

**BOYERTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Boyertown, Pennsylvania**  
[www.boyertownasd.org](http://www.boyertownasd.org)

**Facilities Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, March 15, 2016**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Elsier, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 p.m. in the Education Center Board Room.

**Board members in attendance:** Mr. Breece, Mr. Caso, Mrs. Dennin, Mr. Elsier, Mr. Landino, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Neiman, Mrs. Usavage

**Administration in attendance:** Dr. Faidley, Dr. Miller, Mr. Szablowski, Mr. Grenewald

**Members of the Public:** 2

Everyone recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and observed a moment of silence.

**Public Comment Period #1**

There were no public comments

Motion to approve the minutes from the committee meeting of 2/16/16 was made by Mr. Landino and second motion by Mr. Breece. The minutes were adopted unanimously.

**Discussion/Information/Old Business**

Dr. Miller thanked the members of the board who were able to tour the old building prior to the meeting for taking the time to do so. For those that weren't able to attend, if at any point you would like a tour, reach out to Dr. Miller and arrangements can be made. As the tour took place, committee members had an opportunity to see a number of things that will be discussed tonight along with the speculated costs involved.

**BASH Project Construction Update**

Dr. Miller started with a BASH construction update and referenced the handout in the packet. Phase 1 is complete although there is still a short punch list. The spreadsheet shows the primary contractors listed down the left hand side, the contracted bid amounts, the amount paid to date and balances withheld for the punch list items. The summary at the bottom is the amount of money that has been expended to get us to the 100% completion on Phase 1. As you look across the spreadsheet, you can see that Phase 2 is well on the way with 32% complete. The other key piece is that we are 56% complete for the entire BASH project. We are just short of \$25 million at this point.

It is also important to look at where we are at on our contingencies and our pending change orders. The project contingencies include the offsite roadway improvements. We still have big question marks regarding how much the offsite roadway improvements will cost us. \$6.7 million dollars is in the account for the project contingencies. The 9<sup>th</sup> grade academy contingency is directly aligned to the old building knowing that this part of the building has a high potential for change orders because we're dealing in some cases with a 1920's building. Dr. Miller commended the board for having the forethought to put \$1.8 million in as a contingency for this. Change orders paid to date total almost \$1.2 million. The \$6.7 million and \$1.8 million are what remain in the contingency accounts after the \$1.2 million has been

removed.

Mr. Caso asked if the \$1.2 million included the major issue we had recently. Dr. Faidley stated that it is included. For a project of this magnitude and that is 56% completed, the change orders are not that big of a deal.

Mr. Caso asked for verification that the percentages complete are percentages of dollar amounts. Dr. Miller stated that is correct. Mr. Caso asked if we know the percentage complete with respect to the actual construction progress. Dr. Miller stated that he will be receiving a construction update on Friday and will include that information in the board packet if he receives it in time.

### **BASH Project Potential Change Orders**

The discussion then moved to potential change orders. The first change order is an asbestos abatement change order. There was asbestos in the old auditorium that was removed. When the first layer of asbestos was removed, a second layer was discovered so that increased the cost of removal. The actual price for this change order is \$5,116.

The second change order is for sprinklers. The building was bid for a downward sprinkler system. What was found is that there are wooden rafters. On the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, we were able to deal with that by putting a fire barrier up against the wooden rafters as a fire retardant system and not have to do anything with a sprinkler system. However, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, the distance from the rafters to roof was greater than the acceptable limit for us to just put a fire barrier in. The code requires us to put in an upward sprinkler on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The upward sprinkler system was not included in the original bid for the project. We are looking at an approximate change order of \$59,000 for that system. We do not anticipate it being higher than this amount.

Mr. Breece asked if the sprinkler system is a wet or dry system. Mr. Hartman replied that it is a wet system. Mr. Landino asked if the new system would be tied into the existing pipes that were seen on the tour. Mr. Hartman stated that they would be tied into the pipes seen on the tour.

The third change order deals with the floors. We saw on the walkthrough tonight that we are dealing with a large number of cracks in the subfloor structure that is in place in much of the building. We have to remedy these cracks in order to give us a strong foundation to put the new tile product on top. If we don't have a strong foundation, we will end up with cracking coming up through in a few years. Multiple layers of different types of product have separated and caused cracking. The team is trying to mitigate the cost by tapping all the cracked areas to identify the high potential problem areas. The high potential problem areas have been marked for repair. This is not a situation where we are looking to rip everything out and put in all brand new.

