

Lopez Island School District
 PDAT Workshop 6
 4 June 2015

Lopez Island School District Improvements

TCF Architecture Project Number: 2014-012

Attendance:

Present?	Name	Contact Information
x	Brian Auckland, Lopez Island Elementary School Principal & Superintendent	bauckland@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Russel Barsh, KWIAHT / Lopez Island School Science Enrichment	rlbarsh@gmail.com
x	Kathy Booth, Lopez Island Special Services Teacher	kbooth@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Georgeana Cook, Community Representative	mycoachgmc@hotmail.com
	Bill Evans, Community Member	evanslkw@hotmail.com
x	Jennifer Everett, The Robinson Group	beverett@robinson-co.com
x	Brian Fitzgerald, TCF Architecture PLLC	brian@tcfarchitecture.com
x	Patsy Haber, LISD Board Member	Habers211@gmail.com
x	Cheryl Harlan, Lopez Island School Para-pro & Custodian	charlan@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	John Holding, LISD Board Member	john@holding.com
x	Paul S. Henriksen	paulh@centurytel.net
x	Andrew Hickman, TCF Architecture PLLC	andrew@tcfarchitecture.com
	Denny Jardine, Lopez Island School Maintenance	djardine@lopez.k12.wa.us
	Tina Katzenberger, Community Representative	tkatzenb@hotmail.com
x	Kathryn Kester, Lopez Island Secondary Teacher	kkester@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Teri Linneman, Lopez Island School Bus Driver & PSE President	tlinneman@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Kirk Robinson, The Robinson Group	bkrobinson@robinson-co.com
	Dave Sather, Lopez Island Secondary School Principal	dsather@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Carol Steckler, Community Representative	humhouse@rockisland.com
x	Lorri Swanson, Lopez Island Elementary School Teacher	lswanson@lopez.k12.wa.us
x	Kirman Taylor, Community Representative	kirmant@gmail.com

Distribution: Attendees via LISD PDAT Google Drive.

Action Items:

Item #	Topics/Discussions	Discussions/Action/Status/Follow-up
1	Introduction	<p>A John Holding (JH) opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He noted that the goal of this workshop is to set the Schematic Design scope. Hopefully the board will accept the recommendation at the June Board Meeting.</p> <p>B Review of last workshop which had 3 versions – Full Buildout, Medium Buildout, Light Buildout. Discussion today will revolve around a revised version of the Light Buildout. He noted that construction costs are rising and that this impacts the project even though it remains over a year away from construction beginning. With that, he believes that we are close to a scope that matches the funding. The plan is to be in the ballpark with contingencies in place.</p> <p>C Tonight we will look at a base with options / alternates – what can we give up and what do we want to add in to that base? As previously discussed, the line item costs will surprise you, but these are realistic based on school construction costs which are publicly bid and pay prevailing wages as defined by the state.</p> <p>D From the feedback generated at workshop 5 the design team and school leadership have met to generate what will be presented at Scenario ‘C’. Decisions made tonight will likely lead to Scenario ‘D’.</p> <p>E Kathryn Kester (KK) asked about alternates – additive / deductive. Kirk Robinson answered that all of the options to be discussed today will be additive to a base project. At bid time there will likely be a base scope to be bid and several alternates. Brian Fitzgerald (BF) added that tonight they are called design options because they may or may not work eventually as alternate bids. Tonight is about tailoring a scope by prioritizing components of work. There is a long list of options.</p> <p>F JH stated that the Scenario ‘C’, without any options, looks to add up to the available project budget. BF added that Scenarios ‘A’ and ‘B’ were also developed since the last workshop and both of them exceeded the budget, which led to what is being discussed here.</p> <p>G JH added that the plan remains to seek additional earmark funding (separate from OSPI matching funds) from the Lopez legislators similar to what was successfully procured at Orcas and San Juan Islands.</p> <p>H JH reminded everyone of the board priorities for this bond project: keep the facility running and safe, manage operating costs, enhance educational opportunities, enhance Lopez Island School as a school of choice.</p>
2	Scenario ‘C’ Discussion	<p>A BF reviewed the workshop 5 discussions and prioritization efforts. He went over the process of creating the scenarios which were then tested against the budget while addressing the priorities. Scenario ‘C’ seems to meet the priorities identified at workshop 5 and is within budget.</p> <p>B BF presented the site plan and the floor plan boards and explained that the pull-off sketches illustrated additional options that add cost beyond the base scenario. He then went through the floor plan to describe what was included in the base scope. He added that most of the sitework, except what is required to maintain the functions of the school, is listed as optional at this point. An example of what he hoped to discuss was the combined secondary office – it is shown within the base scope but is that where it belongs. The colors on the boards indicate the level of work with the lightest colors indicating light work, green medium, orange heavy work.</p> <p>C A key outcome of workshop 5 was that the fully combined administration area is no longer an option based on the feedback received. Scenario ‘C’ still looks to combine the secondary and LISD offices to create some efficiencies. With this revision other possibilities came to light. The front door is shown remaining in its current location on the west side of the building. The instructional shop is most</p>

