

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

MEETING #: 23

**LOCATION: Austin High School** 

**DATE / TIME: July 21, 2016** 

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

` 🗸	Steve Guerrero	Principal	✓	Chris Fields	Heery/HISD
	Yadira Banuelos	Alumni Class Pres.	✓	Georgianne Sigler	Visitor
<b>√</b>	Covey Nash	Alumni	<b>✓</b>	Octavio Cantu	ERO Architects
	Cruz Casiano	Teacher CTE Fam.	✓	Tim Johnson	Teacher Science
<b>√</b>	Rosemary Grant	Heery/HISD	✓	Joe Nelson	Alumni
<b>√</b>	Marsha Eckerman	Alumni		C. Guerrero	Teacher CTE Ag
	Albert Wong	Heery/HISD	✓	Dan Bankhead	HISD Mgr. Design
<b>✓</b>	Sylvia Wood	<b>HISD Communication</b>		Guadalupe Saldivar	SPED Teacher Asst.
<b>√</b>	Angelita Henry	Parent/Alumni		Raul Asoy	SPED Chair
✓	Tania Roman	Student/Alumni		Chris Williams	Teacher History
	Jacque Royce	Alumni	<b>√</b>	Mark Kerrissey	Teacher History
	Catherine Smith	Teacher CTE Data		Jorge Medina	Assistant Principal
	Eli Ochoa	ERO Architects		Theresa M. Guerra	Registrar
	Eric Ford	HISD Architect		Jose Saenz	Teacher History
	Erica Deakins	HISD Director	✓	Paul Gloria	Community Neighbor
	Tierra Harris	Parent/Alumni		Mark Janicek	Teacher CTE Fam.
<b>√</b>	Luis Landa	HISD AP	✓	Victor Trevino	Teacher Soc. Studies
<b>√</b>	Daniel Maldonado	Visitor		Holly Huffman	<b>HISD Communication</b>
<b>√</b>	Jason Bernal	HISD CSO	✓	Gary Whittle	Heery/HISD
✓	James Galvan	Visitor	✓	Maria Henry	Visitor
✓	Alexander Medina	Visitor			

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of the meeting was to meet with Project Advisory Team to update them on the

latest Austin HS site/floor plan design layouts and studies of the new main entrance area.

AGENDA: See attached



## DISCUSSION:

1. Principal Guerrero welcomed everyone and introduced Jason Bernal, Chief Support Officer for Austin HS. Principal Guerrero introduced the members of the Project Advisory Team (PAT) and Project Manager, Rosemary Grant handed out the most current handbook (also posted on HISD website) to those members who were present and requested the signature page be completed and returned to her. PAT members with voting power are:

Angelia Henry
Catherine Smith
Covey Nash
Cruz Casiano
Dr. Raul Asoy
Jacque Royce
Joe Nelson

Mark Kerrissey Marsha Eckerman Steve Guerrero Tania Roman Tim Johnson Victor Trevino Yadira Banuelos

- 2. All visitors and PAT members were reminded to sign the attendance sheet.
- 3. Grant introduced Dan Bankhead, HISD General Manager-Design, who facilitated the PowerPoint presentation on the Construction Budget slide for Austin H.S. Mr. Bankhead gave an overview of the progress of the 2012 HISD Bond Program and then proceeded to present the established budget for the Austin HS project.
  - a. Mr. Bankhead described the original project budget of \$68,429,000 and how monies were allocated for the specific costs of the project: construction, contingencies, management fees, soft costs ( testing, geotech, surveys, printing and A/E), inflation reserves (for rainy day scenarios), costs of furnishings, technology, and swing space.
  - b. Before HISD approved supplemental funding, inflation/reserves were transferred to the initial construction budget of \$39.8 million increasing the construction budget to \$47.4.
  - c. The approved supplemental funding of \$11,161,679 further increased construction to roughly \$52 million, construction contingency to \$3.9 million, and swing space to \$7.5 million. The overall program budget became \$79.5 million. The swing space line item will be used to provide a temporary building campus for students during construction.
- 4. A discussion of the presentation ensued with the following questions/answers.
  - a. Tim Johnson asked about the cost of temporary buildings. Mr. Bankhead responded that costs can run \$110K to \$150K per temporary building plus additional funding for permitting, walkways, canopies, site work, etc., along with the dismantling and removal of the temporary campus.
  - b. Joe Nelson asked about the student capacity in the classrooms and if science classrooms would be included in the temporary buildings. Mr. Bankhead responded the basic building has two (2) classrooms, each with a capacity of 24 to 28 students with up to 30 students in each classroom. He explained the temporary buildings are extremely flexible, science classes will be included, and described an example of one with a mock hospital suite to teach and test phlebotomists.
  - c. Mark Kerrissey questioned which budget the CMAR fee would come from; Mr. Bankhead replied from the construction budget. Mr. Kerrissey asked how much would be left over for the subcontractors after the CMAR was paid. Mr. Bankhead replied all the trade bids, material vendors