Mr. Hartman discussed the different fixes to remediate the different types of cracks. The classrooms on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors have various layers of flooring added over the years and the floors on those areas are an uneven mess. They have to get everything back down to an original sound wooden substrate which would be the original wood floor. Then they will put layers of plywood which can accept new vinyl flooring. The other half of the building is all concrete. There are numerous cracks, voids and rough areas that need to be patched. KCBA's structural engineer has done a thorough investigation of these floor areas and they are structurally sound but cosmetically a lot of these cracks will ultimately telegraph through the new flooring system if they are not corrected. In some instances, they will take the floor out to the original joist, put some new deck in and fill with new concrete. In other areas, they will saw cut a thin portion of the top concrete to get down to sound concrete underneath and fill with concrete epoxy.

Cracks have to be saw cut, cleaned out and filled with an epoxy mixture. Then over those areas will be another epoxy mixture to give durability and cohesiveness to anchor to the existing floor. Then that will be leveled and finished off and will be an acceptable finish for the vinyl tile to be put on. The potential cost of repairs is approximately \$225,000.

Ms. Neiman asked what the potential is for the cracks to grow further after they are fixed. Mr. Hartman doesn't feel there is much of a potential for them to grow at all because a lot of them are shrinkage cracks that occur in the first year of pour. Also, epoxy is a safeguard to keep the cracks from growing. Mr. Caso asked if it is a fiberglass filled epoxy. Mr. Hartman said it is not fiberglass filled. It is thin enough to flow into the cracks.

Mr. Caso asked if the \$225,000 covered floors for the whole building. Mr. Hartman stated this is for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the old building. There may be more areas that need additional crack repair but at this point they don't anticipate it based on their investigation.

Dr. Faidley asked for clarification on how much of the \$1.8 million 9<sup>th</sup> grade building contingency we are spending on these change orders. There are approximately \$289,000 of change orders pending.

Mr. Elsier polled the board members to determine if the proposed change orders should be put on the next board agenda in April. Mr. Breece, Mr. Caso, Mrs. Dennin, Mr. Elsier, Mr. Landino, Mr. Lewis, and Mrs. Usavage were in favor of putting it on the agenda. Ms. Neiman was not in favor.

### **BASH Project Montgomery Avenue Road Project Timeline**

The next item of discussion was the Montgomery Avenue Road Project timeline. This project will widen Montgomery Avenue as you approach the access point from both directions. Each direction will have a turn off lane and coming out there will be a clean entry point into traffic. The timeline presented tonight is slightly different than before because we found out there will be some roadwork happening on Montgomery Avenue and we pushed back our timeline so we will be working on it at the final point. April 12 is an important date because that is the authorization to go to bid for this project. May 26 is the date by which bids must be received. May 31 is the date we will go through them and we will award the bid on June 14. It is at that point we will know what the project will cost us. The construction timeline is June 30 through October 28.

Ms. Neiman asked if this included the light project at N. Reading and Montgomery Avenues and if it doesn't where are we with the light project. Mr. Szablowski received an email from the Colebrookdale Township Manager last week with PennDOT's final directions. We are close to having the final documents and hopefully within a month or so Colebrookdale Township will put it out for bid. Ms. Neiman asked if we have anything in writing from Colebrookdale Township that they will pay a portion of the cost. Mr. Szablowski stated that we have nothing in writing but that it will be a shared cost although there are no specific numbers at this time. Ms. Neiman asked what is meant by shared cost. Mr. Szablowski stated that even though Colebrookdale Township acknowledges the intersection is poorly designed they are using the Monroe Street extension and the increased traffic on Montgomery Avenue from both directions as justification to make us pay for a portion of the job. Ms. Neiman asked if Montgomery County has hit us up for any money for Philadelphia Avenue yet. Mr. Szablowski stated they have not and that we don't expect them to. Mr. Breece thought that he had heard that we would pay 25% to Colebrookdale. Mr. Szablowski stated that there hasn't been any discussion about the share. Mrs. Usavage asked what the impact is if the project is delayed due to BMMA not completing their improvements on time. Mr. Clough stated that we don't need it until the summer of 2017 so we have some flexibility.