		<p>cost effective in its current location, however, due to issues raised at the last meeting, a vestibule has been added as well as additional acoustic separation. It is understood that programmatically the location south of the secondary wing is the preferred location and should additional funding be secured, that may be a possibility. A question was asked regarding why the shop was not being moved to the Quonset building. BF answered that the costs to make that change were very high due to requirements of shop spaces and the level of work that would be required to bring that existing building up to code and safety levels.</p> <p>D BF continued through the balance of the floor plan, pointing out the base and significant optional items shown. JH reminded everyone that on the state funding side the match from OSPI only covers \$0.20 per \$1 due to Lopez Island being a property rich (as in assessed value) school district in the state’s view.</p> <p>E Patsy Haber (PH) asked if the Special Services remained the same in this scenario. The answer was yes. Paul Henriksen (PaulH) noted that the PIP rooms are very small and bigger spaces would be appreciated. Brian Auckland (BA) responded that those rooms served a specific therapeutic use and that with the one-way mirror glazing allowed observation as configured.</p> <p>F JH noted that a recent study of the building indicated that there were not fundamental seismic issues to address with the structure, which is a positive.</p> <p>G A committee member stated that a visual connection from the reception to the building entry is important.</p> <p>H JH noted that strategic additional power and projectors (including the infrastructure) for the classrooms was included in the base scope.</p> <p>I A question was asked whether the offices in the two southern secondary classrooms were being removed. Currently there would be no change in those rooms.</p> <p>J Centralized bus loading was brought up. BF answered that with the fully combined administration area gone the combined bus loading / unloading was also dropped. A follow up was asked regarding the reconfiguration of the elementary parking lot to address bus safety. BF answered that the elementary area had been looked at and that an option is listed for that.</p> <p>K BF added further information regarding the current construction economy and its similarity to what occurred in 2004-5 and its impact on decision making. The recent recession caused many tradesmen and contracting companies to seek other types of employment or close their doors – the volume of capable bidders has not fully returned. TCF has seen variance in recent bid results over the past several weeks with work in Thurston County and Wenatchee bidding close to design team estimates while work in Seattle was 20% higher than anticipated. BK added that from 2004 to 2008 construction costs rose 49%. They dropped somewhat during the recession but now are rising again. 85-90% of this project will be sub-contracted. The lack of labor mentioned adds additional risk for contractors and they add overhead to their bids to compensate for the increased risk. Reality is that there is a dearth of qualified crews to perform many types of labor. Robinson and the design team are doing their best to mitigate. Another example, to assist in understanding public work construction costs was presented by Kirk listing the prevailing wage rates for several trades and noting that it is very different than the costs for residential construction. In the end the goal is to get good bid coverage as well as high quality workmanship. Jennifer Everett (JE) added that she and Kirk are working hard for the school district to make this project successful. BF closed the discussion on costs by pointing out that there will be positives that result from this project. JH added that the last major project undertaken by the district was over</p>
--	--	---

