

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

<b>Project No.:</b>	170-10792-000		<b>Routing</b>
<b>Project:</b>	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD 2013 Bond Program Management		
<b>Client:</b>	Goose Creek Consolidated ISD (GCCISD)		
<b>Conference Time, Date:</b>	4:00 pm, February 23, 2017		
<b>Conference Location:</b>	Goose Creek Memorial High School Flex Lab Room SW113 6001 E. Wallisville, Baytown, TX 77521		
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Out of District</b>
	Daryl Fontenot	Randal O'Brien	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Michael Beard	Anthony Price	Terre Musgrove / LAN
	Chet Theiss	Brenda Garcia	Clem Medina / LAN
	Angela Chandler	Kathy VanDerBeek	John Carey/LAN
	Ronnie Hotchkiss	Bruce Riggs	
	Tim Covington	Ray Brown	
	Steven Gonzalez	Tom Ortman	
	Gina Rivon	Carl Burg	
		Matt Flood	
		Margie Grimes	
		LeAna Dixon	
		Renea Dobbs	

<b>Purpose:</b>	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><b>Welcome</b></p> <p>1. The CBAC members were taken for a quick tour of the newly completed wing addition to the GCM High School at 4:00pm. Afterwards, the meeting started at 4:15pm on the first floor in the Flex Lab Room. Mr. Fontenot asked the CBAC members if everybody had a chance to review the last meeting minutes. There being none noted, Mr. Michael Beard made motion and Mr. Ronnie Hotchkiss made the second motion. A vote was taken and last month's meeting minutes were approved.</p> <p><b>Technology Progress</b></p> <p>1. Mr. Matt Flood stated that projects are moving forward with video distribution system, junior high e-readers and access points outside the building at the elementary level. These are technologies focus point currently.</p> <p><b>Completed Projects</b></p> <p>1. Mr. Erwin Enojado stated that the GCM High School New Addition is still on this list because the ROTC obstacle course has not yet started and on-going punch list work. The ROTC obstacle course portion was pulled out of the GCM High School New Addition contract in order to get a better price by attracting a GC to install 3 ROTC obstacle courses, one at GCM HS, one at Sterling HS and one at Lee HS.</p>
--

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

2. Mr. Enojado stated nothing major on the punch work, just minor work. Mr. Michael Beard asked about the missing floor tiles. Ms. Brenda Garcia replied that the missing tiles at the existing building is being addressed and is part of maintenance work.
3. Mr. O'Brien wanted to clarify if the floors will be stained versus tile and Ms. Garcia said that they are looking into that right now.

