

MINUTES OF THE  
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING  
of the Board of Education  
Riverside School District No.96  
held on Tuesday, February 16, 2010  
at Ames Elementary School  
Riverside, Illinois

Committee chair Giles McCarthy called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Present: Mr. Giles McCarthy, Mrs. Mary Stimming and Mrs. Hareena Wakely

Absent: None

Also Present: Board Members Mary Ellen Meindl and Jennifer Leimberer; Supt. Jonathan Lamberson; District 96 Director of Maintenance Bill Radtke; Architect Chris English from Concept 3 Architects; and members of the Central School PTO.

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss:

- a. Architect's presentation of bid results and the process for summer 2010 Life Safety and Landscape projects at Ames, Hollywood, Hauser and Central Schools.
- b. Hauser Lift.
- c. Parameters for planning for future facility improvements.

There were no comments from the public.

- a. Architect's presentation of bid results.

Architect Chris English from Concept 3 Architects noted that 17 bids were submitted to the District on February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 for projects scheduled for completion during the summer of 2010. He stated that the scope of work includes outstanding Life Safety work at Ames and Hollywood schools; the redevelopment of the front yard hardscape/landscape at Hollywood and Hauser; the installation of security locksets on the classroom doors at Ames School; and the addition of a vestibule at Hauser's front entrance on Woodside Road. FBG Corporation located in Elmhurst, Illinois submitted the lowest bid at \$580,057 to complete these projects. Mr. English remarked that due to current economic conditions all bids received were well below the estimated project budget of \$1,000,000. FBG Corporation is an experienced school construction contractor that has worked with Concept 3 Architects in the past and Mr. English highly recommended their services.

Even though all bids submitted were below the estimated \$1,000,000 budget, a question arose regarding what would account for the variety of bid amounts received that ranged from \$580,057 to \$954,000. Mr. English noted profit and overhead costs as factors that affected the variety of bids received.

If FBG Corporation is selected, a Committee member inquired whether the company would assign a project manager to be on site. Mr. English commented that FBG would probably assign a rotating project superintendent who would visit the site regularly and that he will visit the District most days to monitor construction progress. He also remarked that Concept 3 will hold weekly job meetings to keep abreast of any potential construction issues.

Discussion transpired regarding the project payment schedule. Mr. English stated that a progress payment schedule will be established, and confirmed that no funds will be paid to the contractor prior to construction.

Conversation took place regarding the building permit process. Mr. English remarked that building permits for school construction are issued by the Regional Office of Education rather than the municipality. He noted that Concept 3 Architects will prepare the required permit documentation for Board approval at an upcoming meeting.

A committee member inquired whether there are any outstanding issues with the Village of Riverside and/or the Village of Brookfield that will impede construction. Mr. English remarked that he does not foresee any issues that will delay construction because both villages have been apprised of the work that is being done. He noted that the Village of Riverside is aware that the hardscape/landscape project at Hauser stops behind the Village set-back line. Discussion transpired regarding how the "gap area" between where the Hauser property line ends and the Village property line begins will be addressed. Supt. Lamberson commented that the Village of Riverside will allow the District to fill-in the gap area with grass and hardscape in a manner that is aesthetically pleasing provided that Village standard aggregate material is used. Mr. English noted that filling in the gap area will be handled via field change order at additional cost because this element is not addressed in the existing project plans. Mr. English also noted that the Village of Brookfield has given approval for the District's contractor to replace the sidewalk in front of Hollywood School.

A question arose regarding who is responsible to verify that the District is in compliance following completion of the Life Safety work. Mr. English remarked that Concept 3 will manage this process for District 96 and will prepare the required certificates of compliance for approval by the Regional Office of Education. Supt. Lamberson also remarked that Concept 3 Architects will indicate when all Life Safety work identified in the 10-year Life Safety Review has been successfully addressed and that District 96 is in full compliance.

Mr. English summarized the scope of work at each school as follows:

**Ames School**

- Alterations to the railings at the school's two main staircases and at the steps going down to the gym.
- Close fire openings.
- Ventilation improvement issues.
- Minor mechanical plumbing upgrades (such as back flow preventers and flush valves).
- Alternate Bid - Installation of security locksets on classroom doors.

**Hauser**

- Redevelopment of the front yard.
- Alternate Bid - Vestibule - per drawings previously submitted.

**Hollywood**

- Address basic fire safety separation issues.
- Replace exterior gym door that is not working.
- Ventilation improvement issues.

- Minor mechanical plumbing upgrades (such as back flow preventers and flush valves)
- Redevelopment of the front yard.

### **Central**

- Redevelopment of Central playground.

Following this presentation, a motion was made by Mrs. Wakely, supported by Mrs. Stimming, and unanimously approved by the Committee, that the Building Committee recommend approval of the 5 bids as itemized by FBG Corporation and as recommended by Concept 3 Architects to the full Board later this evening.

Supt. Lamberson thanked the Committee for taking this action. He also thanked Mr. English and Concept 3 Architects for their efforts on behalf of District 96. He noted that many District's go out to bid when contractors have already begun to fill up their summer work schedules and are forced to pay a premium to get the work done. He noted that by seeking bids early in the year Concept 3 helped the District attract a sufficient number of bidders to drive the price down.

A question arose regarding whether construction activities would prevent summer school from taking place at Hollywood School. Supt. Lamberson noted that construction at Hollywood would prevent the school from being used for summer school and that the District Leadership Team is currently discussing the best location for this year's program.

