

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:	4:30 pm, June 3, 2015		
Conference Location:	Facilities Maintenance Complex Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Daryl Fontenot	Randal O'Brien	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Angela Chandler	Anthony Price	Bill Cabrera / LAN
	Judge Don Coffey	David Fluker	Olivia Hamel / LAN
	Tim Covington	Margie Grimes	Van Franks / LAN
	Chet Thiess	Dr. Melissa Duarte	Dowen Sims / LAN
	Dickie Woods	Bruce Riggs	
	Michael Beard	Carl Burg	
		Brenda Garcia	
		Rick Walterscheid	
		Ray Brown	
		Beth Dombrowa	
		Matt Flood	
	Tom Ortman		
	Kathy VanDerBeek		

Purpose:	CBAC Meeting
<p><u>S.T.E.M. Labs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Erwin Enojado began the meeting by showing slides of the locations and costs of the junior high school S.T.E.M. labs. Mr. Enojado pointed out the S.T.E.M labs would come in under budget at \$659,168.91. Mr. David Fluker stated the information regarding the S.T.E.M. labs was just to inform and there was no need for endorsement. <p><u>Security Vestibules</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Fluker began discussing Security Vestibules by stating the GMP for the project was \$8.1 million, and currently the project is approximately \$3 million over. Mr. Fluker went over floor plan slides for San Jacinto, Gentry and Sterling, that displayed possible alternates for cost reduction. He then asked to the Committee to reference an additional handout with all 7 possible alternates listed. Those alternates are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) Gentry redesign: Deduct \$23,824.15 • (2) San Jacinto redesign: Deduct \$61,046.00 • (3) Tempered glass in lieu of bullet resistant glass: Deduct \$700,000.00 • (4) Sterling new entry & bldg. & canopy redesign: Deduct \$949,322.00 • (5) Lee High entry & ramp changes: Deduct \$272,270.00 • (6) Galvanized chain link gates in lieu of specified ornamental gates: Deduct \$393,180.00 • (7) Alt. steel picket gates in lieu of specified ornamental gates: Deduct \$262,770.00 Judge Don Coffey suggested the District go with all 7 alternates. Mr. Randal O'Brien clarified that the Facilities Department had already recommended 4 of the alternates, explaining that the 	

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

- Committee would have the other 3 from which to choose. Mr. Fluker stated only 6 or 7 could be chosen, not both.
4. Mr. O'Brien noted the alternates referring to fencing would be me a massive change throughout the District.
 5. Judge Coffey stated the current gates and fences surrounding the schools are always open, so he does not want to encourage spending money for a security fencing system that will only be ornamental.
 6. Mr. Matt Flood explained the gates should be closing at 10 PM and opening at 5 AM, as well as on the weekends. However, he stated the gates are not functioning due to card reader issues on the double gooseneck. Mr. Flood explained the District thought it would be best to address the issue once school was out for summer.
 7. Judge Coffey said he didn't think the money would be well spent on gates that are only closed at night, even if they were functioning properly.
 8. Mr. Flood pointed out the goal will be to close the gates during the school day, beginning next year. He explained it was important to block access to the back of the campus.
 9. Mr. Michael Beard stated electronically controlled gates will always malfunction. He also noted the District has been operating years without fencing. Mr. Fluker said the alternates in the hand out (6 & 7) only refer to the gates and controls, not fencing.
 10. Mr. Dickie Woods asked what was perceived to be the biggest threat, to which Mr. O'Brien stated the security systems were to protect the children during the day.
 11. Mr. Rick Walterscheid also stated the main goal was to secure the facility and to not allow access to the rear of the campus.
 12. Mr. Daryl Fontenot clarified that some of the Committee members did not think perimeter fencing around the front of the school was necessary.
 13. Mr. Fluker stated he was seeking an endorsement for option 6 or 7, but wanted the Committee to see the Project Budgets chart, which he then presented on the PowerPoint.
 14. Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Fluker to clarify why the last month's meeting showed the project budgets chart stating the total bond budget to be over by \$10 million, and now total bond budget is shown as \$7 million under. Mr. Fluker explained the previous chart with the \$10 overage contained just estimates, explaining the numbers shown today, are actual contract amounts. Mr. Fluker also pointed out the Goose Creek Memorial (GCM) addition project was not included in this chart as it is going out to bid and there is not have an exact amount yet.
 15. Mr. Tim Covington asked if the recommendation of tempered glass in lieu of bullet resistant came from the contractor, to which Mr. Fluker concurred.
 16. Mr. Fluker confirmed the Administration recommends bullet resistant. Ms. Brenda Garcia stated the 3 new elementary schools do have the bullet resistant glass.
 17. Judge Coffey inquired why the District is keeping option 5, the Lee High School Ramp, and why it is so costly. Mr. Fluker explained the ramp has to be in the front of the school and pointed out it is a long ramp that needs to be aesthetically pleasing due to the campus being a historical site.
 18. Judge Coffey moves to endorse the Administration's recommendations of deduct alternates 1, 2, 4 & 7. Mr. Covington seconds, the Committee votes and the endorsements passed with no opposition.
 19. Mr. Fluker then stated the Committee had been given a hand out of the projected budgets that included project estimates, which shows the overall remaining bond budget overall to be \$5.9 million over.
 20. Mr. O'Brien pointed out there was currently no estimated cost on the hand out for the Stuart/Kilgore Center and he stated this could be a project where savings could be found.

Follow Up Items

1. Mr. Fluker asked if future endorsements could be a possibility via e-mail for the Committee, if necessary, to which Judge Coffey confirmed.
2. Mr. Fontenot stated the next meeting will be June 22nd at 4:00 PM.