was wasted.
6. Mr. Grom said that Green Center has been on the list for 5 years and the reason why it's been on the list and just on the list and there's some recognition to exactly that point.
7. Mr. Grom stated that we have 2 pages of projects and needs that we've already identified and begun to start thinking about and include this committee to have a role on that and getting organized and getting the Board Of Trustees to recognize and be interested that has something to come from this committee.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Follow Up Items

1. Mr. Brennon Marsh stated the next meeting will be May 25, 2017 at 4pm. With no further questions or discussions, the meeting was adjourned.

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