## **JHW Project Timeline**

Dr. Miller reviewed the JHW project timeline that was included in the packet. The timeline reviews what has happened up to this point as well as anticipated dates looking forward. The project dates back to October 2013 when PlanCon Part A and Part B were approved by the board. It sat on the shelf for a period of time because of the state moratorium related to PlanCon projects but we did get in the queue to ensure the project would be reimbursable. In June 2015, the board approved the start of design development by KCBA Architects. Almost at the same time, KCBA had to update parts A and B to include KCBA as the Architect of Record for the project. Throughout this past fall, we had discussions about air conditioning and GESA and there were discussions at that time about including some of the JHW project into the GESA to absorb some of the cost. Unfortunately, it later came to light that this would not be allowed because there wasn't enough reimbursement in there to include JHW. At that point, JHW was moved to its own individual project. On February 16, 2016, the board approved the authorization to issue requests for proposals for construction management. We currently have the RFP out and they are due back by March 25. We are anticipating a good response.

Looking ahead, as we come into April, we are looking to review the proposals in an interview process to determine who we will bring to the board for approval for construction management services. We are going to be looking for and reaching out through Mrs. Dennin to identify board representation to be a part of that process. Ideally, we would like to screen and have interviews done in the first full week of April so that at the April 12 facilities meeting we can bring forward our recommended company and possibly have it on the board agenda for April 12.

Moving from that point forward, we looked at being completed by August 2018 and backfilled the rest of the timeline dates. These are anticipated dates and we believe it is a reasonable schedule.

Completing design development by June 2016 is a critical piece. There are a lot of questions related to the scope of this project. We need to look at it from the perspective of what are the must dos. We need to know the instructional and facilities impact as well as pricing to know what the scope of the project will be. This is the point we want to be at by June 2016 so we can have the tough conversations about the scope of the project.

Once we determine the scope of the project, we can look at completing the construction document, advertising bids, collecting and reviewing bids and getting true bottom line pricing. Our speculated price and bid price may be different. In March 2017, we plan to award the bids and then we are looking at 2 summers of construction starting in June 2017 through the entire school year and finishing in August 2018.

Mr. Breece asked if at some point before June there would be a meeting to review the wish list for JHW even if we don't have costs. Mr. Clough from KCBA indicated that they can put together a PowerPoint to graphically make the list more real. Mr. Breece would like the presentation to be in priority order.

## **Public Comment Period #2**

There were no public comments

## **Committee Comment**

Mrs. Dennin commented to the board members that there were a lot of emails going back and forth over the weekend regarding the Friday packet. When we have a committee meeting, she would expect that all of the questions asked over the weekend would be answered as part of the meeting. Going forward, she feels board members should wait until the committee meeting to discuss the questions. For committee meetings, it isn't

necessary for administration to give answers to all questions prior to the committee meeting. If we are going to be voting on something at a board meeting, then it is critical to have all of the information several days in advance. If it is for a committee meeting and it is information we are going to get at the meeting, we don't need it ahead of time.

Mrs. Usavage stated she gets nervous with all the replies to emails prior to a meeting because it can be on the edge of deliberating by email. However, she thinks it's good to ask the questions in advance. She sends her questions to Dr. Faidley prior to the meeting as a heads up so he knows what her expectations are at the meeting.

Mr. Breece stated that the emails were asking pertinent questions that should have been in Friday's packet especially when we're dealing with money. When you read over a PowerPoint presentation 3 times and you don't understand what we're talking about, we are missing information and need to get it up front. Going forward, he would like to make sure the board is getting thorough information. To control information is to limit it. This is information they already had and he doesn't understand why the information wasn't included in the packet. The board should have an opportunity to have all the information and not have it watered down in any capacity.

Mr. Caso stated that when he reviewed the presentations for the finance committee meeting they were informative but he didn't really know what was going to be asked of him at the meeting. So that is what precipitated his email. The definition of deliberation is discussion leading to a decision of which there was none in the emails.

Mr. Landino stated that this discussion reinforces how we can use the template that Mrs. Usavage created and come up with standard expectations. The template is a way to package information in a consistent format.

Dr. Faidley stated that a lot of the information in Mrs. Usavage's list is provided by administration in one way or another. He is certainly glad to create a template using Mrs. Usavage's headings and use it for everything we do. He will create a draft of a PowerPoint template that will meet all of those requirements.

### **Announcements**

March 22, 2016 Parent/Community/Intergovernmental Committee, Education Center, 6:00 p.m.  
March 22, 2016 Policy Review Committee, Education Center, 7:00 p.m.  
April 5, 2016 Finance Committee, Education Center, 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Elsier adjourned the meeting at 9:33 p.m.