		budget. This process is more protective and we will be able to meet the bond's goals.
3	Options and Cost Estimate Discussion	<p>A BF introduced the spreadsheet listing the base scope as well as all of the alternates and there projected raw (sub-contractor bid) costs. KP added that all of the overhead and profit, contingencies, etc. are together at the bottom of the spreadsheet and add another 25% or so to the project. Once the indirect costs of design and agency fees, sales tax, furnishings and equipment, testing, etc. are added each line item is multiplied by about 1.7x. This is impacted somewhat by also figuring in OSPI state match funding but that is the general outcome of each line item.</p> <p>B JH said that he hopes to be able to present the request for earmark funding to lawmakers in July once they have completed their continuing work in Olympia and he understands the need to know as soon as possible while also knowing the process and how to navigate.</p> <p>C Someone asked if the energy savings cost for LED lighting versus what is proposed could be calculated. JH estimated that it was in the range of \$25-30,000 per year.</p> <p>D Someone pointed out that the existing playground was a concern to risk management. Is that addressed here? Answer – only the site costs, not equipment costs.</p> <p>E Options I1a and I1b regarding the gym HVAC were brought up. What is repair? Replacement of portions of the system that will keep it operating beyond the 5-10 year window when if not addressed it would be expected to fail.</p> <p>F Kathy Booth (KB) pointed out that her office does not have any ventilation.</p> <p>G KK asked if the scope of the security camera system estimated could be quantified. TCF to check with Hargis (electrical and communications engineers).</p> <p>H KK asked if the classroom projectors included speakers. This would be necessary for playing movies. Could sound system speakers be used for both the audio enhancement and the projector? KB said that they had purchased some classroom audio enhancement packages for \$350/ea. JH indicated that LISD may look into acquiring these outside of the contract should that be the necessary. A committee member noted that the audio has been shown to be very effective in the learning environment.</p> <p>I Lorri Swanson (LS) thought that the classroom sinks had previously been included within the base scope. BF answered that we were trying to include them and if they are a priority those efforts would continue.</p> <p>J Items I17-20 dealing with infrastructure continue to be placeholders as investigation of existing systems continues.</p> <p>K Regarding the Multi-Purpose Room lighting option, efforts are being made to keep the existing lighting turned off as much as possible currently in that room.</p> <p>M KR went through the overview of the sub-totals and totals as well as the various fixed and variable costs. Kirman Taylor (KT) noticed that they did not total 1.7x. Kirk answered that it was in the neighborhood of 1.7x – 1.6x</p> <p>N Georgeana Cook (GC) asked if there remained the possibility of a technology levy and if yes could that offset some costs here – perhaps \$150,000. The answer was that although that remains a possibility it does not work well with this project's timeline. JH noted that it should remain on the table.</p> <p>O BF asked that everyone look at what was and was not included that they deemed to be important and offer ideas for discussion. JH suggested that we go around the table and for each person to give their sense of what has been presented. BF added big or small – feedback is important.</p> <p>P PaulH indicated that it would be helpful to have a summary of the order of dominos that lead to various conclusions.</p>