**Construction Progress**

1. For the Security Vestibules project, Mr. Enojado stated that Sterling High School and Lee High School are now complete but with minor punch work. There are still some small pieces of glass missing but it is scheduled to be installed this week per Mr. Tom Ortman as he had received a confirmation from the General Contractor (GC).
2. Mr. Enojado mentioned that part of this Security Vestibules project is the installation of fence around the school campus perimeter. Mr. Enojado then gave the status of the campus; San Jacinto Elementary is 95% complete, Smith Elementary is 10% complete, De Zavala Elementary is 40% complete and Austin Elementary is 5% complete. The fencing crew will be starting next week at Horace Mann Junior School and Harlem Elementary School.
3. For the Transportation Center Project, Mr. Enojado stated that work is on-going. The concrete pour for the bus parking lot is approximately 40% complete and work on the building is progressing along.
4. For the Emergency Lighting & Lighting Controls Project, Mr. Enojado stated that work is on-going and gave the status; Lee High School, FMC Building, Smith Elementary and San Jacinto Elementary are all 100% complete. Peter Hylands is 95% complete, Highlands Elementary is 80% complete, and Hopper Primary is 30% complete.
5. For the 2016 Fire Alarm, Intercom & Sound System Project, Mr. Enojado said the Stallworth Stadium speaker installation is 100% complete, Administration Building is 90% complete, Austin Elementary is 80% complete, and Hopper Primary is 40% complete.
6. For the Stuart Career Center Kilgore Repurpose Project, Mr. Enojado stated the work at Kilgore Campus is on-going with sheetrock installation in the hallways, electrical, HVAC ductwork, concrete pad for the smoke house, and front entrance concrete work.
7. For the Sterling High School Library/Cafeteria/ CTE Expansion Project, the New Cafeteria Kitchen Building is on-going with compacting the select fill for the building pad. Pier layout, drill & pour piers are scheduled for the next couple weeks.
8. For the Carpet Project –Districtwide; Harlem Elementary, De Zavala Elementary, Highlands Elementary, Austin Elementary and Crockett Elementary are 100% complete. Cedar Bayou JS and Carver Elementary are 95% complete, and Lee High School is 5% complete. The remaining campus are Baytown JS, Travis Elementary, Lee High School, Facilities Management Complex (FMC) and Administration Building.
9. Mr. Enojado continued his update with the presentation of showing pictures of the Fencing Project for Horace Mann JS and San Jacinto Elementary, Transportation Center, Sterling High School Library/Cafeteria/ CTE Expansion Project and Kilgore Campus Projects.
10. Mr. O'Brien shared to the group that the district had received some general complaint from the surrounding neighbors for the Transportation Center on the concrete pour being at 4:30am. He said that the district has done a really good job listening and addressing their concerns. He also explained that if we don't get in line on time we don't get concrete that day. One of the things that the drivers of the concrete truck were doing is honking their horns when the concrete pour is done as a matter of safety from their standpoint. Mr. O'Brien said that it's one thing to have a back-up noise, it's a totally different thing at 4:30am to be honking. Mr. Price went out to the site and his team required them to use the flag system versus the honk system. This was one of the ways to address the complaint. From Mr. O'Brien's understanding, the neighbors may not still be extremely happy about the construction site, being that it's a few hundred yards away from their homes, but they are appeased at this moment in time.

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

11. Mr. O'Brien pointed out to the committee members that it's important to know that each project is assigned to a project manager who are sitting at the back room. Mr. Ray Brown who took the group for the tour is the assigned project manager for this project. Mr. Carl Burg is assigned to Kilgore project in which he will be the one taking us for a tour if we choose to go there. Tom Ortman is the assigned project manager for the Fencing, Carpet, Vestibules, Fire Alarm System and Sound System projects.

**Design**

1. Mr. Enojado stated that the MEP Package 4 Project is being advertised and bids are due the week after spring break, on March 21. After receiving and evaluating the bids, the recommended contractor will be presented to the Board of Trustees in April for approval. This will be a summer work time frame for the campuses that consist interior work. Campuses that have exterior work such as the FMC Building will not need to be completed until October as it has no school impact.
2. Mr. Ronnie Hotchkiss questioned if someone has coordinated with the instructional department as to which campuses will be occupied for summer school. Ms. Brenda Garcia said that the communication with the Curriculum Department began back in December. Facilities Planning & Construction Department sent a list of campuses that will not be available for summer school due to construction. Mr. O'Brien said that Mr. Price has presented this to the executive council about 2 weeks ago and has been approved.
3. Mr. Enojado stated that the FCA Renovations Repairs and Upgrades Districtwide Project is progressing as the team continues to finish designing the plan by having on-going weekly meetings with Comex as the CMAR. This project is divided into 4 packages. The first package of the project is ordering kitchen equipment so that it can be installed in the summer time along with minor kitchen renovations. The next important package to order are Glazing and Doors & Door Frames as this is also critical to receive by summer time. The third package is the CTE renovation in Lee High School as this is critical to complete in the summer window time frame. The last package is the exterior and site work which can be completed after summer time as it has no critical impact when school starts. Advertisement to receive bids on kitchen work is scheduled on March 5<sup>th</sup> and receive bids on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Afterwards, recommendation to the Board of Trustees in April and submit a letter of Notice to Proceed (NTP) to the CMAR as soon as possible.
4. Mr. Beard asked what the final options were presented to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for the Agriscience Center Expansion and Renovation Facility. Ms. Garcia explained that what was presented last week were the changes the members recommended which was including the entire concrete drive as part of the base and the trailer parking area as an alternate. The items that the members wanted to include as a base were kept as an alternate but recommended all of the items as part of the project which the BOT approved the designed.
5. Mr. Hotchkiss commented on the concrete masonry unit (CMU) walls because he received additional information. According to his brother, the CMU walls that were installed in this facility had to be air conditioned due to heat from the swine. Ms. Garcia said that the heat had been a discussion from the beginning and that is why the design calls for a louver system above the CMU walls for air flow. There are above ceiling fans (big fans) to solve the heat and if not, individual fans can be plugged-in at each stalls for more air flow. Mr. Hotchkiss said that the facility does not need to be air conditioned if it can be fixed during the design stage which Ms. Garcia agrees. Ms. Angela Chandler commented that in commercial operations an intermittent mist is used. This can be used if heat becomes a problem which is cheaper than a HVAC system and Mr. O'Brien agrees. The CMU walls were decided upon because of the benefit of avoiding transferring disease.
6. For the Technology Center, Mr. Enojado stated that three bids were received last week on Feb 14<sup>th</sup>. Each bids were evaluated and scored on Wed, Feb 15<sup>th</sup> and submitted to Purchasing Dept. to determine which contractor received the highest ranking score. Durotech General Contractors received the highest score of 90.94, Teal Construction received the second highest score of 75.64 and Jade Construction Group at third place of 62.59.

