

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, March 26, 2015		
Conference Location:	Facilities Maintenance Complex Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Daryl Fontenot	Randal O'Brien	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Michael Beard	David Fluker	Van Franks / LAN
	Dickie Woods	Margie Grimes	Olivia Hamel / LAN
	Angela Chandler	Ray Brown	JP Grom/ LAN
	Judge Don Coffey	Kathy VanDerBeek	
	Tim Covington	Bruce Riggs	
	Chet Thiess	Carl Burg	
	Tony Krause	Brenda Garcia	
	Brennon Marsh	Rick Walterscheid	
		Shirley Mosley	
		Beth Dombrowa	
		Matt Flood	
	Tom Ortman		

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 to approve the minutes. Mr. Chet Thiess 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 4 of the schools were in construction and 4 of the schools are about 98% complete, explaining the rest of the schools will be worked on this summer. Next, Mr. Grom stated the Lamar roofing project is under contract. Mr. Grom said the Elevator project is also contracted and the District anticipates work will commence at the Administration building. Mr. Grom said the Security Vestibules project has been bid using a Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR). Then Mr. Grom noted the Mechanical Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) package 1 at Lee High School has been awarded and the contractor is preparing for work to begin this summer. Mr. Grom also explained that contractors will be working on the Windows project simultaneously with the MEP and Elevators projects at Lee High School. <p><u>Completed Projects</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Grom next stated the punch list for the 3 new elementary schools were complete, explaining 	

PLANNING (continued)
ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

- some items just need be re-inspected.
2. Mr. Grom explained there is still work to be done on the traffic signal at Bañuelos Elementary, as well as the traffic signal at Clark Elementary. He said the signals for Clark Elementary should be completely installed by mid-April.
- Technology Progress**
1. Mr. Matt Flood stated the Technology department was currently working on phone conversions, hard lines to voice over IP, and the security cameras project.
 2. Mr. Flood noted library upgrades, installing more computers, had been completed at Cedar Bayou and Horace Mann Junior Schools. He said library upgrades were almost complete at Baytown Junior and Gentry Junior is the next school on the list for upgrades.
 3. Mr. Flood stated the installation of student computers in the classroom at the elementary level had begun today. He explained there will be 2 computers installed in every core-content classroom in every elementary and the project should finish sometime in May.
 4. Mr. Flood then referred to his packet requesting endorsement, explaining he would like to merge Goal #9 for Core Content Classrooms with a balance of \$1.8 million and Goal #10 for Non-Core Content classrooms with a balance of \$1.1 million. Mr. Flood pointed out that merging the two goals would cover the \$864 thousand dollar overage for the Non-Core Content classrooms.
 5. Mr. Flood said the Non-Core content classrooms do need interactive whiteboards, presentation stations and student response systems for the high schools, which were not originally in the scope.
 6. Judge Don Coffey expressed concern that the District will still get request for more promethean boards. Mr. Flood explained that hopefully this will fulfill some of those requests, noting that in the original bond planning for Non-Core classrooms, the promethean boards were not included.
 7. Mr. Randal O'Brien asked if merging the goals was all bond funded, to which Mr. Flood confirmed.
 8. Mr. Michael Beard asked if there would be an overage of funds. Mr. Flood said no.
 9. Mr. Fontenot made a motion to approve merging Goal #9 and #10, Judge Coffey made a second motion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.
- Design**
1. Next, Mr. Grom began discussing the projects currently in the design phase. He started by discussing the Goose Creek Memorial (GCM) presentation, by Huckabee Architects. Mr. Grom also referred to a memo that was handed to the Committee seeking endorsement for the GCM expansion. Mr. Grom explained the memo went over the design history of the GCM expansion.
 2. Mr. Grom then noted the previous design put more emphasis on cosmetology and floral. He stated the former floral lab, on the first floor, has been moved and replaced by the welding lab.
 3. Mr. Grom then explained that the cosmetology lab on the first floor had been reduced to just a classroom.
 4. Mr. Grom noted the second floor plan is almost exactly the same.
 5. Judge Coffey stated he had received some e-mails from GCM asking when GCM will get a life skills classroom. Judge Coffey noted GCM was the only high school in the District without a life skills classroom, and he didn't know if that was in the scope, but he wanted the District to be aware of the Community's concerns.
 6. Mr. O'Brien commended Mr. Dave Fluker for getting the architect's re-design fee down to \$200 thousand from almost \$500 thousand.
 7. Mr. Grom then referred back to the memo and pointed out the District was seeking endorsement on the GCM schematic re-design.
 8. Ms. Brenda Garcia added that the design was still in schematic, so there is still opportunity to adjust if needed. Ms. Garcia also stated the current schematic design had already been approved by the GCM principal and CTE director.
 9. Judge Coffey asked if the cost of construction would increase, to which Ms. Garcia said there would be slight increase in construction cost.
 10. Mr. Beard asked if there were extra funds to cover the \$3 million budget increase of the GCM design. Mr. O'Brien pointed out the Committee had already approved that cost.

