



## Minutes 2012 Bond Project Advisory Team (PAT) Meeting Austin High School

**MEETING #:** 29

**LOCATION:** Austin High School

**DATE / TIME:** January 25, 2017 at 1:30 pm

**ATTENDEES:** (those marked with a check were present)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Guerrero	Principal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chris Fields	Heery/HISD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rudy Trevino	HISD CSO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Georgianne Sigler	Visitor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Diana Davila	HISD Trustee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Octavio Cantu	ERO Architects
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hilarion Martinez	HISD SSO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tim Johnson	Teacher Science
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Debbie Crow	HISD SSO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joe Nelson	Alumni
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andreas Peeples	HISD Sr. Mgr.	<input type="checkbox"/>	C. Guerrero	Teacher CTE Ag
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Covey Nash	Alumni	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dan Bankhead	HISD Mgr. Design
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sylvia Wood	HISD Communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guadalupe Saldivar	SPED Teacher Asst.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Busby	HISD COO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Raul Asoy	SPED Chair
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Derrick Sanders	HISD-Of. Const	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chris Williams	Teacher History
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Richard Gay	Procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Kerrissey	Teacher History
<input type="checkbox"/>	Catherine Smith	Teacher CTE Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jorge Medina	Assistant Principal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eli Ochoa	ERO Architects	<input type="checkbox"/>	Theresa M. Guerra	Registrar
<input type="checkbox"/>	Angelita Henry	Parent/Alumni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jose Saenz	Teacher History
<input type="checkbox"/>	Erica Deakins	HISD Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Paul Gloria	Community Neighbor
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tierra Harris	Parent/Alumni	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mark Janicek	Teacher CTE Fam.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tania Roman	Student/Alumni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Victor Trevino	Teacher Soc. Studies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alfonso Maldonado	Alumni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Holly Huffman	HISD Communication
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yadira Banuelos	Alumni Class Pres.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gary Whittle	Heery/HISD
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cruz Casiano	Teacher CTE Fam.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ariana Sherman	HISD AP
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sara Torres	Student Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marsha Eckerman	Alumni

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of the meeting was to meet with the Project Advisory Team to update members on timeline, budget, and swing space options for Austin H.S.

**AGENDA:** See attached



## DISCUSSION:

1. The January 18, 2017 PAT meeting was rescheduled to January 25, 2017, and time changed from 4 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. as requested by Principal Guerrero, due to early class dismissal for Austin HS.
2. Principal Guerrero opened the meeting by stating that Rosemary is still on the project, but that Gary Whittle will be conducting the presentations on behalf of Rosemary until further notice. He then directed attention to the PAT Norms that were posted. Principal Guerrero stated that he would like to put the Norms in place so that PAT meetings can start on time, allow all agenda items to be presented, and allow the team to hear everyone's comments.
  - a. Questions should be reserved until the end of the presentation. If questions come up during the presentation, they may be placed on a "parking lot" until the end of the meeting, or answered later in the presentation. If any questions are not answered during the meeting, then a response will be provided in the distributed meeting minutes or at the next PAT meeting.
  - b. Principal Guerrero stressed the importance of all questions being answered as quickly as possible, to which Gary Whittle stated he would provide a timely reply.
  - c. Principal Guerrero introduced Debbie Crowe, who will be the timekeeper of the meeting, in an effort to provide an efficient and productive meeting and accomplish all objectives.
3. Principal Guerrero welcomed Trustee-Diana Davila, Chief Support Officer-Dr. Rudy Trevino, School Support Officer-Hilarion Martinez, Chief Operating Officer-Brian Busby, Officer of Construction Services-Derrick Sanders, Procurement Officer-Rick Gay, and GM of Construction-Andreas Peeples.
4. G. Whittle updated the PAT on Construction Drawing progress.
  - a. 100% plans have been received and the review process has begun.
  - b. Octavio Cantu, Project Architect, stated a review will be conducted on the 100% construction documents to ensure documents are complete and efficient. In addition to the City of Houston review process, reviews will be conducted by HISD, Program Manager, and CMAR, once the CMAR selection is approved by the Board.
  - c. G. Whittle provided plan review timelines:
    - i. Program Manager's review is currently underway. Includes both Architectural and MEP reviews to look for errors or conflicts.
    - ii. On February 1, 2017, HISD facility maintenance department managers will meet to review and discuss construction drawings. HISD Facility Maintenance Departments (HVAC, electrical, plumbing, security, technology, data cabling, academics, athletics, food service, etc.) all review for compliance and conformance to design guidelines.
    - iii. Following BOE approval on February 9, 2017, the CMAR will begin a constructability review from a general contractor's and subcontractor's point of view. This review is to generate any questions or comments for A/E response to reduce questions during the bidding process.
  - d. February 27<sup>th</sup>, all first round review comments generated by PM, HISD, and CMAR will be turned in to ERO for response and incorporated into final review set.
  - e. A second review will then be conducted to confirm previous comments were included and to do a final check of the plans and specification. Any new comments will be turned into ERO on March 28, 2017.



