

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, August 21, 2014		
Conference Location:	New Alamo Elementary School Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Daryl Fontenot	Randal O'Brien	JP Grom / LAN
	Michael Beard	Dr. Melissa Duarte	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Don Coffey	Ray Brown	Bill Cabrera/LAN
	Brennon Marsh	David Fluker	Olivia Hamel / LAN
	Dickie Woods	Bruce Riggs	Downen Sims / LAN
	Manual Escontrias	Tom Ortman	Doug Bensen / Huckabee
	Chet Thiess	Kathy VanDerBeek	
		Brenda Garcia	
		Matt Flood	

Purpose:	CBAC Meeting
<p><u>Welcome</u></p> <p>1. Mr. Daryl Fontenot began the meeting by asking for approval of the minutes from last month. Mr. Dickie Woods motioned to approve and Mr. Manual Escontrias made a second motion. Mr. Fontenot declared the minutes approved. Mr. Fontenot then gave the floor to Mr. JP Grom from LAN.</p> <p><u>Construction Progress</u></p> <p>1. Mr. Grom stated he would quickly go over the handout/PowerPoint, only highlighting some of the most important issues so that attendees could tour the facility (Alamo Elementary) at the completion of the meeting.</p> <p>2. Mr. Grom began by going over the Construction Progress, noting the Certificate of Occupancy had been obtained for all 3 new elementary schools. He briefly showed some month to month photos of each elementary school. Mr. Grom then noted the only items left to complete on the 3 elementary schools were some punch list items and some fencing and landscaping activity. Mr. Grom stated the District is pleased with the success and hard work of all involved.</p> <p>3. Next, Mr. Grom pointed out that there continues to be progress moving forward with the Fire and Life Safety project and for the B.P. Hopper Chiller.</p> <p><u>Technology Progress</u></p> <p>1. Mr. Grom then introduced Mr. Matt Flood to discuss Technology Progress. Mr. Flood stated the District was on schedule with desktop technology, but still working on laptops and a few last minute items. Mr. Randal O'Brien pointed out that within the last 2 weeks the technology team had really accomplished a lot within the 3 new elementary schools.</p>	

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

2. Mr. Michael Beard asked about the status of laptops and ipads. Mr. Flood stated the District has enough ipads to start distribution the second week of school to seniors and the third week of school to everyone else, based on their online enrollment. Mr. Beard asked when Mr. Flood thought all of the ipads will be completely distributed, to which Mr. Flood stated the end of September.
3. Mr. Beard then asked what percentage of students Mr. Flood thought declined to receive an ipad, based on their online enrollment. Mr. Flood thought less than 10 percent.
4. Mr. Fontenot asked what was the typical reason a student might decline an ipad. Mr. Flood answered, stating that after questioning parents last year, some students already had an ipad, or they did not want the added responsibility. Mr. Flood noted that there was no charge to receive an ipad and that the decision was up to the parents.
5. Mr. Beard asked if there was a fee if the ipad was damaged or lost. Mr. Flood stated he believed \$50 for a damaged ipad and \$100 for a lost ipad. (He noted he had to check the requirements to confirm.) Mr. Flood made a note that the last time ipads were issued, less than 10 students did not return or pay for an ipad.
6. Mr. Beard suggested a good idea might to find out why the students did not take the ipads. Mr. Beard thought a fear of not being able to pay the lost or damaged fee might deter students from registering for an ipad.

Design

1. Next Mr. Grom began to discuss the Design slide and all the components under that category. He stated there would be some items he would go over in more detail than others. The first item being the Transportation Center, to which Mr. Grom gave the floor to Mr. O'Brien.
 - a. Mr. O'Brien first stated the last presentation on the Transportation Center that went before the Board dealt with location only. He said the District is still at a point of deciding on a location, however, the Board wants to now see the costs of the site and utilities associated with the Transportation Center location.
 - b. Mr. O'Brien stated the District discovered the estimated cost for the Transportation Center was double what had been projected, and he went on to explain how the cost was derived.
 - c. Mr. O'Brien said there was a \$10.7 million budget to build the Transportation Center, and that money was not tagged to include the cost of the land. However, Mr. O'Brien explained, the District felt like the \$10.7 million would cover the Transportation Center land cost. He then stated the District got an estimate on the schematic design of the Transportation Center for \$5 million. Which, Mr. O'Brien concluded, would leave the District with approximately \$5 million for site and utilities along with land acquisition. Mr. O'Brien then explained that the estimated cost of site and utilities alone came in at \$6.4 million.
 - d. Once Mr. O'Brien explained the process of the escalated figures, Mr. Grom stated exactly what those totaled figures were. Mr. Grom said the Gentry land site total project cost would come in at \$13.5 million, \$16.8 million for the Lee site and the Archer land site would come in at \$17.3 million.
 - e. Mr. O'Brien explained that all of these figures exceed the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) budget and will be presented to the Board on August 25th.
 - f. Mr. O'Brien then stated in some cases in the FCA, Mr. Dave Fluker and himself had found where the firm that compiled the FCA tried to project inflation and allow overages in budget. Mr. O'Brien stated he would like to get from the Committee the preferred site, but also the possibility of an over budgeted expenditure, due to inflation. Judge Don Coffey disagreed with the reasoning of the over budget cost due to inflation. Judge Coffey stated he thought it was simply a miscalculation by the firm that prepared the FCA and the miscalculations had also occurred in the last bond.
 - g. Mr. O'Brien said some savings will be realized with some projects and some will be over

PLANNING (continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

- budget. He stated the Committee needs to decide the best choice for the most effective project entirely.
- h. Mr. O'Brien noted some projects are inter-related and that might create savings. Mr. O'Brien stated the District does not have a budget map from the first project to the last project, noting that each project depends on the District's savings.
 - i. Mr. O'Brien asked the Committee if they would rank the Transportation land location purchase the same now that costs are involved. Mr. Fontenot concurred that the Committee may want to change their decision on rank order of the Transportation site location.
2. Mr. Beard stated he would like to see a list of projects the District expected to acquire savings from and how much. Mr. O'Brien agreed to the idea. Mr. O'Brien also noted that if the District doesn't realize savings, all the projects will not be completed. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that he and Mr. Fluker have looked at the budget of the projects, but as part of LAN's job, they will help to itemize cost for the projects.
 3. Judge Coffey suggested that the budget does need to be reviewed so the District can better understand the budget and better allocate the funds.
 4. Judge Coffey stated that in the last bond, the District ran out of money and declared all the projects complete, when they were not. Mr. O'Brien said the District refunded \$20 million, but concurred the projects were not complete. Mr. O'Brien made the note that the point is to not have incomplete projects from the FCA. He stressed the District is trying to bring everything up to completed status.
 5. Mr. Beard then asked about CTE and the Goose Creek Memorial project that is over budget and on the agenda to go to the Board on August 25th. Mr. O'Brien stated both projects are over budget, but do need to go to the Board at this time, unless the Committee objects. Mr. O'Brien stated he was seeking the opinion of the Committee on the Transportation and GCM projects. He did point out there is currently a savings that could be used for these or other over budgeted projects, from the 3 elementary schools. Mr. Grom stated the figure to be around \$8 million. Mr. O'Brien stated at this time however, it would be fair to say the District has only realized about \$4 million of that \$8 million.
 6. Mr. Fluker also added that the purchase order is in for the Lee Bleachers at a cost of \$1 million, which will create approximately \$700,000 in savings. However, Mr. Fluker suggested not re-allocating the savings to another project until the entire list of projects for Lee is completed.
 7. Mr. Grom then began the discussion on the Goose Creek Memorial High School Addition.
 - a. Mr. Grom explained that all of the 3 options will build off the front corners of the schools and be about 42,000 square feet. Mr. Grom then described the "Option A" design from Huckabee Architects. He next said "Option A" contains built out classrooms for un-allocated programs. Mr. Grom explained the reasoning was due to this being the only opportunity to expand this addition. Mr. Grom stated the estimated cost would be around \$10.4 million. He noted this would put the project at \$3.1 million over budget. Judge Coffey expressed concerned about the GCM project being over budget, since the project itself almost did not pass.
 - b. Next, Mr. Grom went onto "Option A-1", explaining the first floor would remain the same as in "Option A", however, the second floor would be just a shell. He stated this option would not contain built out classrooms. Mr. Grom said "Option A-1" had an estimated cost of \$8.9 million, saving around \$1.4 million.
 - c. Doug Bensen, from Huckabee Architects, clarified that "Option A" is taking into account the 225 students that were in the master plan for the west wing. Mr. Bensen then stated "Option A-1" did not account for those 225 students.
 - d. Next Mr. Grom explained "Option B", stating the estimated cost to be around \$7.2 million. Mr. Grom explained this plan met all District requirements, however, would not allow build out in the future.
 - e. Mr. Beard stated he felt "Option B" was the least favorable of the options.
 - f. Mr. O'Brien stated he was seeking endorsement for the GCM project options.

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

- g. Judge Coffey stated that the voters voted for "Option A", therefore he put in a motion for "Option A" as well. Judge Coffey stated the District would have to find the money to meet the needs that the voters voted on. Mr. Woods put in a second motion for "Option A". Mr. Fontenot asked if there was any more discussion on the topic. Mr. Beard stated he was uncomfortable making the decision after only seeing the information for a short amount of time.
 - h. Mr. Beard stated that he takes issue, in general, with how things have been presented to the Committee. He stated he feels the Committee is rushed to give a decision on endorsement, yet not given enough time to review the information.
 - i. Mr. O'Brien explained it is LAN's responsibility to assist the District with budgeting projects and verify the funds are being spent appropriately. Mr. O'Brien also explained the options for GCM came in from the Huckabee the previous evening. He made sure to note Huckabee was not at fault and they were working with what the District has requested. Mr. O'Brien then explained to Mr. Beard that this was just giving him the latest information available, however he did not want Mr. Beard, or any Committee member to feel rushed in any way. Mr. Beard thought the information should be presented this meeting, but endorsed the next meeting.
 - j. Mr. Fontenot asked if taking a month to endorse projects would have an impact on scheduling, to which Mr. O'Brien confirmed.
 - k. Mr. Fontenot asked the Committee to vote on taking more time with the Huckabee/GCM options before endorsing.
 - l. Mr. Bensen interjected, noting there would also be a substantial cost increase for delaying the vote, due to monthly increasing cost of labor and materials. Mr. Woods agreed and wanted to second Judge Coffey's motion for "Option A".
 - m. Mr. O'Brien also pointed out how things get kicked back two weeks from the legal department and cause internal delays as well.
 - n. Judge Coffey stated the GCM project is a valuable project to the community and considering the extra money available from the elementary schools, he agreed the District should proceed. Mr. O'Brien, at the request of Judge Coffey, asked LAN to get the budget together to find where projects are under or over in funds.
 - o. Mr. Fontenot again asked the Committee to vote on the motioned "Option A", the Committee passes the motion. "Option A" was endorsed by the Committee to go before the Board on August 25th.
 - p. Mr. Bensen asked what Huckabee needed to present to the Board, to which Mr. O'Brien stated "Option A", with "Option A-1" and "Option B" on stand-by.
8. Next Mr. Fontenot made a motion to re-rank the Transportation Site locations. Mr. Fontenot's thought was Gentry would rank number 1, Lee number 2 and Archer would rank number three.
 9. Judge Coffey stated there will need to be major work on Archer if the Transportation site is located on the Gentry land.
 10. Mr. Beard asked what would be the financial impact on the Transportation Center if the Committee did not endorse until next month. Mr. O'Brien stated the Transportation Center project will be impacted less, since the District has not yet engaged in construction.
 11. Judge Coffey agrees with Mr. Fontenot of Gentry being ranked site 1 for the Transportation Center.
 12. Mr. Fontenot wanted it noted that since the Board asked for more information on the Transportation Site, the site and utilities cost, that the Committee was informed and thus their rankings had been changed.
 13. Mr. Fontenot made a motion and Judge Coffey made a second motion that carried. Mr. Fontenot noted one opposed vote for the record. New rankings for the Transportation Site locations are ranked by the Committee as Gentry 1, Lee 2, and Archer three.

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

Planning

1. Mr. Grom then went to the Planning slide in the presentation where he stated the Alamo Stuart Career Center had the potential to be grouped with other career technology similar projects. He stated this would get some commonality in design and a single point of contact. He noted this would also attract contractors of a reasonable size. Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Fluker stated that some projects have been put out to bid, but currently with no bites.

Project Grouping

1. Mr. Grom next began the discussion of the financial recap by stating that the 2014 Bond had been sold. He stated in the 2014 Bond series there were \$35 million in proceeds. He showed a list of projects underway that total \$34 million. Mr. Grom stated that leaves the district \$30.7 million to fund FCA projects.
2. Next Mr. Grom said the 2015 Bond series will sale for \$85 million in spring 2015. He showed a list of 2015 Bond series major projects that will fall under the bond. Mr. Grom said those projects totaled \$27.8 million and left \$57.1 million to fund FCA projects.
3. Mr. Grom then discussed options of grouping future projects based on what was discussed in the financial re-cap above.
 - a. The first option Mr. Grom suggested was grouping based on priority. He stated the cons would be the ability to only get to small project items and it would cause a need for many contracting and procurement events, causing a process slow down.
 - b. The second option Mr. Grom discussed was grouping projects based on trade. He stating a concern would be some high-priority items that may not get accomplished within trade packages due to sequencing.
 - c. The last option Mr. Grom mentioned was grouping projects based on the building. He noted the major con with this grouping would be a large scope of work that may not be completed over a summer session.
 - d. Mr. Grom then stated that, after discussion with the District, the recommendation made to the Committee is based on grouping by trade. This was based on the fact that it will expedite the contracting and procurement process and draw in many contractors for bigger projects.
 - e. Next Mr. Beard made the comment that he did not think the Committee should be a part of how the District and Program Management team should group work. He noted he trusted the system to complete that task.
 - f. Mr. Grom explained the District and LAN are trying to find the most cost effective sequence of events of grouping the projects.

Master Schedule

1. Mr. Grom next briefly noted the master schedule in the hand out and projects underway.

Financial Recap

1. Mr. Grom then proceeded to the Financial Recap portion of the presentation. Mr. Grom pointed out that Ms. Shirley Mosley still needed to process the last round of invoices, but that the financial pages could be found in the hand out.
2. Mr. Beard asked what was left to finish the 3 elementary schools, to which Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Grom both answered landscaping, fencing and traffic lights.

Follow Up

1. Next Mr. O'Brien went over a legal document within the packet. He point out the document was in reference to the purchase of the 3 vehicles mentioned last meeting, and noted they were covered under Furniture, Fixture & Equipment Cost.



PLANNING

(continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

2. Then Mr. O'Brien stated he did not want the Committee to feel under pressure to endorse any item for which they did not feel comfortable. He explained that he is trying to keep the Committee updated with the most recent information.

Critique/Evaluate Meeting

1. Mr. Fontenot stated that if the location of the meeting is changed in the future, he requested an extra e-mail, with "location change" in the subject line to notify the Committee.