- and other building costs are all part of the CMAR'S Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) one source for contracting which provides the logistics for "it takes an army of people".
- d. Covey Nash asked if all the inflation/reserves had been allocated to construction. Mr. Bankhead said yes, that money has been moved to the construction budget. He did state that a separate owner's contingency of \$3.9 million remains.
- e. Mr. Trevino asked exactly how much is it per T-Building, an amount he has been requesting for several months but has not yet received.
- f. Victor Trevino further commented that his calculations yielded a temporary campus of forty (40) buildings if each classroom has a capacity of twenty-five (25) students, if current enrollment holds, that even at the worst case of \$150K per building, it would be a cost of \$6 million, not \$7.5 as budgeted. He questioned: "Is it fair to say that we are estimating the budget as the number seems higher than necessary?" Mr. Bankhead replied that although the numbers are preliminary, one must consider costs associated with administrative, dining, athletics/P.E. and other non-classroom buildings.
- g. Mr. Trevino said that he believes the costs are exaggerated. Mr. Bankhead replied that this estimated budget reflects district's experience with the additional costs for detention, fire roads, etc., and are reasonable for a school of this size and complexity. He re-emphasized the \$79.5 million stays at Austin. Mr. Trevino said he would like to see the actual numbers. Stating "We have a contingency but it seems that we are allowing additional contingency with every single line item."

  Mr. Bankhead replied that the district is comfortable with the budget as presented.
- h. Marsha Eckerman challenged Mr. Trevino on why he wanted to see the information and that not everyone on the PAT feels the way he does. Mr. Trevino replied that this is tax-payer' money. Covey Nash responded that this is bond money. Principal Guerrero suggested this item be tabled and get back to it as there are other items on the agenda to discuss. He is more concerned how students will be impacted and how the instructional program will look like across the street. He will be glad to bring the topic back once all the information being requested is available.
- i. Chief Support Officer, Jason Bernal, interjected that he has participated in many PAT meetings and stated that everything presented can be nitpicked or the group can move forward. He stated that arguments that aren't productive can stop progress.
- 5. Mark Kerrissey asked what would by the time frame for the swing space. At this time, it is assumed that swing space will be needed for approximately 30 months.
- 6. Grant added with the PAT paperwork structure, there is always the opportunity to question the meeting minutes which has occurred with the minutes being corrected and redistributed as revised.
- 7. Architect Octavio Cantu opened the second Agenda topic of the PowerPoint presentation that illustrated three (3) additional exterior elevation alternative options for the Jefferson Street Entrance to Austin HS. Option A was originally selected, but some PAT members had questions/comments and it made ERO take a step back and reevaluate the entrance elevation.
  - a. Option A elevation with an extended roof overhang had been selected earlier and has been shown in several presentations.
  - b. Option B elevation is more traditional, reflecting elements of the Dumble Street entrance in smaller scale and incorporating arches with plaster finish that work with the entrance. There will be no metal panels. Two (2) of the arches are slotted with sun shades between face of the arch and the building face.



