

Building Construction Oversight Committee (BCOC) Meeting Minutes

Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020, 5:30pm

Location: Edmunds Middle School Library / Maker Space

Committee Members

Present: Peter Bahrenburg, Kate Stein, Marty Spaulding, Tom Peterson, Keith Pillsbury, Nathan Lavery, Clare Wool

Absent: Noel Green, Jordan Redell, Erik Hoekstra, David Boehm

Others in attendance: Dylan Lozier, Mark Montminy, Ramsey Allen, Tim Kostuk, Natty Jamison, Jim Drummond

For more information and the slide deck:

<https://www.bsdrv.org/district/budget/bhs-renovations/>

<https://www.bsdrv.org/2020/02/04/bhs-btc-reenvisioning-update-february-4-2020/>

Meeting Commenced at 5:30pm

Topic	Discussion
<u>Introductions</u>	Tom Peterson (TP) called the meeting to order, introducing himself and others present. TP established that the main topic for the meeting would be the path to hitting the \$70 million bond vote budget, and the next steps to getting the project approved to move forward. Overall, the estimate is still above \$70 million, but a path, with different options for scope reductions and cost savings, has been identified. The BCOC hopes to reconvene in the next few weeks to make the tough decisions, and then present the decision to the school board, and then to the board of finance. Tom reiterated that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to focus on solutions, not to dwell on how we got here. A third party estimating company has been contracted to verify estimates at SD and possibly at DD as well.
<u>Overview of the Estimating Process and Methodology</u>	Dylan Lozier gave a brief overview of WT's approach to estimating a project at the SD stage and Tim Kostuk elaborated, saying: identifying the costs of what is in the documents as well as what is not. WT uses their cost data from nationwide, regional, and local school and similar projects that they have worked on. They compare these numbers with market trends. Working with Neagley and Chase, they verify these numbers in the local market and connect with local subs to get their real prices. For example: WT identified sprinkler pricing as \$3.52/sf whereas Firetech, a local sub, had it at \$3.30/sf. They compared notes, and Firetech hadn't factored in temporary covers. Reconciled prices to within 4.05% of one another. Dylan: Once we have gone through this process for every scope element, we incorporate it into a more easily digestible cost of work template. Current cost of work: \$59,269,232. This does not include general conditions, contingency, other soft costs. The total project cost currently is: \$82,497,081.

<p><u>Potential Scope Reductions</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the slide deck for more information. Mark Montminy: to clarify - these are the costs with all of the cost drivers (see slide) included. Potential scope reduction options: these are not proposed lightly, and we understand that they represent some difficult choices and are more than just a \$ amount to the community.</p>
<p><u>Potential Scope Reductions</u></p>	<p>CHPS Certification: we can still maintain many of the design guidelines of CHPS, such as daylighting of classrooms and noise separation, but by dropping the certification we can save administrative / consultant costs. Bike Parking: removing canopies over proposed bike parking. Student Parking lots: these can potentially be overhauled using a different funding source, in a separate project. Existing gym floor: still serviceable, but will need replacement relatively soon. Gym Bleachers: will be completed this summer using capital plan funds. Reducing furniture budget: budget had ballooned after bond vote. Cut back down to roughly \$360k which is 20% higher than indicated in the bond vote budget. Alternative interior finishes: lower initial costs, but potential for higher maintenance costs. Galleria / BD connector: bring proposed double height entrance down to single story. 3800sf loss in circulation space, but no reduction in program space. F building renovation scope reduction: elimination of sprinkler system, no roof replacement, and no new hvac. Administrative spaces to remain in F. ADA and elevator upgrades remain. Alternate HVAC: alternate would still be more efficient and comfortable than current system, and gym and admin spaces will be cooled, but classrooms will not have AC. Auxiliary gym: removal would result in a less striking new facade. Could remain in the bid as an alternate. Can also easily be a project at a future date.</p> <p>Cost savings all together result in a total owner cost of approximately: \$67,872,767.</p>
<p><u>Project highlights</u></p>	<p>Mark M: these highlights (see slide) are in the project regardless of scope reduction choices.</p>
<p><u>Next Steps</u></p>	<p>Tom P: 3rd party estimating company has a very quick turnaround time and should have numbers back fairly quickly. Then it is time for the hard decisions to be made before presentation to the school board and the board of finance.</p>
<p><u>BCOC Member Questions</u></p>	<p>Nathan Lavery: will the new facility be more efficient overall? Mark M: short answer is yes. There will be new roof and windows, improved wall package, etc. Tom P: it should be more comfortable and controllable as well. Tom P: when can the BCOC convene again? Clare Wool: March 6 or 9? All: yes, pending missing BCOC members approval. Nathan L: is it a fair assessment that the removal of the galleria is mainly a loss</p>

	<p>in curb appeal rather than an impact on program/functional elements? Mark M: that is correct. All program space has been relocated. Circulation is affected though. We are confident we can still provide some wow factor!</p> <p>Nathan L: can the auxiliary gym be added back as the budget gets more zeroed in, and there are funds available? Mark M: yes. Marty Spaulding: and we will keep it in the bid docs as an alternate? Mark M: yes. Because it is distinct, unlike HVAC for example, which goes through the whole facility.</p> <p>Clare W: is any access being reduced or are elevators being eliminated? Mark M: ADA accessibility has not been reduced, and the new/refurbished elevators remain.</p> <p>Clare W: are there any changes to the site plans? Mark M: since the plans that were shown in December; no. Auxiliary gym will affect the parking lot.</p> <p>Clare W: there is a student bubble coming up through middle school, and this facility will have more than enough space to accommodate an increased population.</p>
<p><u>Member of the Public Questions:</u></p>	<p>Joel Fitzgerald: To me, taking care of what we have now should be the top priority. We shouldn't build new gyms when we can't take care of the one we have. I am concerned that F building and the BTC is being neglected, and those trades are very important for future curriculum.</p> <p>Peggy O'Neill: we as a city have a net zero energy use target - I hope that is still being taken into consideration. I am concerned about retaining / expanding the parking lots while neglecting public / alternative transit. I am also concerned about prioritizing savings now versus long term costs. That building is hot, and getting hotter, putting in new HVAC now seems cheaper to me.</p> <p>Joe Petrarca: I have experience in the architectural field, and am speaking as a concerned taxpayer: I voted against the bond because I thought it was too little money. This is our chance at a flagship building that conveys our values to our kids. LEED isn't even mentioned. The building team is doing a great job addressing the critical needs, but anticipated savings often disappear and there are more surprises in store. With everything already cut at SD, what will give down the road?</p> <p>Mark B: I share the concerns others have shared. Has the cost of swing space for displaced students been factored in? This new design seems harder for phasing. Tom P: so far those costs are factored in. You are right that phasing will be a challenge.</p> <p>Nathan L: what is the contingency %? Marty S: 10%.</p>

Meeting Concluded at 6:47PM
Next meeting:TBD