- f. Final “Issue for Construction” drawings are due April 10, 2017. These plans will be submitted to City of Houston to begin building permit process. Permitting has been averaging 4 – 6 months for full approval.
5. G. Whittle presented an updated timeline for the project to the PAT. The target timeline, as presented, assumes CMAR approval in February’s BOE meeting.
    - a. Approval of the selected CMAR is on the Board of Education (BOE) agenda for approval at the next meeting on February 9, 2017.
    - b. There will be two bid packages through the CMAR: one for the T-Campus, and one for the new Austin HS.
      - i. Anticipated bid package for the T-Campus would be ready to issue for bids in March.
      - ii. The bid package for the new Austin HS will include the “Issue for Construction” drawings, which will be ready to issue for bids after April 10.
    - c. The timeline for the T-Campus puts procurement / installation beginning in late March, lasting through end of September. Allowing time for FF&E and Technology, the T-Campus could be ready for a December occupancy (Winter Break).
      - i. The move date will need to be discussed as any anticipated delay may create a tradeoff with increased construction cost implications.
      - ii. G. Whittle highlighted several examples of recent moves. Wharton Dual Language was moved over a 3-day weekend and Sterling High School moved into their new campus over Winter Break, and both moves went relatively smooth.
    - d. V. Trevino questioned construction cost increases as a result of delays. G. Whittle responded that labor costs are at the mercy of the market and any potential cost impacts wouldn’t be known until the project goes out for bids. Industry averages range between 2.5 - 5% per year.
    - e. A question was asked about the responsibility for the relocation packing and unpacking. Response: HISD has resources available to move Summer or Winter. In response to a comment about a chemical spill during a previous move, G. Whittle stated companies are dedicated to moving special items such as science/chemistry lab chemicals, monitors, and CPU’s, separate from the relocation companies. All movers are insured for loss/damage.
    - f. Continuing with the timeline, G. Whittle stated that the T-Bldg. campus should complete by early November, which would allow ample time for the move into the T-Bldgs. He cited Wharton Dual Language was available to the teachers for several weeks before the actual move, in order to set up classrooms. V. Trevino interjected that teachers could not be required to work over the Winter Break.
    - g. The anticipated construction start is January 2018, with a 24 – 30 month duration, meaning a December 2019 or Spring of 2020, move into the new facility. After move to new building, the T-Bldg campus will be dismantled and the site returned to its previous condition.
  6. G. Whittle presented a budget overview of the project to the PAT by reviewing the 2016 July PAT presentation by Dan Bankhead, with some added detail.
    - a. The original budget and scope of work was established when the 2012 Bond passed, and was based on a Districtwide assessment report that made recommendations for all campuses.
    - b. It was stated that Management Costs include many project specific line items such as third party consultants hired by HISD, legal, custodial, and relocation, and not just Project Management.

