

Minutes of the High School Facilities  
Building Committee Meeting

Present: Mary Altschaefl, Tom Gehl, Roger Johnson, Gary Jones, John Ratzel, Dorothy Smaglick and Meg Wartman

Also: Glen Allgaier, Robert Borch, Matthew Gibson, Daniel Pavletich, David Ross, Robert Ziegler, and Robert Stieg of Boldt Consulting, Abie Khatchadourian of Plunkett Raysich Architects, and John Foster of C. G. Schmidt and Alan Hamari of CNI and Lisa Sink of the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel

Tom Gehl called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. in Room 161 of the Administration Building and welcomed everyone.

Mary Altschaefl moved to approve the Committee's proposed agenda. The motion was seconded by Gary Jones and passed on a voice vote.

Meg Wartman moved that the Committee approve the minutes for the July 1, 2008 meeting with changes to the cost figures presenter, deletion of a sentence "Rob Stieg expects that a short list of items (10 to 20) will be prepared that may merit closer review; e.g., HVAC systems and kitchen/cafeteria plans" and addition of a sentence "C. G. Schmidt has developed the schematic design budget with breakdowns of multiple categories, which may be referenced for detailed discussion of various items." Gary Jones seconded the motion, and it was approved on a voice vote.

Rob Stieg explained that the meeting's focus would be to receive the schematic design cost estimates from C. G. Schmidt. He felt that, since the referendum amount is being met despite a different estimating method, the referendum cost is being substantiated and there is justification that the process is on target. While the 3-percent design contingency will be shown as used, more scope is included. The consultant team remains committed to obtaining maximum value. There will be more "check points" as the process continues to further verify staying on target.

John Foster presented and explained the schematic design budget document, highlighting that the project continues to be within budget and yet contains \$839,502 of items beyond the \$1,501,747 design contingency. The unallocated phasing allowance includes funds that may be needed for items to complete the remodeling/additions in phases; e.g., a second shift superintendent, partitions and temporary classrooms. Currently, \$636,362 of the \$1,000,000 has not been assigned.

A concern was raised about a large increase in site work costs. The original estimate was off, and more site work than anticipated turned out to be needed. Roger Johnson asked to see more detailed cost information on the site work.

Use of the design contingency would be for these items: kitchen improvements, Project Lead the Way space, Brookfield East gym partition, Brookfield Central accessibility near the gym addition, handrails required by code, drama/theater lighting improvement allowances, music room acoustical allowances, parking lot lighting, landscaping, Brookfield Central storage building move, and mechanical/waste yard enclosures. Cost control logs showed items that may be added to or deleted from the project; e.g., black box floor options, HVAC system design, solar heating and/or ice storage cooling use, newer air handling unit refurbishing, existing gym floor not being refinished, reuse of existing electrical gear and 1,000 amp for new gear, band room riser removal, more bleacher seats, and added parking lot lighting. An enhancements list will be developed next to show trigger dates when decisions need to be made on these items.

A request was made for a summary of where the project's scope has been exceeded. Phasing plans should be ready for Committee review in two weeks, and the July 15 Common Council meeting will address remaining issues and will schedule the public hearing. A question was raised regarding options on academic space. A concern was expressed about design leading too far ahead of discussions and that the highest-level deadlines need to be reviewed first.

Committee members prepared a list of key decisions needed before July 28. These included: occupancy and usage of both gyms; HVAC systems' piping and energy-conservation alternatives at both schools; plans for both kitchens, both buildings' windows, Brookfield Central band room floors and acoustics and comparison with Brookfield East, and both schools' business lab floors. Items that will be reviewed after July 28 included the Civic Drive connection (not in the current budget and safety concerns about its placement) and rainwater at Brookfield Central (when and how it should be addressed).

Matt Gibson will arrange for presenters for the first decision. Items to be evaluated to help make decisions include: ventilation, comfort and air conditioning requirements; partition wall in addition to nets and the ability of the structure to handle the weight; sufficient volume of activities to justify added costs; bleachers (number now and/or later and parity issue); and floor refinishing. Rob Stieg will chair the group addressing the second decision. They will try to meet next Monday and report back to Committee on Tuesday. Some energy-saving alternatives may have become more cost effective with the looming increase expected in utility costs.

The Food Service Director and the kitchen consultant need to address the kitchen plans. Abie Khatchadourian will present window information at the next meeting including what windows are planned to be used, how many will be operable, how they will be screened, what their financial impact will be, and what options are available in addressing life/safety and ventilation issues.

Brookfield Central Applied Technology and Engineering space questions will be addressed outside of the Committee.

Rob Stieg handed out an updated issues list. One item was added since the input from the last Committee meeting: design assist for HVAC and electrical. Design assist is used frequently for remodeling projects instead of design build, with the objectives of best product and best value. A wider group of contractors are invited to apply early in the process (before final drawings). They are interviewed on the basis of their qualifications and are culled to the most qualified. Requests for Proposals are sent on specific criteria. The winning contractors, being on the team earlier, work directly with the engineer and construction manager. They would have a vested interest in making sure the plan will work, solving problems on paper rather than in the field. This helps to keep projects on schedule. If used, the design assist contractors would start by September 1. A request was made to see some examples of how this process would work (including time flows), and a concern was raised about the community's interest in bidding.

The Committee's next meeting will be in Room 161 of the Administration Building at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 15.

Dorothy Smaglick moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m. Mary Altschaefl seconded the motion that was approved on a voice vote.