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

7. Mr. Enojado explained that per Texas Code, the highest ranking GC will need to be proposed to the BOT and request approval to negotiate a contract. If the school district is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the selected contractor, therefore, the district may proceed to the next highest ranking contractor until a contract is reached.
8. Mr. Daryl Fontenot asked to briefly go over what goes into the score. Mr. Enojado said that the weight factor for 75% is on past work experience, related projects, strength of project team, financial stability, and safety. The weight factor for 25% is the cost.
9. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if all these contractors are bonded before they start a project at this size and if they have Performance & Payment Bond (P&PB). Ms. Garcia said that contractors are required to submit the P&PB at the time of signature of the contract.
10. Mr. Beard asked if the project can actually be sent out again for bids but not suggesting to do so, just needed a clarification on what the per code meant. Technically it can be sent out again for bids.
11. Mr. Beard also asked if the members will be notified before the negotiated price gets presented to the BOT. Ms. Garcia said yes and explained that the notification will mostly likely be by e-mail due to time constraint. Upon CBAC approval, the plan is to proposed contract to the BOT on March 20<sup>th</sup>. If a contract is not reached, district will need to formally decline the proposal and move onto the next bidder and so forth.
12. Mr. Beard noted that he would have a problem approving a \$2M over by e-mail. Mr. O'Brien commented that this would not be even be presented to the members.
13. Mr. Beard asked if we know why there was a difference of \$2.2M. Mr. Enojado explained that this may be better explained during the contract negotiations and how the cost was arrived at the number. Mr. O'Brien commented that they have overbid to cover themselves.
14. Mr. Hotchkiss asked when Durotech can be approached. Mr. O'Brien commented that Durotech is a highly reputable company and excited to have them as a bidder and as many know, we're competing against Alvin which passed a \$300M Bond at the same time as GCCISD. Now, we're competing against Sheldon which passed few hundred million dollar bond and Durotech has been awarded to some of the work. Ms. Garcia expressed that the good news is that Durotech already have that work before bidding this project and therefore, Durotech is interested in the Technology Center project.
15. Ms. Garcia reiterated Mr. Beard's uncomfortable method of approving Durotech's price by via e-mail. She asked if a special meeting would need to be called. Mr. Beard would like to know why Durotech is \$2.2M over the budget which is approximately \$1.3M higher than the other two bidders. He also said that it's interesting that the price of the 2 lowest ranking bidders are very close to each other. Several people committed that part of price inconsistency among the 3 bidders could be the bidder's lack of experience in school buildings, covering oversight cost and/or being aggressive to get into this type of work. Mr. O'Brien said that the good news is that this would be determined as part of the negotiation.
16. Ms. Garcia gave more information about Durotech's qualification and said that they scored higher than the other 2 bidders due to NOC experience.
17. There being no further questions or comments on the Technology Center, Mr. Enojado continued his update on the Stuart Career Center Kilgore Repurpose Project. Mr. Enojado explained that this project is broken into two phases, Phase 1 is the Kilgore Campus which is under construction and moving forward and Phase 2 is the Stuart Career Center Renovations. The GMP contract for the Stuart Career Center Renovations was approved by the BOT on Feb 13<sup>th</sup>. This information was e-mailed to the CBAC members on February 7<sup>th</sup> for endorsement which Mr. Fontenot received an approval from the members on February 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Garcia thanked Mr. Fontenot for being there.
18. Mr. Enojado continued with the Stuart Career Center Kilgore Repurpose Project introducing a new endorsement which is funding the RTUs for Kilgore Building. He said that this was an unforeseen situation to ask for an endorsement at this moment. He explained that the engineer along with the team determined that the existing RTUs are nonfunctional and cannot be repaired. Barlett Cocke General Contractors who is the CMAR on board for this project submitted a proposal of replacing these units. The total replacement cost (materials, equipment & labor) plus soft cost came out to