- i. In addition, it includes a set aside to cover operating costs for the Managers, including building costs, technology, office supplies, etc., for the full duration (8+ years) of the Bond program.
- c. The line item labeled as Soft Costs is exclusively for design architect/engineers fees. The remainder of Soft Costs are included in the Management Costs line item, and include third party consultants for Roofing, Hazmat, Environmental, Geotech Surveys, Property surveys, construction material testing to be in compliance with specifications, test & balance of HVAC equipment, commissioning for proper installation and peak performance as part of LEED requirements, and other consultants required for regulatory conformance.
- d. The inflation/reserve fund was originally included to cover anticipated rising costs of construction and any unknown or unforeseen conditions that might arise. Those funds have since been reallocated to the Construction Budget. To maintain some reserve for surprises, some of the approved Supplemental funds were used to increase Contingency.
- e. Program Costs originally included Swing Space. The original allocation for Swing Space, \$1,788,350, has since been moved to it's own line item. The remaining funds \$1,994,977, were set aside at the beginning to cover Bond office overhead, including salaries and operating costs. Bond employees include managers, auditors, accountants, procurement officers, legal compliance, minority compliance, risk management, and others, for an (8+) year period.
- f. The approved Supplemental Funding, \$11,161,679, was allocated as follows:
  - i. Construction \$4,559,215
  - ii. Contingency \$1,710,861
  - iii. Swing Space \$4,891,603
- g. The current Swing Space budget of \$7,595,372 consists of the following:
  - i. \$1,788,350 from Program Costs (Swing Space)
  - ii. \$915,419 from Soft Costs
  - iii. \$4,891,603 from Supplemental Funding
- h. Current funds budgeted to build Austin HS include:
  - i. Construction \$52,000,000
  - ii. Contingency \$ 3,906,843
  - iii. Management / Soft Costs \$ 5,186,942
  - iv. Design Fees \$ 2,476,545
  - v. Inflation / Reserves \$ 0
  - vi. Program Costs \$ 1,994,977
  - vii. Furnishings/Equipment \$ 4,080,000
  - viii. Technology \$ 2,350,000
  - ix. Swing Space \$ 7,595,372
- i. Fixtures, Furniture & Equipment (FFE) includes furniture for classroom/learning areas and administration offices, capital equipment not covered under construction, science and other products that are not expendable. Fixed Cabinets are included in Construction. Equipment includes loose items, such as science kits, kilns, etc.
- j. Technology includes WiFi access points, smart boards, projectors, CCTV, audio/visual, public address system, servers & phone systems, and cabling.
- k. M. Kerrissey commented it appears that Austin HS contributes \$2,000,000 to program costs, but with over (40) schools as part of the Bond Program, that adds up to a lot of money.
  - i. D. Sanders added that was the amount Budgeted. Actual expenses may be less.
- l. A discussion of the budget continued with the following questions.
  - i. Question: What portion has been spent of the \$79,590,679?

1. Response: The Bond Oversight Committee will present spent-to-date information at their upcoming meeting. It was stated this was public information and would be distributed after the Bond Oversight Committee Meeting. **(See full response in Addendum to Meeting Minutes, Item #1).**
  - ii. Question: How does Austin inflation compare to other schools as first tier construction started earlier and should have less inflation?
    1. Response: G. Whittle and D. Sanders stated original budgets were established with fixed percentages by line item, but both were unsure if percentages changed based on when the project was scheduled to start. **(See full response in Addendum to Meeting Minutes, Item #2).**
  - iii. Follow up question: Is this information available or is it private issue?
    1. Response: G. Whittle stated the only privacy issue was with the CMAR selection.
  - iv. Question: What happens if there is any unused contingency left over?
    1. Response: School administrators typically develop a wish list of items they would request if funding were available. Examples include additional graphics, additional A/V equipment, etc. M. Kerrissey stated that if we don't use it, we lose it, and any money left over goes back to the bond fund. D. Sanders stated that any Contingency already in the project would likely be spent for Austin HS.
  - m. V. Trevino questioned the budget listing of district wide projects that was responded to by Brian Busby and D. Sanders: The original budget listing of district wide technology upgrades & restroom upgrades were for schools not included in the 2012 Bond. Land reserves were used to purchase land at various locations, including the property across from Austin. Program Management costs (total costs distributed to all projects) are sum of contracts awarded to Program Management firms, including work on Districtwide Projects and non-Bond projects.
  - n. M. Kerrissey questioned the typical cost of a CMAR contract and will the funding come from construction? G. Whittle replied the CMAR cost is essentially overhead & profit, general conditions including staff, insurance, and bonds. The industry average for CMAR fee and general conditions are around 5%. M. Kerrissey commented that if the cost is \$5M, then the difference of \$47M would go to bricks & mortar. G. Whittle stated that yes, the bulk of the remaining \$47M would go to subcontractors.
7. G. Whittle responded to an earlier question of how relocation is managed.
- a. The packing and moving of school related items will be handled by a relocation company, paid for out of the Bond funds allocated to the project.
  - b. The PM will coordinate with the Principal and Staff to determine the scope of the move. How many boxes per teacher? How many pallets? What furniture is moving? Etc.
  - c. The PM then works with Procurement to solicit proposals from the five (5) approved moving companies based on this scope.
  - d. All proposers will tour the school with the PM and Procurement, and prepare a proposal based on the outlined scope. Historically, proposals are very close as each relocation company has agreed to a master agreement with similar unit costs.
  - e. C. Williams questioned the amount of involvement required of teachers in the move.
    - i. All boxes are provided by the moving company. The relocation company will provide labels with relocated room number visible on the box. The staff is responsible for packing personal effects. The relocation company will move the boxes from current

classroom to new classroom, where the staff will be responsible for unpacking and arranging their personal effects.