- c. Option C elevation is similar to Option B with similar windows and arches, however the thin brick on the tilt wall extends full height to roof line.
- d. Option D is similar to Option C elevation as it has the same entry, thin brick on the tilt wall and same arches as Options B and C but with narrow windows and built out ribbing between the windows and also on the Lockwood St. elevation. The windows will be above the top of bleachers.
- e. The building sits higher and the plaza at the corner of Jefferson and Lockwood Streets will obscure steps and ramps necessary to get to the finished elevation. Chris Fields questioned if this was also part of Option A to which Mr. Cantu affirmed it was.
- f. After additional questioning and discussion: Options A and B were eliminated and Options C and D were voted upon with the voting PAT members selecting Option C by a vote of 6 to 3.
- 8. Additional discussions were generated by the illustrated elevations.
  - a. Mr. Fields questioned if the windows extend from the second to third floors. Mr. Cantu answered that from the outside it will appear like one window, but it will be spandrel. Depending on the room, if it lends itself, it will be a window from finish floor to ceiling, and if not, it will be spandrel. [Spandrel is a panel used between windows, filled with opaque glass, where it is necessary to hide the edges of floor slabs and ceiling details.]
  - b. There are no windows on Lockwood St. side as it is the northern exposure with no real direct sunlight.
  - Mr. Fields asked if we go with Option D, will we see the ribbed element on Lockwood St. as it adds
    a little character to that blank canvas. Grant asked if that same element could be placed on Option
    C. Response to both was no.
  - d. Mr. Trevino expressed dislike of the sign marque and asked if the Stephen F. Austin name could be placed on top of the entrance tower. Mr. Cantu said that he will look into it.
  - e. Metal panels have been replaced by plaster and will be a cream or buff color.
  - f. Mr. Cantu stated that all options are within a similar cost range.
  - g. Paul Gloria commented about his concern with the width of Jefferson Street and the traffic. Mr. Cantu said that the building was set back as much as possible as the street was not able to be widened. It will give the appearance of a wider Jefferson Street.
  - h. Mr. Trevino questioned the Jefferson St. entrance versus Dumble St., the designed parking in front of the new entrance, and use of the black top lot between the building and field as visitor parking. Covey Nash asked, "How many people or days out of the year do you expect for that parking lot to be used? But on the other hand, the new parking lot will be used for plays and any other events that might happen during the year." Mr. Trevino did say that he liked what ERO had done to the front of the building as well.
  - i. Ms. Grant interjected that we appreciate Mr. Trevino's comments however the building footprint is designed and the meeting needs to stay focused on the agenda. Mr. Trevino commented, "With all due respect, I was told by a former HISD Chief that everything is still on the table." Grant replied that the building has been designed and the team is moving forward with 60% construction documentation, the next phase is 100% completion and the project is past the point of redesign. To further elaborate how far along the project is, Mr. Bankhead questioned the number of sheets in a building plan and Mr. Cantu responded that for a project of this size, there will be about 300 sheets and specifications will be split into two volumes. Architectural, civil, food service, landscape, and structural in volume 1 and MEP in volume 2.
  - j. In response to Mr. Trevino's parking comments, Tanya Roman reminded everyone that at prior PAT meetings, members listened to the traffic consultant and the need for service to the cafeteria, CTE and maritime program. Tania continued, "We weren't going to be able to accommodate the traffic in



that area if there were 2-3 big trucks in that area. We listened to the professionals and we made our decision not to go with this option. I know that some of these things are not what we wanted, but it is a compromise and we just need to keep moving forward."

