

BOYERTOWN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
Boyertown, Pennsylvania
www.boyertownasd.org

Facilities Committee Meeting
Tuesday, May 31, 2016
Meeting Minutes

Mr. Elsier, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm in the Education Center Board Room.

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

Administration in attendance: Dr. Miller, Dr. Faidley, Mr. Szablowski, Paul 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.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the May 24 meeting were not available and will be presented at the next meeting.

Discussion/Information/Old Business

Mr. Elsier turned the meeting over to Dr. Miller for an update on the JHW design development.

JHW Design Development

Dr. Miller stated that at the next board meeting on June 14, 2016, we will be seeking board approval for the design development for the JHW project. Mr. Caso asked if we would be approving the scope of the project at the next board meeting and Dr. Miller stated that was correct. Dr. Miller clarified that we will be looking to approve a \$20.8 million project with soft costs and contingencies built into it. The real budget for the process will come out of the bid process.

Mr. Caso expressed concern over the 20% contingency figure. Mr. Cicala from Fidevia stated that the 20% is a combination of soft costs and contingencies. Three contingencies are needed at this time. The design contingency is reflective of the stage you are at in the plans. The bidding contingency ideally covers bidding irregularities. The construction contingency is about 5%. The soft costs are customarily 15% from a safety standpoint.

Ms. Neiman stated she asked for information in order to make a decision and it will not be available for a few weeks. She would like to know how we can vote on June 16 if she has not received the information she requested to make a decision. Dr. Miller stated they are working on the classroom utilization information that was requested and expect to have it in Friday's board

packet. Ms. Neiman expressed concern that this doesn't give her much time to review the information. Dr. Miller stated that in order to keep the timeline that was established for the project, we need to approve the design development in June.

Mr. Caso's recommendation is that we utilize the BASH leftover contingency and eliminate the contingency presented tonight. Dr. Miller agreed that we are definitely on a positive footing with the BASH contingency. Mr. Caso stated that this project was originally slated as a \$15 million project and now we are at \$21 million. Dr. Miller stated the original \$15 million was a rough estimate from Mr. Grenewald and Mr. Szablowski. The \$21 million was arrived at after we brought in professionals for the estimating process. Mr. Stengle stated that we also added things to the project and that he believes the original estimate was accurate.

Dr. Miller introduced Jay Clough from KCBA who explained the design development which will set the project scope. Within the scope is safety, health, security, energy efficiency, accessibility, infrastructure, educational programs and building additions. PDE expects a certain level of improvement as part of the funding they are providing. The next stage of development is to adjust and refine design concepts to seek cost savings.

We will continue to look at the design through the PlanCon process. PlanCon Part D will be filed after we meet with the township. PlanCon Part D is when the financials are worked out and you will have a good financial picture in terms of what the state will be obligated to someday pay the district. PlanCon Part E is when it is voted on publicly and the state architect reviews it again. PlanCon Part F will be another public look and vote before it goes out for bids. PlanCon Part G will be the vote to say yes we will or will not award and alternate projects will be selected. From now until January, we will be looking at the project incrementally together and will be reaffirming, changing and shaping the project.

Some of the overall building upgrades include a new HVAC system, a new electrical system, data systems and security upgrades, painting walls, replacing acoustical ceilings and possibly sprinkler work. Mr. Clough also shared the following 1963 general building upgrades: replace windows, remove asbestos and install new floor tile, replace doors and hardware, replace casework and student lockers, replace stage rigging and stage lighting, and replace auditorium sound system. There will also be roofing upgrades and ADA improvements.

Specific building upgrades include a new secure entrance and office suite. The new addition has to do with new programs because of expansion of ADA, mechanical equipment and reconfigurations. We are renovating the major public toilet rooms that serve students and staff. STEM fit out, art room fit out and science lab upgrades are also part of the project. Gym locker room renovations has a mixture of ADA, educational and safety issues.