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

- be \$1.2M. Due to time frame and school starting in August, Mr. Enojado said that it's critical that these units be ordered as soon as possible.
19. Mr. Enojado explained that the funding for the RTUs can come from forthcoming savings from closing projects. He said that another source of funding can be from the \$600K parking lot budget at the Administration Building. As everybody is aware, there is no property to expand a parking lot.
  20. Mr. Hotchkiss said that the members would feel more comfortable seeing what the total remaining budget will be on the Project Budget Sheet by inputting Technology Center's high bid numbers prior to negotiations.
  21. Mr. Beard asked if the RTUs is part of the bond item description to which it is not.
  22. Mr. Fontenot questioned why the units suddenly stopped working after being vacated for a couple of years. He added that before the bond started the building was being used as an elementary school and the AC units were working fine. When the new elementary school was built it was vacated and the units suddenly stopped working and curious as to what might have caused this.
  23. Mr. O'Brien stated that the Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) Reports that were generated in 2010 is now 7 years old and to his understanding, the units were 15 years old at that time which is now pushing almost close to 20 years old. Life expectancy for HVAC as we hope for is 20 years. He explained that he can't speak to the 2010 assessment, whether or not VLK/Jacobs got up there and evaluated the air conditioned units. He also said that he can speak to the fact that the way the bond was put out there is fairly flexible. He stated that this particular work absolutely qualifies as bond payment because it's part of the Kilgore renovation project. He also stated that the architect's assessment did not put this on the line item but this does not prohibit us from consideration.
  24. Ms. Garcia explained that it's not much different from the MEP work that was completed a while back where items were discovered that required fixing to make the total system functional.
  25. Mr. Beard added that it's immaterial as to why the units are not working and they have to be fixed. The issue he expressed are the numbers that are not being reflected on the Project Budget Sheet. He further expressed the concern, first of all, that this is kind of an emergency. Second of all, there are 2 or 3 big projects remaining that will either be on budget or go over the budget. He pointed out that one of the project has already gone over the budget and may even go more.
  26. Speaking of Technology Center, Mr. Hotchkiss asked will the projected total be at \$13M if a high number is used. Ms. Garcia said that the worst case scenario is a total cost of \$13.1M.
  27. Mr. Beard asked what's the timing here. Ms. Garcia said that this will be taking to the BOT this Monday night.
  28. Mr. O'Brien asked Ms. Margie Grimes to talk about the back-up/a contingency plan to fund the \$1.2M RTUs cost. Ms. Grimes explained where we stood on the revenues bond deposit.
  29. Ms. Grimes said as of last year we have an estimated of \$1.2M worth of investment earnings that have not been recognized in the financial reporting's. The 2015 and 2016 equates to \$1.2M and so far this year an additional estimated \$0.5M has been earned. Therefore, a total of \$1.7M can be utilized on any bond projects or any expenditures that the board approves as appropriately as authorized in the bond. Ms. Grimes is estimating more interest earnings between now and the end of the year.
  30. Mr. O'Brien said that this is what the members of this board needed to hear that there are other safety net besides the savings from each of the listed projects for the event of a problem in the future projects.
  31. Mr. Hotchkiss asked as to what other projects that may go come over besides the Technology Center. The group responded that the Ag Center will not go over but may be close. The Transportation Center was brought out but this project has been already calculated at a right number in the Project Budget Sheet. Mr. Fontenot commented that it's a guaranteed max contract.
  32. Looking at the Project Budget Sheet, Mr. Hotchkiss said based on the \$13.1M, there's \$2M more on the Technology Center. Therefore, it's going to be \$6M over which will leave the bottom line of \$1.1M left plus any other savings. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if there were any other projects that's projected to over the budget.
  33. The last remaining projects are Ag Center, MEP Group 4, Green Center and FCA Renovations.