Dialogue took place regarding the extent of excavation that will be required to build the vestibule at Hauser. It was noted that footings and foundations will be poured below the frost line. In light of this, a Committee member expressed a desire for the District to take a proactive approach to assure that proper security and signage is installed around the construction site for student safety.

Supt. Lamberson asked Committee members to forward their ideas or suggestions regarding a dedication plaque for the Hauser vestibule to him.

### **b. Hauser Lift**

Discussion took place regarding the broken lift at Hauser and whether the solution currently in place to transport students between floors is optimal.

Dr. Lamberson noted that Hauser has 2 permanent lifts. One lift is functional and can transport students to the school's mezzanine level to access the art room, exercise room, and the auditorium. The other lift located at the north end of the school (near the LRC) is broken. It was installed approximately 40 years ago and accessed the school's 3 floors. Mr. Radtke commented that this lift has been repaired repeatedly in recent years and that he would prefer to replace it instead of continuing to repair it. He noted that through the combined use of the working lift to the mezzanine level and a portable lift to the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor assistance transporting students can be provided if necessary.

A question arose regarding how often a lift has been required at Hauser in the past couple of years. It was noted that a lift has not been needed very often in recent years and that the portable lift was last used in October 2009.

Dr. Lamberson presented a range of options regarding the lift for the Committee's

consideration:

- **Option 1:** Remove the old lift and replace it with a new, larger capacity lift.
- **Option 2:** Repair the current lift that has cracks in the infrastructure tubing. Estimated cost: \$16,500. Continued repairs are likely. Only one vendor can service the existing lift.
- **Option 3:** Leave the existing broken lift in place but continue use of a portable lift system.
- **Option 4:** Remove the broken lift and continue use of a portable lift system.

Supt. Lamberson expressed his preference that the permanent lift be replaced. He noted that Hauser is the only District 96 school that has a permanent lift and that the elementary schools are required to use a portable lift if the need arises. If the Committee opted for a portable lift solution at Hauser it would be in keeping with the other District 96 schools.

Dialogue took place regarding the advantages and disadvantages of replacing the permanent lift at Hauser versus buying a second portable lift to be used District-wide as needed.

A Committee member asked “how” students may be adversely affected by using a portable lift as opposed to a permanent lift. Being “jostled around” by the portable lift and getting to class a few minutes late were noted as potential adverse affects. A Committee member expressed interest in replacing the permanent lift in an effort to offer as much support as possible to students in need.

Following this discussion, Committee members unanimously agreed that Hauser’s existing broken lift should not be repaired. The Committee also asked Supt. Lamberson to provide a list of permanent lift and portable lift costs from a variety of vendors for their consideration.

Dr. Lamberson and Mr. Radtke addressed the Committee regarding a situation that has developed with Hauser’s auditorium chairs. Mr. Radtke noted that several years ago all of Hauser’s auditorium chairs were fitted with a cast iron folding mechanism that is now deteriorating. The company that provided the deteriorating folding mechanism has gone out of business and it is very difficult to find replacement parts. In recent years, rows of Hauser balcony chairs have been replaced with a similar looking but higher quality chair. As the rows of old chairs have been removed, viable chairs have been salvaged for parts to repair chairs that break on the main level. Mr. Radtke noted that chairs are breaking at an increasing rate and he would like to replace all of the auditorium chairs on the main level with the higher quality model. An initial price quote of \$175.00 per chair, installed has been received. An estimated total cost to replace all chairs on the main level is approximately \$70,000.

Supt. Lamberson remarked that he has seen auditorium chairs collapse on senior citizens during graduation and that the situation is not only dangerous but it presents a liability issue for the District. He wanted to make the Committee aware of the situation this evening and stated he hopes to provide a recommendation regarding auditorium chair replacement to the Finance Committee in March.

c. Parameters for planning for future facility improvements.

Dr. Lamberson remarked that the District will complete its current Life Safety

requirements in the summer of 2011. With these projects complete the District will be able to focus on other capital improvement projects that will help District 96 schools be instructionally ready for the next few decades.

Mr. McCarthy commented that although the District currently finds itself in an envious financial position, he has asked Dr. Lamberson to speak with a bond professional and to research grant funding that might be available for capital projects. Supt. Lamberson noted that a fiscal planning presentation will be given at the Finance Committee meeting in March.

Committee members unanimously agreed that they do not consider a tax referendum a viable funding source for upcoming capital improvement projects.

Discussion transpired regarding the need to develop a capital projects priority list and an over-arching mission statement containing the criteria a project must meet in order to be added to the priority list.

A Committee member expressed interest in having two priority lists: a short-term priority list to address immediate “cosmetic” improvements to create a more pleasing learning environment for students, such as painting and replacing worn carpet; and a long-term priority list to address more costly projects.

A Committee member conveyed interest in receiving input from District 96 principals, Dr. Lamberson and Mr. Radtke regarding the capital projects they would include on a District-wide priority list.

Supt. Lamberson remarked that he will develop a capital projects priority list for the Committee to review by first referring to a similar list created by Concept 3 Architects a few years ago. He noted that any additional ideas from the District Leadership Team and Mr. Radtke would be incorporated. He will also create a “rubric” to assist the Committee in developing a capital projects mission statement.

Following these remarks a motion was made by Mrs. Wakely, supported by Mrs. Stimming, that the Building Committee meeting be adjourned.

The time was 7:26 p.m.

---

Susan Moorhead, Board Secretary

---

Giles McCarthy, Committee Chair