- f. C. Williams questioned if there would be extra duty pay for teachers for time to pack.
  - i. Response: That is a campus administration decision.
- g. C. Williams questioned if there was a greater likelihood of items getting lost or damaged during a 10 day Winter Break move, as opposed to a Summer move.
  - i. Response: Even in a Summer move, the bulk of the physical move would still happen over a one week period, so no additional risk in moving over Winter break from that perspective.
- h. C. Williams questioned if the move would impact the academic performance of students, considering schedules for STARR exams in the spring, tutorials and retakes.
  - i. Response: B. Busby responded that Academics would be involved in the decision surrounding the planned move date, and should consider all potential impacts.
  - ii. If the move were delayed (6) months, impacting construction start, it could have budget impact on project. Same money may buy less scope of work in Summer 2018 than it does in December 2017.
- i. V. Trevino continued discussion regarding safety of students, interruption of studies and STARR testing, and interruptions that could be brought on by contractors working around the site. He commented that Austin barely met minimum standards last year and may be difficult to meet standards with the move scheduled in December. He stated that lower academic performance could result in losing students, thus impacting operating budget of the school.
- j. Jorge Medina stated that many students have social and behavioral issues, and the move would have to be carefully planned to avoid impacting the care of those students.
- k. Brian Busby stated that the Bond Office and Bond Managers have been building schools for a long time, and there are examples of successful moves and less successful moves. We must keep in mind that voters approved the money to be spent to build new facilities and we need to agree to work together toward that goal. The Bond Office can only provide information and make recommendations. A decision that may impact Academics would need to be made by the Principal, Chief Support Officer and School Support Officer.
- l. G. Whittle encouraged Principal Guerrero to talk with the school administrators who have moved in December, such as Sterling High School, and ask if they felt an impact on the teachers or students.
  - i. Trustee Davila was at Sterling shortly after the move and stated the Principal was confident it did not affect students' performance or engagement.
- m. C. Williams and V. Trevino expressed a concern regarding the impact on teachers, and asked that teachers input should be considered regarding a December move.
  - i. Principal Guerrero agreed that a December move would be a massive decision and one that would not be taken lightly. Those conversations will be started immediately, and teachers input will be taken into consideration. All options will be explored and there are a lot of things to consider.

## 8. Q&A

- a. Question: J. Medina raised questions on the permitting process, CMAR selection, and timing of having T-Buildings ready. He asked how many classrooms would be available at the T-Building campus, as they are starting to prepare master schedules for the 2017 academic year.
  - i. Response: G. Whittle stated he had additional information to present regarding the T-Building campus later in the presentation.