Outside site work to be completed includes an upgrade to the front entrance to resolve pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, reconstruction of deteriorated paving, replacing deteriorated curb and sidewalks, and installing LED site lights.

Mr. Clough shared the design development budget provided by Fidevia. The total project cost is \$20,842,574 including \$4,168,515 in soft costs and contingency. The goal is to spend less than the total budgeted amount.

Mr. Stengle would like to know if we are moving this through the typical bid process. Dr. Miller explained this would go through the bid process similar to the high school project. Mr. Stengle commented that once the design process is agreed on by the board next week we are committed to completing the project even though we may make changes along the way. Mr. Stengle asked for confirmation that we already borrowed \$15 million and have it in the bank for this project. Dr. Miller stated that was correct but that we actually have \$21 million in the bank for the project from borrowing \$15 million. We may also be able to use leftover BASH construction contingency money towards the JHW project.

Mr. Breece pointed out the contingency is about 25% of the construction cost which he finds to be high. Dr. Miller explained that it's not just contingency.

Mr. Breece would like to take a look at the student lockers since he missed his tour. Mr. Breece believes that if the lockers are functional it is a lot of money to spend since there have been no serious injuries to date. Mr. Elsier encouraged Mr. Breece to contact Dr. Faidley for a tour. Dr. Faidley's office will send an email to the board offering some possible dates and times for tours.

Mr. Clough from KCBA explained that we could provide some alternates like we did at the high school for the board to look at. Dr. Miller commented that it would be beneficial to think about putting some items outside of the base project as alternates on the bid. This will give us the ability to make informed decisions based on real dollars and real numbers.

Mrs. Dennin asked if the project update provided during this meeting will be what the board votes on next week. Mr. Elsier stated that was correct. Mrs. Dennin wondered if we can remove items from the proposal after it is voted on. Mr. Elsier stated that items can be taken off completely or can be changed to an alternate.

Dr. Faidley asked for clarification on the contingency costs. As we move through the different phases of the project, will the contingency costs decrease? By the time we get to bidding, we will knock off 5% of the contingency costs. Dr. Faidley asked what the expected PlanCon reimbursement is based on the expected construction costs of \$17 million. Mr. Clough stated that he expects it to be roughly \$4 million based on our past experience at JHE.

Mr. Stengle is concerned about putting alternates in the bid because he suspects there will be a greater cost than what's already built into the budget. Mr. Cicala from Fidevia explained that it will not cost more. If you include alternates in the bid documents, contractors bidding will strategically price them so we will get a good value. Mr. Cicala added that if you add projects in the construction phase then you pay a premium for it because there is no incentive to the contractor who already has the job to give you a competitive number.

Mr. Stengle commented on the lockers. He shares Mr. Breece's position and wants to be clear on the explanation that was given. The locks can be replaced as needed, the lockers are too small, there are sharp edges that pose a safety risk and they are 50 years old. It seems like if you have a sharp edge a file could take care of that. Mr. Stengle respects administration's call on including lockers on the bid as well as Mr. Breece's concerns on the cost of lockers.

Mr. Clough explained that he would like to help guide the board on which alternates to choose because contractors can become confused in the bidding process. Single trade items make better

alternates than those that would involve multiple trades. If the alternates are structured properly, they are a very good tool to tune the budget. Mr. Clough will guide the process and a decision can be made as a group.

Mr. Caso would like to know how these numbers were developed. Are they based on square footage, preliminary estimates or prior experiences? He can't vote yes on the proposal without knowing the context. Mr. Cicala explained that for the new addition square footage was used to develop a price. The addition is about 6000 square feet and is \$225 per square foot. Mr. Cicala shared that they used RSMMeans which is the industry standard for providing cost data that is relevant and accurate. Mr. Cicala offered to provide the detailed estimate with the trade breakdown if that would help everyone understand the pricing. Dr. Faidley stated this will be provided in Friday's newsletter.