PLANNING  
ENGINEERING  
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

34. Ms. Garcia said that we're requesting an endorsement on funding the RTUs in order to get the units on time before school starts.
35. Mr. Hotchkiss said if you feel that there are other savings and projects are looking that their coming in close other than Technology Center then we're probably good.
36. Mr. Beard asked if the \$1.2M is a hard number and Ms. Garcia said that it's the final number which includes engineering fee, cost of units & labor, and a 10% contingency.
37. Mr. Beard made a motion to endorse the use of funding as presented with the acknowledgement that the members have concerns about the numbers. Ms. Angela Chandler made a second motion to that.
38. Mr. Fontenot stated a motion was made and a second motion, all in favor and none opposed.

**Planning**

1. For the Green Center Project, Mr. Enojado stated that the team have been working on this for the past several months and the architect and engineers are on board and will start generating drawing plans and get it out for bids and start construction in the summer.
2. For the Specialties- Stallworth Bleachers, Mr. Enojado said that a proposal was received from a vendor to supply and install bleachers and in Purchasing Department's review for approval. The replacement of the bleachers is very few and the approx. cost is \$80K.
3. For the Conveyances –Lifts for Special Ed Dept. Looking for a vendor to provide a turnkey work – to supply and install these equipment. A board member asked as to how the cost has been already reduced, quiet substantially reduced, if the planning haven't even started. Mr. Enojado explained that Special Ed does not need a lift for all the campuses. Also, the lifts were budgeted at \$25K and the requested lift is approximately \$5K.

**Project Groupings**

1. This Project Budget Sheet was discussed earlier on the topic of the Technology Center bid results and the funding of the RTUs for Kilgore Building.

**Master Schedule**

1. Mr. Enojado went over the Master Schedule and pointed out that there are no more blue bars and that they are all green. Green meaning that projects are either under design or under construction.

**Financial Recap**

1. Mr. Enojado pointed out that on the very last page of the financial packet, the summarization states at 65% money spent and will start to increase as the year ends. More projects will be closing at the end of the summer.

**Follow Up Items**

1. Mr. Beard asked the dates for spring break which is March 13 - 17th. He also asked the date for the next board meeting which is March 20<sup>th</sup> and the next one is April 10<sup>th</sup>. He asked if we foresee needing to meet and looking for a resolution. Ms. Garcia's concern is the approval of the Technology Center's negotiations and hopes to take it to March 20<sup>th</sup> which is before CBAC meeting. Mr. O'Brien would like to meet with CBAC to discuss the outcome rather than vote electronically.
2. Mr. Fontenot stated the next meeting will be March 23, 2017 at 4pm. There being no further questions or discussions, the meeting was adjourned.