- b. Question: Why was the CMAR approval delayed until February?
    - i. Response: The CMAR board approval was originally scheduled for January 2017, but the Board President understood PAT and Trustee Davila had unanswered questions, and recommended the item be pulled from January's meeting. If questions were resolved, the agenda item would go to the next BOE in February.
  - c. Question: When will the decision be made about the the December move?
    - i. Response: The decision will be decided by Principal Guerrero and Chief Support Officer Trevino, among others, and should be expected to happen quickly. Any impact on permitting is not an issue, as there is still time for a smooth December 2017 or Summer 2018 move.
  - d. Question: Is there a deadline for a decision on when the move would take place?
    - i. Response: G. Whittle stated that the lease for the T-Buildings begins once the Certificate of Occupancy is received from the City. Brian Busby stated that once the city has approved the T-Building plans, we will bid and negotiate the price to go forward, fabricate the buildings according to HISD design guidelines and install the buildings. Once awarded, the vendor will go forward with the process, and once complete, the project will begin making lease payments, regardless of when the buildings are occupied. G. Whittle stated that if the decision is to hold off the T-Buildings for a Summer 2018 move, that decision will need to be provided by late February 2017 so that the PM could delay the bidding process. Vendors typically guarantee pricing for only (90) days, so we would either need to award the contract to a vendor or re-bid later, potentially resulting in further cost escalation.
  - e. Question: When do you expect the final GMP to be established?
    - i. Response: G. Whittle referred to the schedule presented earlier that the Bidding timeline shows the GMP could be finalized as early as June 2018, but would be appropriately timed with the start of construction. If the move is to occur in December 2017 for a January 2018 start, we would want pricing from subcontractors within (90) days of the start of construction.
  - f. Followup Question: If the District cannot reach agreement on a final GMP, can we walk away?
    - i. Response: Yes. If the District and CMAR cannot reach an agreement on GMP, the two can mutually part ways and the process of procuring a new CMAR would start all over.
  - g. Question: Will a delay in CMAR approval affect their current pricing?
    - i. Response: Possibly. Those bids were received in November and are only guaranteed for (90) days. G. Whittle further explained that the CMAR was being approved based only on the percentages they bid for General Conditions and Fee, to be added on top of the Cost of Work. The process was explained how CMAR's solicit and receive bids from Subcontractors to establish a Cost of Work. Their approved percentages would then be added on top of that, establishing the final Guaranteed Maximum Price.
9. G. Whittle presented several proposed T-Campus layout plans to the PAT.
- a. Original layouts discussed in August 2016, Options A, B, & C.
  - b. Option A - An early concept with (6) restroom buildings, (44) individual 24 ft x 64 ft, portable buildings for classrooms and administrative offices, an open air student commons, and warming kitchen. It did not include an operating kitchen, CTE, athletics, or a conditioned dining space. Concept was that Dining and PE could share a covered multi-purpose building, with PE taking place outside of Lunch hours, when it would be used as a Dining Commons.

- c. Option B - Opposite of A, wherein a restroom is centralized in each building, a large building for the band, separate structures for administration, and serving/dining. Every building has plumbing that ensures safety and security, and addresses student management concerns, which is a big advantage. This option does not include an operating kitchen, CTE, athletics, or a conditioned dining space. The same concept was in place for Dining and PE to share facilities. Advantages would be that restrooms, offices, and science labs could be distributed to all buildings as opposed to being centralized in one part of campus. This would allow for cohorts to be established and limit student travel throughout campus.
  - d. Option C – Known as the Hybrid option, with an assortment of individual buildings and multiplex classroom buildings, plus a student commons. Again, this option does not include an operating kitchen, CTE, athletics, or a conditioned dining space.
  - e. Option D - This option evolved during several meetings with Staff and incorporated CTE programs, conditioned dining space, an entry plaza, full operating kitchen, multi-purpose building, separate Choir/Band building, (13) multiplex classroom buildings, and a pre-engineered structure for CTE (40 ft x 100 ft). The CTE structure would remain after all other temporary buildings were dismantled.
  - f. Option E - The current version is considered to be an ideal layout developed through continued meetings and HISD programming. Option E includes (10) large multiplex classroom buildings, (2) individual buildings for administration, a separate facility for Choir/Band, and a pre-engineered multi-purpose building (100 ft x 175 ft), that includes CTE workrooms, conditioned dining, full basketball court, and an operating portable kitchen. All buildings have centralized restrooms. The concept with the pre-engineered structure would be for it to remain after the temporary campus is removed, but the permanent use of that building has not yet been determined.
10. Preliminary budget pricing was reviewed for (4) of the (5) options, with considerations for either leased or purchased buildings.
- a. Option A was estimated to be \$8.3M with leased buildings, \$10.7M with purchased buildings.
  - b. Option B was estimated to be \$8.6M with leased buildings, \$11M with purchased buildings.
  - c. Option C was estimated to be \$7.6M with leased buildings, \$10.2M with purchased buildings.
  - d. Option E was estimated to be \$10.5M with leased buildings, \$12.3M with purchased buildings.
  - e. Option D was never formally estimated, as it continued to evolve through ongoing meetings. It was roughly estimated to be somewhere between pricing of Option B and Option E.
  - f. Option E at \$10.5 M includes all preferred items, including a permanent structure for \$1.2M. Budget pricing was developed through Heery Int. historic pricing, estimates from previous CMAR and some pricing from Aries Building Systems. It was stated that this is uncharted territory, as there is no historic pricing for providing a full school the size of Austin HS in T-Buildings. We have examples of partial to half sized campuses utilizing T-Buildings, but not a full operational campus for over 1,700 students.
  - g. HISD is focusing on the leasing option, as the leased cost is about half that of purchasing. Research into HISD temporary building history has evidenced there is little to no need for multiplex classrooms, special science labs, or custom learning centers that may not fit the needs of other campuses. Additionally, HISD's current inventory of T-Buildings are in such poor condition that towing to a new location is difficult and refurbishment costs were proven to be more than a new building in many cases.