Mr. Caso would like to know the breakdown between the soft cost and contingency. Mr. Clough explained the soft cost is 12% and the contingency is 13% but in 3 pieces. The items that would be included in soft costs has been sent to Dr. Miller but we don't know the costs at this point because we haven't met with the township yet. Mr. Caso would like to see more details as to what is included in the soft cost. Dr. Miller explained we have only contracted with KCBA for design development at this point. If we extend our contract with KCBA to engage in the rest of the project, they will provide us with some of those answers. As we go through the project, these details will be listed on PlanCon D as line items

Dr. Faidley asked when we can expect to see an itemized cost list for soft costs. Mr. Clough stated that we should get in front of the township in about a month and then PlanCon D will be completed and that information will be provided in a 30 page document. Mr. Caso stated he is asking for information not data and a 30 page document is data he would have to sift through. Dr. Miller explained that he would provide a single page executive summary for everyone. Mr. Cicala will provide a soft cost breakdown and a list of what compromises the contingencies for Friday's newsletter.

Mr. Stengle feels that Mr. Caso's questions could be answered by meeting to go over all the documents. Dr. Faidley and Mr. Cicala agreed that a meeting could be set up to discuss these questions with Mr. Caso and any other board members interested in attending.

Dr. Miller explained that if the board approves the scope of the project the next step would be to seek board approval to extend our contract with KCBA. Mr. Stengle asked if the contract would be going out for bid and Dr. Miller said that due to the amount of work that has already been done by KCBA he was not intending to put it out for bid. The contract cost will be a percentage of the total cost of the project.

Mr. Caso recommended knocking out the contingency on the proposal by using the leftover BASH contingency. Mr. Stengle stated that because the money is already borrowed for both projects that it doesn't matter if we take the money from the BASH contingency or from the loan because we have the money either way. Mr. Landino agreed with Mr. Stengle that looking at the contingencies is all semantics as the money is already there. At the end of both projects, there has to be a determination of what to do with the extra funds left. Mr. Landino stated we will not use any more contingency than we have to but the contingency is there for safety reasons just in case we need it, as it was with the high school project. Mr. Grenewald stated that we need to

allow for unforeseen problems. For example, they have plans to go in and scope the underground piping which is 50 years old. The condition is unknown and if some piping needs to be removed and replaced that would be taken from the contingency money. The contingency is for anything that hasn't been fully investigated yet and could be a problem.

Mr. Elsier asked the board for approval to move forward with placing the contract extension of KCBA on the board agenda. The item was approved to move forward.

BASH Construction Project

Change Orders

There are three change orders to discuss.

The first change order is for Worth and Co., our mechanical contractor, for \$38,338.76. It was discovered that the original piping needed to be replaced after the original insulation was removed. The additional cost is for cleaning, painting, restoring and insulating tunnel piping and adding duct work to existing chase in area A.

The second change order is for Apex Plumbing and Heating, our plumbing contractor, for \$44,553.06. The additional cost is for rock removal and disposal which was discovered while installing new pipes.

The final change order is from our general contractor for \$26,782.04 and involves structural work in Area A (old building) related to floor removal, steel beam reinforcements and curtain track replacements. This also includes Area D (cub gym) masonry repairs related to cutting new openings in existing walls to install reinforcements. When we look at the cost breakdown, there are 2 contingencies. The change order for Area D will come out of the main BASH contingency and the one for Area A will come out of the 9th grade academy contingency.

Mr. Elsier asked the board for approval to move forward with the change orders. The item was approved to move forward.

PlanCon I

Dr. Miller explained that since we exceeded the change order limit set by PDE we must complete a PlanCon I submission to PDE which provides information on all the change orders.

Mr. Caso asked if that raises any red flags with PDE. Mr. Clough explained that our project is not an Act 34 limited project. When the amount of the addition is more than 20% of the area of the building, it is an Act 34 project and you can cheat the system just by doing change orders. PDE is making sure change orders are not being used to gradually build up a project. Mr. Caso asked if there is a threshold and Mr. Clough stated the threshold is \$300,000.