PLANNING

(continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

11. Mr. Beard expressed concern, stating that GCM cost approval was prior to the Committee finding out about several other projects that were in excess of allotted dollars. Mr. O'Brien stated he did want to discuss the projects and where to find extra money later in the meeting.
12. Ms. Angela Chandler suggested continuing the presentation and postpone the endorsement until the end of the meeting. Mr. O'Brien agreed.
13. Ms. Garcia pointed out that the Board did approve the \$10.4 cost at the DD phase.
14. Mr. Grom then began his discussion on the Data Center by explaining a chart that plotted comparisons of Districts and organizations and what made up their data center infrastructure.
15. Mr. Grom then explained another chart breaking down the scope and cost of the potential options for the NOC of the Data Center.
16. Next, Mr. Grom discussed the last chart, noting the current estimate for the District's Data Center to be around \$10 million, with a budget of \$7.1 million.
17. Judge Coffey asked about the mall branch of the District possibly moving to the new Data Center. Mr. O'Brien clarified that the mall branch would move to the current TMS area, once TMS can move to the new Data Center. Mr. O'Brien confirmed that there will be no new square footage added to the Data Center.
18. Mr. O'Brien stated there is another option to co-locate, meaning your data source is elsewhere. He explained co-locating would be most economical, but was not the original intention with bond. Mr. O'Brien then stated the discussion could proceed further at the end of the meeting.
19. Mr. Beard noted he met with Mr. Flood a couple times regarding the Data Center, and Mr. Beard stated he was pleased with the tier plan for the Data Center. However Mr. Beard did think it would be hypocritical to build a NOC without a state of the art Data Center containing training classrooms.
20. Mr. Beard also expressed concern about not wanting to move outdated equipment to the new Data Center.
21. Mr. Grom stated the Transportation Center, designed by JMB2, is currently working through the DD phase of design.
22. Mr. Grom then said the District expects to receive bids for the Stallworth handrails project on March 31st.
23. Mr. Grom said the Lamar carpet project will be going to the Board March 31st for recommendation for evaluation.
24. Next, Mr. Grom stated the MEP packages 2 & 3 contract with Estes McClure & Associates (EMA) will go to the Board on March 31st. Mr. Grom then stated the Sound System package, also by EMA, will move forward within the next couple of months.

Planning

1. Mr. Grom stated the District has been visiting different facilities around the state, conducting research of different models in order to find the best practice of CTE for Stuart Career Center & Alamo Repurpose.
2. Judge Coffey made note that the District needs to not forget the Kilgore name attached to the Stuart Career Center & Alamo Repurpose. Judge Coffey suggested "Alamo" needs to be omitted from the repurpose center. Mr. O'Brien agreed.
3. Mr. O'Brien said what will drive the design for the Stuart-Kilgore Career Center is whether it will become a career center or a stand-alone high school that is career oriented.
4. Mr. Grom then stated the Sterling High School Library/Cafeteria Expansion project is still in the internal planning phase.
5. Mr. Grom said the vendor for the modular furniture has been chosen and they are working with MEP engineer to get the systems coordinated. Mr. Grom stated the next time the Committee meets, the S.T.E.M. labs project should be moved to design phase.
6. Next, Mr. Grom went on to discuss the projects grouping recap. Mr. Grom noted the numbers were current as of this morning. He stated the last time the Committee met, the project remaining budget was around \$11 million over and pointed out that the number had decreased to \$9 million. Although progress had been made, Mr. Grom noted there was still work to do in order to continue

2925 Briarpark, Suite 400
Houston, TX 77042

TEL 713.266.6900

www.lan-inc.com

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

to decrease that number.

