

BCOC Meeting Minutes

Date: December 19, 2019. 5:30pm

Location: Burlington High School, Cafeteria

Committee Members

Present: Peter Bahrenburg, Jordan Redell, Kate Stein, Marty Spaulding, Tom Peterson, Erik Hoekstra, Keith Pillsbury, Nathan Lavery

Absent: Clare Wool, Noel Green

Others in attendance: Mark Montminy (Black River Design), John Hemmelgarn (Black River Design), Natty Jamison (Peterson Consulting), David Boehm (member of the public, potential new BCOC member) Amy Mellencamp (member of the public), Joseph Petrarca (member of the public), Jeff Comstock (member of the public)

Meeting Commenced at 5:35pm

| Topic | Discussion |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>Introductions</u> | Tom Peterson (TP) called the meeting to order, introducing himself and others present. TP explained that these monthly meetings serve to update the BCOC on the progress made by the project team that meets weekly. TP explained that this meeting differs somewhat from others and would mainly be a summary of the different design options that were presented by Black River Design (BRD) after the initial estimate of the conceptual design came back over budget. Goal of this committee and process is to reconcile the Owner's Project Requirements (OPR) with the budget. |
| <u>Summary of Design Options:</u> | Mark Montminy (MM) began by explaining the process BRD used to approach cuts to match the budget. They made cuts to the total square feet (sf) of new construction in favor of a higher percentage of renovation sf. Base assumptions for all of the new options included these assumptions regarding the site: Leave existing bus loop. No new upper parking lot, which would have required extensive ledge blasting. Current plan is to leave the lot adjacent to Institute Rd. while making it ADA compliant. The proposed addition to the south of A building is eliminated in all new options, except for a proposed one-story hallway. It was discovered that the ledge in that area is extremely deep and the soils are not structurally viable. These factors would have necessitated very expensive foundation construction methods. <i>*all SF reductions and savings are as compared to the initial SD estimate.</i> |
| <u>Option A:</u> | SF reduction: ~ 10,000. Rough Estimate ~ \$85m. This option calls for renovating levels 1 and 2 of A building in place, including the aviation and autobody areas. This means that property services will have to remain on Shelburne Rd.(This is true for all design options.) Double-height gallery entrance has been somewhat infilled with classroom space. This option placed the auxiliary gym at the SE corner of A building. |
| <u>Option B:</u> | SF reduction: 13,500. Rough Estimate: ~ \$80m. Main features/differences of this option: moving the auxiliary gym to the north of the parking lot. This makes it easy to separate out for construction at a later date if required. This options includes some new construction to the east of A building, |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | as well as new construction sandwiched between A and B. This option houses all of the sciences in D building. F building to remain BTC with ADA upgrades, renovation. |
| <u>Option C:</u> | MM did not spend much time summarizing this option, as it only provided \$7m in savings, less savings than previous options. |
| <u>Option D:</u> | SF reduction: 14,000. Rough Estimate ~ \$11m in savings. This option includes new construction connecting A and B buildings on the east side, keeping new construction mostly out of the courtyard. Aspects of this remain in current design iteration. The wooded area to the north and east of campus is considered a natural area and has restrictions, including a 100 ft buffer zone, complicating this option. Option D also allows lower cost options for piping from the heating building (G) to the rest of campus. |
| <u>Option E:</u> | SF reduction: 16,700. Rough Estimate ~ \$16m in savings. This option included renovating C building in place, however, that would result in a very spread-out campus, which runs counter OPRs goal of consolidation. C building also has significant structural issues and no elevator. All in all, too many issues to make renovation feasible. |
| <u>Option F:</u> | SF reduction: 21,600. Rough Estimate \$12m in savings. L shaped addition that extends far out to the east side. This option was the most highly developed and had sub-options. Includes a B-D connector, 2 story with 4 classrooms. |
| <u>Option G:</u> | SF reduction: 25,000. Rough Estimate ~ \$15m in savings. This option placed the auxiliary gym to the east of the auditorium. Includes an L shaped addition connecting A and B buildings and another L shaped addition connecting B and D buildings. This B-D connector is in a location that would be particularly difficult to construct due to restricted access. This would require a great deal of construction in occupied areas, resulting in difficult access and higher cost. |
| <u>Option H:</u> | SF reduction: 18,000. Rough Estimate ~ \$16m in savings. This option ties buildings B, C, D, and E together, making it very difficult in terms of phasing. This connection exists at level 5 in building E, which is the highest point on site. This results in accessibility issues due to a great deal of vertical circulation and it keeps the facility very spread-out. (a negative) |