		<p>R The secondary office, budgeted at \$172000 looks like an area for potential savings. Also the elementary office at \$218000. A comment was made that the elementary office costs were skewed by the inclusion of the restrooms within that cost but that both would be looked at for potential savings and efficiencies.</p> <p>S The covered connection between buildings was brought up as a non-essential item that could be eliminated in favor of potentially more important options – perhaps classroom sinks.</p> <p>T The \$98000 to remodel the existing Quonset building for fitness / weight training was also brought up.</p> <p>U These four items were then looked at in greater detail. Carol Bangi (CB) brought up the previous meeting’s discussion for a secure entrance and asked how that was accommodated in Scenario ‘C’. JH answered that without the fully combined office that approach was lessened. BF answered that it was possible to address, but at additional cost. CB knows that the community has talked about safety. JH commented that Scenario ‘C’ is not as secure as some of the earlier scenarios. GC asked if the administration could be reduced to cover the cost of classroom sinks. BF answered that we could take another look with a goal of bringing the cost to below \$100,000. JH added that it remains on the table to not combine those two offices. CB said that if there are operational savings then the combination office is to the benefit of the school. JH answered that yes, there would be less cost long term. BA noted that it provides both a safety and efficiency benefit, but a less cost alternative should be explored. JH noted that the bond had promised improved security / safety. BA noted that the security consultant had pointed out that the biggest deficiency is exterior lighting. A line item to provide security lighting (not pole parking lot lighting) was added. Russel Barsh (RB) asked that it be dark sky compliant. At the elementary building CB felt that the additional square footage at the kitchen was worth the cost. LS added that there is a need for a family restroom at the multi-purpose room area. A question was asked about the elimination of the transportation office to accommodate the restrooms. Andrew Hickman (AH) answered that space had been allotted at secondary office suite to accommodate the transportation office functions. KK noted that the covered walk between buildings could be traded for many things – classrooms sinks, casework, etc. KK added that exterior security doors should be included. Lights at the building exterior need to be added in for safety and security. KB noted that in her experience a kindergarten toilet room is important. GC asked about a less cost fitness / weight room solution – can \$50,000 be saved? BF noted that the work did not need to be included in the project. PH asked if fitness could be housed at Culinary Classroom. CB answered that following discussions in the past with Jeanna that was not possible. GC noted that the Culinary Classroom should be ‘reserved’ even if culinary were moved or eliminated to serve a CTE purpose. JH noted that a larger kitchen may allow for instructional space. BA noted that with the discussed adjustments it should open up opportunities. GC said that a decision on the kitchen was key to making other decisions which rely upon that one. KT asked if students could do the work at the Quonset in lieu of having it done in the project. PaulH questioned the need for a larger kitchen – could 300 square feet make that much difference? CB answered that she believes it does. PaulH favored less cost at the administration area.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Wrap up</p>	<p>A BF noted that it was a good idea if the design team were not to touch the Quonset building.</p>

		<p>B JH pointed out that there are some very good ideas on the table – security, lighting, classroom sinks. BF added simplify administration, don't touch Quonset building, proceed at this time with larger kitchen / elementary office reconfiguration.</p> <p>C BF asked if we could meet next Thursday 6/11 with a revised plan and estimate at 4pm? PaulH asked if the spreadsheet could be emailed out. JH indicated that the detailed numbers were for internal use only, not for public consumption at this point. BF indicated that the next meeting would have a revised floor plan and accompanying summary. JH will work with PaulH to keep him informed since he is unable to make next Thursday's meeting.</p> <p>D GC noted that at some point the PDAT would need to make a recommendation as a whole. PaulH asked about community input and board approval timeline. JH indicated that the community would be invited for input after the board approved the preliminary design and budget. JH added that there is a tight frame to set the scope within the overall schedule.</p> <p>E JH noted his appreciation of everyone's work tonight. Great ideas were shared to help get the balance right. PH asked that a closer look be taken regarding safety – bus safety at elementary, bus safety (wider sidewalks) at secondary. JH asked that any additional comments be sent to him as the point person. BF added his thanks for all of the hard work.</p>
--	--	--

Minutes by Andrew Hickman, TCF Architecture, PLLC

END OF MEETING MINUTES

If any information contained in these minutes does not meet with your understanding, please provide written comments stating any differences, or exceptions taken, to TCF Architecture PLLC prior to the next meeting. Revisions and clarifications to these notes will be formally made at the following meeting. In the event no exceptions are taken within one calendar week, TCF Architecture will assume that these minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the meeting.

(Note: Follow-up information or status updates, not specifically discussed at the meeting, may be included herein and identified as such.)