Montgomery Avenue Improvement

Dr. Miller shared the timeline in regards to the Montgomery Avenue expansion. The original plan was to discuss the bids tonight so that at the June 14 board meeting we could award the bid. However, last week we made a decision to postpone opening of the bids to ensure a better bid process due to some recent information. BMMA, who is doing simultaneous work, has pushed back their timeline. Colebrookdale Township also has some concerns about the improvement

project and the timeline. A meeting has been scheduled for next Tuesday with Colebrookdale Township and Boyertown Township to get into agreement with the project.

Mr. Stengle asked if we made any progress on who is paying for the traffic light. Dr. Miller stated that the traffic light is not expected to be installed for 2 years. He explained that it is anticipated that both the township and the school district will pick up some of the costs. Dr. Miller shared that if Tuesday's meeting has a positive outcome we will reinstate the bid process and look to approve the bids at the July board meeting.

Mr. Landino asked if we would be going out to bid for items that may not be worked on for two years. Dr. Miller explained the traffic light project is something the township is working on. Our project only deals with the Montgomery Avenue improvement.

Memorial Stadium Watering

Dr. Miller discussed the final topic of BASH water and field watering. Currently, there are two waterlines coming into the BASH complex. The baseball field gets watered from a well and the football stadium gets watered through city water. Currently, we don't have a dedicated meter that measures just the water output onto the football field. The stadium field is watered using a water cannon and is watered based on weather conditions. In a typical summer, the field could be watered once a week for 16 hours with an estimated cost of \$5,957 per summer.

Mr. Stengle asked if the storage cost was included in the price of the water. Dr. Miller stated that it is included but we would like to get a meter on the section that goes directly out to the field sprinkler so we can only be charged for water usage and not storage. We don't know yet whether we will be able to do that.

Mr. Breece would like the board to give direction to the administration to get a package together for getting a well put in to water the football field as well as the soccer field. Mr. Elsier asked the board if administration should move forward to get a cost to put in a well, run the electric for the pump and report on how that would be offset in the reduction of city water and sewage.

Mr. Stengle feels it's worth looking into but would like to have a better understanding of the production of water in Boyertown and how the manufacturing companies in the area affect the contamination of ground water.

Mrs. Dennin asked Mr. Grenewald if we have ever looked into drilling a well before for the watering of fields. Mr. Grenewald shared we do have a few pieces of information from previous research. Mrs. Dennin wondered if we had a ball park figure. Dr. Miller shared we are hoping the cost would be around \$15,000.

Ms. Neiman asked if the cost could be built into the existing high school project. Mr. Clough stated that PlanCon would not fund it because it is a site issue. Dr. Miller shared he would look into the issue.

Mr. Elsier asked for approval to move forward to receive pricing on drilling a new well. The item was approved to move forward.

Public Comment Period #2

Mrs. Dierolf had the following questions:

- Why is the contingency cost increased from the last paper she received even though some of the projects were removed?
- What are the soft cost items are and their amounts?
- What is the cost for the changes being proposed for the parking lot at JHW associated with parent drop off? She does not feel this money is being spent towards education and feels there is no need to make this change.

Mrs. Curry would like an explanation about why there are two separate contingency funds for the high school construction project and an explanation on which funding accounts were used to pay for the change orders. Mrs. Curry would also like to know if the Worth and Co. change order could have been avoided by having an alternate project bid on during the original bid process. Mrs. Curry would like confirmation on whether an Act 34 hearing occurred.

Board Member Comments

Mr. Stengle asked for an explanation of what Act 34 is. Mr. Clough explained that Act 34 is a law written in 1973. The first part determines how much you get reimbursed for a project. The second part limits the amount you can spend per student on a building project. The BASH project was an Act 34 project under the old architect but because it was redesigned with minimal additions it is no longer an Act 34 project.

Announcements

June 7, 2016 Boyertown Area School District Commencement
June 14, 2016 Board of School Directors, JHE Auditorium, 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Elsier adjourned the meeting at 8:31 pm.