- k. Mr. Nash asked about a canopy and Octavio indicated on Option B that the canopy is shown on the Lockwood St. side.
- 9. What to expect at the next PAT Meeting.
  - a. Interior color board presentation of two (2) color palettes.
  - b. Rendering of the Lockwood St. elevation.
- 10. Action items.
  - a. Hand out PAT handbook and secure signatures from those absent at this meeting.
- 11. Future Tentative PAT Meeting Dates will be discussed at the next meeting.
  - a. August 18, 2016
  - b. September 15, 2016
  - c. October 20, 2016
  - d. November 17, 2016
  - e. December 15, 2016
- 12. The following questions were submitted to the HISD Bond Department on July 28, 2016 and August 1, 2016.
- Q1) Please post the Austin HS budget slide, which was presented to the Austin PAT, to the HISD Bond website. This critical, yet positive piece of information, will allow us to inform the East End Community members who were unable to attend the PAT Meeting.
  - A1) The architectural PowerPoint Presentation was posted 8/01/16. The Budget PowerPoint presentation was posted 8-10-16 upon notification that these slides were missing
- Q2) The July 26, 2016 Bond Oversight Committee Report indicates that Austin's "Supplemental Funding" is \$11,161,679. Is this a firm commitment by the District to as funds Austin HS will receive?
- A2) Yes, the \$11,161,679 in Supplemental Funding has been set aside specifically for Austin High School.
- Q3) The Bond Department updated the Austin Building Program website on July 26, 2016; however, the schedule was not updated to reflect the proposed schedule. Also, is it the intention of HISD to move the school into T-buildings and start demolition this coming January? Please advise.
  - A3) The schedule shown on the Bond website is the original project schedule. The schedule has since been revised to reflect the PAT's desires to relocate students into temporary buildings on site during the Summer of 2017. Projects of this magnitude typically take 30 to 44 months to complete from the start of mobilization to final completion.



- Q4) Please furnish the email addresses of all voting PAT members and also the non-voting members to all parties. Also add the HISD administration staff like Ms. Wood. I do not have Mr. Nash or Mr. Nelson's emails, for example.
- A4) The email addresses of present members and attendees can be found on the PAT Member sign in sheet and are also included in this email.
- Q5) Please confirm the targeted submittal date of the 60% Construction Documents.
- A5) ERO Architects plans to submit the 60% Construction Document set to Houston ISD during the week of August 8, 2016.
- Q6) Will students have lockers in the new Austin High School?
  - A6) No, students will not have lockers in the new Austin High School.
- Q7) Milby High School has been under construction for two years. I believe schools should not take more than 2 years to build if managed correctly.
  - A7) High schools, specifically ones like Milby High School that involve constrained sites, large scale demolition, phasing, challenging renovations, budgetary restrictions, and underground constraints such as aquifers, asbestos containing pipe, concrete and more will take 30 to 44 months on average to complete...sometimes up to 48 months. Milby is on track to finish in less than 40 months, and in pace to complete 6 months ahead of schedule.
- Q8) Is Austin High School going to negotiate a construction contract after the building is torn down?
  - A8) At this time, HISD intends on having one contract with one contractor. This contractor will contract with other subcontractors to perform the asbestos abatement, demolition and construction of Austin High School.
- Q9) Has the District hired a separate demolition company to tear down Austin, or is that a responsibility of the selected Construction Manager At Risk?
  - A9) See A8 above.
- Q10) Does the District have a demolition time line for Austin? If not met, are there penalties?
  - A10) Austin High School will be demolished per the selected contractor's schedule and phasing plan. There are penalties assessed by HISD related to post-Substantial Completion delays.
- Q11) Will Austin share in the salvage value?
  - A11) HISD has the first right to salvage on equipment and electrical equipment. Please make sure that once are disconnected they need to cover and call ask 48 hours in advance. The contractor need to be responsible for their actions. HISD will keep the equipment and electrical equipment such as circuit breakers, transformers keep the cover closed, switchboards keep the



covers closed (do not remove the circuit breakers), and panel boards keep the cover closed. Always keep the equipment in a clean, dry place and cover the equipment not to get wet.

Any and all questions submitted to the HISD Bond Department post August 1, 2016 will be included in next month's PAT Meeting Minutes.

NEXT PAT MEETING: Thursday, August 18, 2016 @ 4:00 p.m., Austin HS Library

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