

MINUTES OF THE
BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
of the Board of Education
Riverside School District No.96
held on Tuesday, April 20, 2010
at Blythe Park Elementary School
Riverside, Illinois

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

Present: Mr. Giles McCarthy and Mrs. Mary Stimming

Absent: Mrs. Hareena Wakely

Also Present: Board President Nancy Jensen; Board member Mary Ellen Meindl; Supt. Jonathan Lamberson; District 96 Director of Maintenance Bill Radtke; Architect Mark Miller from CONCEPT 3 Architects and approximately ten District 96 parents and staff.

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss:

- Approve Replacement of Hauser Handicapped Lift.
- Capital Projects List.
- Bids for Summer 2010 Central Playground Project.

There were no comments from the public.

- Bids for Summer 2010 Central Playground Project.

Architect Mark Miller noted that 5 bids were submitted to the District on March 31st, 2010 for the 2010 Playground Remodeling Work at Central Elementary School. The project scope of work will include the removal of existing site features, such as the timber and mulch walkway and turf, to be replaced by:

- New flagstone pavement.
- New hardscape outcropping stone retaining wall.
- New stone steps leading down to the playground area.
- New widened exposed aggregate concrete sidewalk leading toward the school (Village of Riverside standard aggregate material).
- New landscape plantings as discussed with the Central School PTO.

Due to current economic conditions all bids received were well within the estimated budget. G.L.I. Services Inc., DBA George's Landscaping, Inc. submitted the lowest bid at \$50,758 to complete the project. Mr. Miller noted that George's Landscaping is confident they can perform the work within the specified time schedule. Based on this assurance and references for similar sized projects Mr. Miller recommended the Central Playground Remodeling contract be awarded to George's Landscaping.

Following this presentation a question arose regarding whether District 96 had received the necessary approvals from the Village of Riverside to proceed with construction. Mr. Miller noted that CONCEPT 3 has made the Village commissions aware of the District's remodeling plans. He noted that to-date no objections have been expressed by the Village.

Supt. Lamberson remarked that the portion of the proposed widened sidewalk leading to Central's Kindergarten door that is on Village property was bid as an Alternate so that if the Village were to object to this aspect of the design remodeling work on District property can proceed. Dr. Lamberson is hopeful that the Village will not object to the widened sidewalk, but reiterated any objection raised will not impede remodeling plans occurring on District 96 property.

Following these remarks, a question arose regarding why the "muddy area" on the school playground wasn't addressed as part of the 2006 playground renovation sponsored by the Central School PTO. It was noted that the PTO was aware of the muddy area and that attempts have been made to address it by planting grass. Insufficient grass has grown-in over the years due to increased playground use and minimal sunlight/deep shade in this area.

Discussion transpired regarding the cost of the proposed project. It was noted that the Central School PTO will contribute \$10,000 toward project funding. It was also mentioned that members of the PTO have contributed significant dollars, time and effort over the years to enhance the appearance of Central School's landscaping and playground area. Additional investment per the proposed plan will provide a long-term solution to the "mud" problem.

A question arose regarding whether the District's smaller schools are at a disadvantage because their PTA/O's might not be able to fundraise at comparable levels as larger schools. Supt. Lamberson remarked that when the 2006 Central PTO playground renovation project was proposed a decision was made that the District would provide all District 96 schools with basic landscaping, and playground equipment that is safe and functional, to provide a consistent hardscape/landscape appearance at all schools. It was also decided that PTA/O's could fundraise for any increment that would allow for the installation of more elaborate plantings or upgraded playground equipment.

Following this discussion, the Committee agreed by consensus to recommend approval of the bid for the Central School Playground Remodeling Project as submitted by George's Landscaping to the full Board later this evening.

- Capital Projects List.

Supt. Lamberson remarked that the development of a "Capital Projects List" is a result of discussions with the Finance Committee and the full Board regarding how to prioritize capital projects in District 96 schools to make them educationally ready for the next 20 or 30 years. The Building Committee has been asked to establish "parameters" that will be used to add projects to the list that will bring each school to a particular threshold of capital improvement.