| <u>Summary of Option F Variations</u> | TP stated that the current design being developed is a variation on option F. MM showed on screen the revised addition connecting A and B building, making it not sprawl as much, and keeping it out of the 100ft natural area buffer zone. |
| <u>Questions from BCOC</u> | TP opened the floor to questions from the committee: Kate Stein (KS): stated that she would just like to thank the project team for all of their work, and that she remains very excited at the progress being made and how the program goals have been maintained. Jordan Redell (JR): What is the current estimated cost of the auxiliary gym? Has making it an add/alt been discussed? MM : we haven't decided if it should be an add/alt. It is estimated to be roughly \$1.8m. KS : the auxiliary gym is important program space for teams and PE |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>classes. It could potentially be a modest revenue stream as well if rented out. MM: the aux gym also provides flex space during construction.</p> |
| <p><u>Questions from the public</u></p> | <p>TP opened the floor to questions from members of the public in attendance. Amy Mellencamp (AM): one of the initial desires of this project was to have grouped classrooms with 'learning communities'. Does the current design only have traditional classrooms? TP: with this current plan, there are far fewer opportunities for these learning communities than with the conceptual design and first SD. They are not definitively eliminated though. AM: is it really feasible for D building to hold all of the sciences? How many classrooms are there? MM: there are 7 science classrooms with prep rooms. AM: I don't see how that could work. Final comment, the site of the aux gym is very important. Must be easily accessible and easily monitored for security and safety. JR: the aux gym is a large, standalone cost. Are there other, similar big ticket items that have been considered as add/alts? TP: Your're right that the aux gym stands out in that regard. There are not any other obvious items that don't cut into the OPRs. We believe that the current plan represents the bare minimum requirements to meet the project goals. Member of the Public, Jeff Comstock (JC): It seems that there are conflicts between the best design ideas and the construction schedule. Has altering the schedule been considered to help with cost? TP: I'm a little unsure of what you are asking, but we have considered every option to provide savings. Every option still results in a cost crunch. Our plan is still evolving and working toward reconciling the budget, OPRs, and design. Member of the public, Joseph Petrarca (JP): I filled out comment forms and submitted comments online as well, but never heard back. What happened before the bond vote? How did we end up here? Why was no testing performed prior to design? Why were there no estimates performed before the bond vote? TP: These decisions predate my involvement in the project, but from what I know, there was not much money available for testing ahead of time. JP: What level of detail were the plans at when the bond went out for voting? Couldn't it have been estimated better at that point? TP: At the time of the bond vote the drawings were only conceptual, not very detailed. JP: How could you go to bond vote with that? TP: the city's debt limit was a factor in developing the budget. JP: This bond was sold to voters promising 21st century learning environments and that has to stay. TP: we all agree. JP: color / 3D drawings would also help in presentation. JR: The city's debt limit was not the only determining factor in making the budget. TP: No, but it was a factor. KS: The school board came up with 3 tiers of options, and ended up going beyond even the top tier.</p> |
| <p><u>Overview of current design</u></p> | <p>TP: with our little time left, I'd like to briefly go over the current design. MM: Presented the color-coded floor plans of the current working design. JP: It is clear you are working hard here. Vertical circulation seems like the challenge. TP: the current SD estimate is in the hands of Whiting Turner. We are being as painstaking as possible, having many meetings to hash out every detail. The bad news is the price looks like it will still come in too high. JR: What other changes can be considered to meet budget? TP: We could explore lesser extent of renovations. Frankly, these buildings need a lot, and it wouldn't serve BSD in the long run to not renovate fully. We are exploring other funding options. There isn't much else that can be cut without affecting OPRs. JP: then what? JR: what is the process of exploring other funding? Will that delay construction even more? Do OPRs need to change? What is the timeline? TP: good questions, ones we have been asking ourselves. Our role as the BCOC is to provide all of the information to the school board, who has the power to make the decision. John Hemmelgard: Could this process cause delays? Yes it could. JP: keeping the public informed</p> |

should be paramount and easily accessible on the website. **TP**: we are wrapping up, but before we end I'd like to introduce Mr. David Boehm who has generously volunteered to join the BCOC if that is allowed. Mr. Boehm has extensive experience in this industry, and I (**TP**) would welcome his presence on the committee. **JR**: The City would also welcome David's being a member of the committee.

Meeting Concluded at 6:51PM

Next meeting: 01/16/2020