- h. All estimates include additional cleaning of the site, parking, fences & gates, walkways, canopies, sanitary sewer, water, electrical service, communications, technology, building installation, and life safety systems. Dismantle and removal costs are also included.

11. Questions that followed T-Building layout and price presentation.

- a. C. Nash asked about the use of the land after the T-Buildings are dismantled.
  - i. Response: It is unknown at this time. The pre-engineered building that would remain would have a structure that could be reconfigured into other uses.
  - ii. Mr. Nash suggested that it could be used for future classrooms if enrollment surpasses the 2,200 capacity that Austin HS is being rebuilt to.
- b. J. Medina stated that Athletics and band are growing, as is ROTC and CTE. The ideal future use of that land would be fields that could be used for after-school practices by these groups.
- c. G. Whittle recommended that the final layout be determined based on needs and budget pricing, and only one option released for bid to vendors. He suggested that if vendors are asked to spend more time pricing multiple options, the pricing received is typically adjusted higher to compensate for the additional work of assembling multiple bids.
- d. The group commented that all options appear to be over the \$7.5M budget for Swing Space as estimated today. G. Whittle reiterated that these prices are only estimates, and final pricing could be higher or lower, but they are confident estimates are realistic. If T-Campus costs go over the Swing Space budget, there is some contingency set aside, but at some point it could be necessary to start using funds allocated to permanent construction.
- e. Questions on the terms of the lease for T-Buildings.
  - i. Response: The lease starts the day the City of Houston provides the Certificate of Occupancy. The lease period of 30-months is budget based. Actual lease ends when the buildings become unoccupied.
- f. Principal Guerrero summarized that a lot of numbers were being presented and discussions around a permanent building are ongoing, and that they would continue working with the Bond Office for the most prudent solutions.

12. Principal Guerrero thanked all visiting dignitaries, senior managers and PAT members for their full participation in the meeting.

**NEXT PAT MEETING:** Date to Be Confirmed - 4 p.m. in the Austin HS Library

**AGENDA:** To be determined

Please review the meeting minutes and submit any changes or corrections to the author. After five (5) calendar days, the minutes will be assumed to be accurate.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Grant  
Project Manager  
HISD – Construction Services  
3200 Center Street, Houston, TX 77007  
Phone: (713) 556-9257 Email: rgrant3@houstonisd.org



**Addendum to Meeting Minutes  
2012 Bond Project Advisor Team PAT Meeting #29  
Austin High School**

Several questions and concerns raised during the meeting were to be followed up and responded to afterward by HISD Construction Services and Heery Project Manager. Those responses are as follows:

1. PAT Member requested the amount spent to date on the Austin HS project.
  - a. Per the January 2017 Bond Oversight Committee report, as of December 31, 2016, the Austin HS project had committed, either through signed contracts or actual expenses, \$2,690,319.43. Major contracts have been awarded for Architectural Services, Program Management, and Enhanced Commissioning. Other expenses include Traffic Study, Property Survey, Roofing Consultation, Geotechnical Report, HazMat Consultation, Communications Infrastructure, Printing/Reprographics, and Advertising for Bid Solicitations.
2. PAT Member asked how inflation budget was established, relative to other schools that started earlier.
  - a. In establishing line item budgets for 2012 Bond Projects, several items were determined by a percent of the Construction Budget. Inflation was calculated assuming 5% inflation per year, based on the original targeted start date for projects. So, projects started later in the program did receive higher allocations for inflation than projects that began earlier.
3. PAT Member requested more information about Communication System planned for new building.
  - a. New facility will have a new PA system, with zones that can be customized for targeted communications or school All-Call.
  - b. New facility will include wall mounted TV's that can display announcements, upcoming events, or newsworthy items.
  - c. Primary source of communicating with students should be email, website, and social media.
4. PAT member requested more information about improvements to the Storm Sewer system and improved drainage around the School.
  - a. New facility will have a completely new Storm Sewer system with detention designed for 100 year flood events. All stormwater collected on the Austin HS site will be processed into the City system within the boundaries of the site, releasing nothing to the neighboring streets and neighborhoods.

**END OF ADDENDUM**