Financial Recap

1. Next, Mr. Grom went over the financial recap, stating \$185 million have been sold. He also pointed out the District has a cost to date of \$94 million with about \$15 million in committed cost.
2. Mrs. Margie Grimes stated the District just received \$82 million in bond proceeds the for the second bond sale.

Endorsement Items

1. Next, Judge Coffey asked if the District could speculate about 10 to 15 percent of a potential savings by using a commercial contractor for the Transportation building. Mr. Grom stated that amount sounded reasonable, but there is no guarantee those specialty contractors would bid.
2. Judge Coffey asked who the responsible party is for soliciting the bids. Mr. Grom stated the architect, LAN and the District all work collectively.
3. Mr. O'Brien said he has put thought to finding a solution to the underfunded projects by thinking through future projects. He pointed out that the decision of the scope of work for the Stuart-Kilgore Repurpose could help determine savings. Mr. O'Brien explained those questions will need to be answered and a presentation/workshop will take place March 31st, before the Board meeting, which he invited all to attend. Mr. O'Brien stated the workshop would begin at 6PM and it would be interactive with the audience.
4. Mr. O'Brien said the square footage of the Kilgore and Stuart Center is way over what is needed for the repurpose. He suggested if only half of the center needed to be renovated; only half of the funding would be needed, providing a savings that could be used elsewhere. Mr. O'Brien also noted the buildings were currently in good shape.
5. Mr. O'Brien next stated a possible area of finding savings might be the agriculture science building. He suggested possibly using the Kilgore Center basketball pavilion and two football fields area as an agriculture barn, rather than building two new facilities. Mr. O'Brien suggested it could be a potential savings, explaining the existing pavilion cost \$750 thousand to build.
6. Judge Coffey pointed out the agriculture building was cut from the previous bond and was therefore left untouched in this bond when items were cut. Mr. Beard also expressed concern with changing the scope of the agriculture building. Mr. O'Brien confirmed nothing was in motion and reiterated these are just possibilities of potential cost reductions. Mr. O'Brien noted the pavilion will not be torn down if it is not used as an agriculture barn.
7. Mr. Fontenot stated he would be unsure of the City of Baytown's requirements for having an agriculture center within city limits.
8. Judge Coffey noted he did not agree with trying to find another facility for the agriculture building. He suggested leaving the agriculture building as planned.
9. Mr. Fontenot said he has no issue with what Mr. O'Brien is proposing, as long as the needs of the program are met, but he does question the requirements that the City may present.
10. Mr. O'Brien made a note that this was only for conversation and none of these proposed ideas were in motion.
11. Mr. Fontenot made a motion to endorse the schematic re-design, not cost, of the GCM addition. Mr. Chet Thiess made a second motion, a vote was taken and the endorsement passed, with a dissenting vote from Mr. Beard.
12. Mr. O'Brien stated this Committee could make a recommendation that money is needed from another source, if needed. Judge Coffey suggested instead telling the Community a project is a necessity that will be completed, leaving it to Administration to find the funds.
13. Mr. Fontenot stated the \$5 million over scope for the Security Vestibules is not a huge issue, noting he couldn't see anyone complaining about the over spending of security for students.
14. Ms. Angela Chandler stated that the bond is about investing in the schools and creating an end product of a better quality student that is prepared for life. Ms. Chandler is confident these projects are accomplishing that goal.



PLANNING

(continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Future Agenda Items

1. Mr. Fontenot adjourned.

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO