



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, September 18 th , 2014		
Conference Location:	Facilities Maintenance Complex Baytown, TX 77521		
Attendees:	Committee Members	District	Out of District
	Daryl Fontenot	Randal O'Brien	JP Grom / LAN
	Michael Beard	Margie Grimes	Erwin Enojado / LAN
	Don Coffey	Ray Brown	Bill Cabrera/ LAN
	Tim Covington	David Fluker	Olivia Hamel / LAN
	Dickie Woods	Bruce Riggs	Downen Sims / LAN
	Angela Chandler	Tom Ortman	Van Franks / LAN
	Chet Thiess	Kathy VanDerBeek	
		Brenda Garcia	
		Elizabeth Dombrowa	

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. Michael Beard motioned to approve and Mr. Chet Thiess 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 began by presenting pictures, taken by Mr. Bill Cabrera, of the 3 elementary schools and stating this would probably be the last time the schools would have a construction progress update, as they are upon completion.</p> <p>2. For Bañuelos and Alamo Elementary, Mr. Grom showed some classroom, corridor and computer lab photos. For Clark Elementary, he presented the completed landscaping and gate photos.</p> <p>3. Next Mr. Grom stated that the schools were mostly completed. He noted all that was lacking were some punch list items. He stated the interior punch lists were almost complete, while there was still a little more work to in order to finalize the exterior punch list.</p> <p>4. Mr. Grom then explained that hopefully by the next month's meeting, the District expects to be at 100% completion with punch list items and working on final close out submittal items. Mr. Grom did explain that there were still some traffic light issues that are ongoing.</p> <p>5. Mr. Tim Covington asked if there were any significant punch list items being worked on and if work was being conducted on nights and weekends. Mr. Grom stated he would not classify any issues as significant and Mr. Ray Brown noted the work was indeed being conducted after school and weekends. Mr. Randal O'Brien explained an example was a malfunctioning fire alarm, which Mr. Dave Fluker noted turned out to be a faulty duct detector.</p> <p>6. Next Mr. Grom went on to discuss other items under Construction Progress. He first discussed the</p>	

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

Fire and Life Safety project, stating that the contractor is beginning to stage and see arrival of material equipment.

7. Mr. Grom then stated that purchase orders have been ordered for the Hopper chiller, Lamar playground, DeZavala playground and the Robert E. Lee bleachers.

Technology Progress

1. Mr. O'Brien stated Mr. Matt Flood was unable to attend the CBAC meeting today due distributing iPads.
2. Mr. O'Brien also stated that there were many conflicts with the third Thursday CBAC meeting time, so he would like to propose a different meeting time, later in the meeting.

Design

1. Next Mr. Grom began to discuss the Design slide and all the components under that category. He began by discussing the Goose Creek Memorial Expansion. He reminded the Committee they were presented with drawing slides from Huckabee Architects last month and noted the Board authorized "Option A", which included the complete construction of the two story facility, including interior build out on the second floor.
2. Judge Don Coffey clarified that he remembered a cost of "Option A" to be around \$10.3 million. He asked what the original budget was, to which Ms. Brenda Garcia answered \$7.3 million. Judge Coffey then asked if both figures included architectural fees, to which Mr. Grom answered that those numbers were complete project cost.
3. Next Mr. Grom went on to Security Vestibules where he stated the District expects 100% construction documents by the end of the month. Mr. Grom stated that looking at the timeline, it looked like around December that the project would be out for bid for subcontractors.
4. Mr. Grom then said the JMB2 Transportation Center schematic designs will go before the Board on September 22nd. He reminded the Committee that the Gentry site had been the approved site location for the Transportation Center.
5. Mr. Grom stated the Stallworth Structural handrails project was ongoing.
6. Next, Mr. Grom said all the schools have been walked for the Windows replacement and Elevators projects. He noted that the timeline for these projects would most likely be around December to bid for a subcontractor.
7. Mr. Grom next said the Lamar roofing project is under design.
8. Then, Mr. Grom stated Huckabee Architects are currently working on the programming for the Data and Technology Center. Mr. Grom explained programming to be the layout of the spaces.
9. Judge Coffey expressed his concern, on behalf of the community, on making Lee High School ADA accessible, without changing the front historical façade. Judge Coffey stated Lee has been ADA accessible, but the concern was forcing people to use the front entrance only, whereas there has always been a side ADA accessible entrance.
10. Mr. O'Brien explained any vestibule work would only happen internally, to which Judge Coffey stated he understood. Judge Coffey stressed once again he was concerned with the exterior façade and asked if the District had the authority to change the façade without anyone's permission. Mr. O'Brien stated he believed the answer was yes, but he believed the ramp design would not even be visible from the street. Judge Coffey stressed the concern for the front stairwell.
11. Mr. Bill Cabrera stated KAH Architects are currently working on a rendering based on pictures Mr. Cabrera had taken. Mr. Cabrera said the plan was to present the renderings before any decision was made. Mr. Cabrera also noted that under ADA law, once there is a secure vestibule to receive visitors in the front, people with disabilities cannot have a separate back/side entrance.
12. Mr. O'Brien stated that the renderings needed to be shown to the CBAC for review, as well as the Texas Historical Commission.

Project Grouping

1. Mr. Grom next began the discussion of the project groupings. Mr. Grom stated that the first 2 slides in the presentation under the Project Groupings category are the same as the month before,

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

- except for the first two line items.
2. Mr. Grom pointed out the first line item as the Goose Creek Memorial Expansion project at a budget of \$10.4 million and the Transportation Center project at a budget of \$11.2 million. Mr. Grom explained those figures had been updated due to approval actions of the Board.
 3. Mr. Grom stated the bottom line being that there were about \$27 million available for funding FCA projects for Bond Series 2014B.
 4. Next Mr. Grom quickly went over the Bond Series 2015 slide, stating it had not changed since last month. He noted \$57 million available for FCA projects.
 5. Mr. Grom then went to the next slide, where he explained that LAN has been working with the District in order to create some project packages.
 - a. Mr. Grom first stated the Elevators as one grouping and the windows as one group.
 - b. He then went on explain that LAN and the District had grouped MEP (Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing) together. Mr. Grom said this type of work involved items that were important to heating and cooling.
 - c. Mr. Grom explained that for project grouping, overlaps were looked at to make the projects more efficient. For example, Mr. Grom said that if a project called for replacing ductwork, the team would look for a project that might also call for ceiling repair work. He stated this way they didn't have to disrupt the campus more than needed.
 - d. Mr. Grom pointed out the budget number for the MEP groping did include some overlapping. Mr. Grom stated the \$17 million MEP cost was attractive to both the engineering and contracting community.
 6. Mr. Grom then went over the rest of the grouping slide in the presentation and handout.
 7. Mr. Grom noted that there is roughly \$24 million that needs to be spent for the 2014 Bond Series, which is under the allotted \$27 million stated above. Then he noted there is \$20.9 million that needs to be spent out of the allotted \$57 million, for the 2015 Bond Series.
 8. Mr. Grom clarified that even though the LAN and District has taken a good cut off the budget, there are still some projects that are yet to be completed. These included some smaller jobs and other jobs that did not have a grouping place yet.
 9. Mr. Grom did note he intentionally left out technology costs.
 10. Judge Coffey asked about the \$8 million savings from the 3 elementary schools that had been discussed in the last meeting. Mr. Grom answered that that number has come down due to purchase orders, other obligations and traffic signals. Mr. O'Brien stated the traffic light would be half a million dollars. Judge Coffey asked if the District was down to around \$ 4 million dollars, to which Mr. Grom stated somewhere below \$4 million and noted that the financial summary would be shown in the upcoming slides.
 11. Mr. Grom stressed that the budgets that were presented are subject to change based on the increasing level of refinement on each of the projects. For example, he stated there will be an engineering firm coming in to work on the MEP groupings and let the District know how realistic the costs were.
 12. Judge Coffey stated that the District already knew it was going over budget with the GCM addition and possibly the Transportation Center. He expressed not wanting to spend money without an idea of how it will be covered. Judge Coffey suggested the idea of presenting how extra cost and over budgets would be covered. He then asked if the District was assuming the over budget cost for the Goose Creek Memorial addition would potential be covered by the savings from the 3 elementary schools. Mr. Grom confirmed that was the assumption. Mr. O'Brien concurred.
 13. Mr. Michael Beard then asked about the re-budgeting issue that the Committee had asked about in the previous meeting. Mr. Grom stated that LAN had been working with the District and had been working with thousands of line items, organizing and checking them with earth cost estimates and other items, in order to be in line with the spend plan.
 14. Mr. Beard stated the specific request was to provide the Committee with a list of projects, budgets cost and possible savings. He asked for confirmation that this request has still not been fulfilled, which Mr. Grom confirmed.
 15. Judge Coffey noted that the good thing about this Committee is that they have the opportunity to

PLANNING
ENGINEERING
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

(continued)

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

move funds from project to project, unlike in the past. Mr. O'Brien affirmed that the verbiage on the Bond Sale was worded that the money could legally be moved.

16. Mr. O'Brien agreed it is a good idea to keep a running tab on the budget and where the District was on that budget.
17. Mr. Fontenot stated the Committee just wants to make sure all items on the propositions are taken care of when the Bond is completed.
18. Mr. Beard asked when all the punch list items will be completed for the 3 new elementary schools, to which Mr. Grom and Mr. O'Brien answered 30 days, barring exceptions.

Master Schedule

1. Mr. Grom next briefly noted the master schedule in the hand out and projects underway.
2. Judge Coffey asked if we had a list of what the major projects included for Robert E. Lee High School. Mr. Grom confirmed. Judge Coffey was curious to the difference compared to Sterling High School. He stated there was \$23 million allotted for Lee and only \$14 million for Sterling. Mr. Fluker said part of that major project cost at Lee will be major HVAC renovations, all the Windows being replaced, auditorium work and Elevators. Mr. Fluker also noted that project work will leave Lee unavailable for summer school for 2015.
3. Judge Coffey asked for a ballpark figure on what the District thought it would spend out of the \$23 million, to which Mr. Fluker responded about \$18 million. Mr. Fluker specified that was not a firm number.

Financial Recap

1. Mr. Grom then proceeded to the Financial Recap portion of the presentation and went into the first Financial recap slide that went over the 2013 Bond Series. Mr. O'Brien asked if he was looking at a \$4 million variance for the elementary schools, to which Mr. Grom clarified \$2.275 million. Mr. Beard asked to be reminded of what is left to be completed technology wise within the 3 elementary schools. Mr. Grom stated that technology was installed and Mr. O'Brien said there was still \$225,000.00 left for technology that had not been spent.
2. Next Mr. Grom discussed the 2014A Series in the packet which is largely technology.
3. Mr. Grom next spoke about the 2014B Series Bond slide, pointing out that much of those projects are in their planning and construction phase. He noted some projects already had committed cost and some did not. Mr. O'Brien stated, for example, the District had purchased the Lee bleachers and they have arrived on site, since there was a committed cost amount. Mr. Fluker confirmed a purchase order has been created for the bleachers, but Mr. Tom Ortman noted there was an 8 week lead time for the arrival of the bleachers.
4. Mr. Theiss asked if the labor cost were included in the committed cost, to which Mr. Grom confirmed.
5. Mr. O'Brien pointed out the CBAC wants to see more of a forecast of potential savings. Judge Coffey stated he realized the Committee may be asking for something out of reach at the moment, until the projects are further along.
6. Mr. Theiss asked if he was correct in not seeing any line item where an actual cost was over the budget cost, to which Mr. Fluker stated, not yet and the District is working to keep it that way.
7. Ms. Angela Chandler asked what was involved in the Stallworth project, to which Mr. Fluker responded adding aisle handrails. Mr. O'Brien pointed out Stallworth was an FCA item and Mr. Grom noted the cost thus far was design cost only. Mr. Grom clarified this cost did not include the cost of the handrails.
8. Judge Coffey asked if the handrails were going to be steel or aluminum. Ms. Garcia stated the District was looking into galvanized steel.

Follow Up

1. Next Mr. O'Brien stated that for follow up, he wanted to know a dollar amount for the savings realized to the day of each CBAC meeting.



PLANNING

(continued)

ENGINEERING

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Est. 1935

AUSTIN

COLLEGE STATION

DALLAS

FORT WORTH

HOUSTON

MIAMI

MIDWEST

PHOENIX

SACRAMENTO

SAN ANTONIO

SAN MARCOS

WACO

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Mr. Fontenot brought up the subject of changing the meeting to the 4th Thursday of the month. 3. Mr. Beard stated it would be helpful for Mr. Matt Flood to attend the next meeting to inform the Committee on technology. 4. Judge Coffey votes to move the meeting to the 4th Thursday. Mr. Beard seconds the motion. The Committee votes and Mr. Fontenot passes the motion. The next meeting will be held October 23rd, 2014, at 4 pm at the Facilities Maintenance Complex. 5. Mr. O'Brien asked Judge Coffey to get Jean McCloud's contact information, from the Historical Society, for Ms. Brenda Garcia for the Security Vestibules at Lee. <p><u>Critique/Evaluate Meeting</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Fontenot asked if there were any critiques or evaluation, to which Mr. Dickie Woods stated he was satisfied. Mr. Fontenot dismissed the meeting. |
|--|