Mr. Miller noted that, in 2006, CONCEPT 3 Architects conducted a *10 Year Life Safety Survey* identifying state mandated facility improvement projects in District 96 schools. These projects have been termed *Priority A* improvement projects. All *Priority A* projects identified in the *Survey* will be complete by the summer of 2011. During the *Safety Survey* additional facility projects were identified and have been termed either *Priority B* or *Priority C* projects.

Priority B projects include infrastructure work such as:

- Replace Univentillators and mechanical piping.

- Install proper ventilation systems in hallways and storage rooms.
- Replace domestic water piping.
- Replace or upgrade of fire alarm systems.
- Replace electrical service.
- Install additional egress lighting.
- Asbestos abatement.

Priority C projects include facility enhancements or projects that address aesthetic issues such as:

- Install air conditioning.
- Renovate washrooms.
- Upgrade plumbing fixtures.
- Replace classroom, gymnasium, and office lighting.
- Replace floor tile and carpeting.
- Restore wood floors.
- Restore plaster ceilings and other historic features.
- Install ADA access.

Mr. Miller presented a *2010 Facilities Survey Report Cost Summary Report* detailing the cost to address the proposed *Priority B* improvement projects in a phased approach over a 4 year period beginning in 2013 as follows:

	2010 COST	2013 COST	2014 COST	2015 COST	2016 COST
AMES	\$1,656,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,054,283
BLYTHE	\$1,647,760	\$0	\$1,911,402	\$0	\$0
CENTRAL	\$2,160,450	\$2,419,704	\$0	\$0	\$0
HAUSER	\$3,766,920	\$0	\$1,092,407	\$3,390,228	\$0
HOLLYWOOD	\$1,218,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,511,163
Sub-Total	\$10,450,490	\$2,419,704	\$3,003,808	\$3,390,228	\$3,565,446
Contingency	\$1,045,049	\$241,970	\$300,381	\$339,023	\$356,545
A/E Fee	\$836,039	\$193,576	\$240,305	\$271,218	\$285,236
Yearly Totals	\$12,331,578	\$2,855,251	\$3,544,494	\$4,000,469	\$4,207,227
MULTI-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TOTAL COST					<u>\$14,607,440</u>

Notes: Costs reflect estimated pricing for the year of implementation.
2010 pricing was inflated by 4% per year to the implementation year.

Priority C projects were noted in the *Cost Summary Report* at additional cost.

A question arose regarding whether any of the proposed projects would trigger ADA compliance work. Mr. Miller commented that generally ADA compliance projects are not activated as a result of *Priority B* (infrastructure) construction but that some limited ADA compliance work may be triggered by *Priority C* projects such as renovation of washrooms requiring widened doorways. He further noted that because of the age of District 96 schools he anticipates transportation of disabled students between floors can be provided by lifts instead of elevators. An elevator would be required if a multi-level school addition were built.

Discussion transpired regarding the construction timeline. Mr. Miller opined that a majority of *Priority B* items could be addressed by 2016 in the phased approach presented above with construction taking place primarily during the summer months.

A question arose whether meaningful savings could be realized if energy-efficient utility systems were installed in District 96 schools. Mr. Miller estimated a 20%-30% drop in energy usage as well as a decrease in emergency system repair costs if energy-efficient utility systems were installed.

A question arose regarding whether the proposed electrical renovation costs included an allowance for technology upgrades. Mr. Miller noted that technology-related upgrades were not factored into the proposed figures.

Mr. Miller remarked that per the proposed phased construction plan he is reasonably sure all District 96 schools will be 99% asbestos free by 2016.

By consensus, the Committee agreed to explore the cost and possible financing options available to restore historic features in District 96 schools such as plaster ceilings and hardwood floors.

Discussion transpired concerning when to solicit input from parents and staff regarding items they would like to add to the Capital Projects List. By consensus, the Committee agreed to seek input from parents and staff in the winter or spring of 2010-11.

Dialogue occurred regarding the need to "re-claim" some of the existing unutilized space in District 96 schools for student use. Supt. Lamberson noted that re-claiming unutilized space is a goal of the capital improvement process and mentioned that the elementary school principals are currently studying space utilization in an effort to relocate the ECE Program. Once the results of their space utilization analysis are available CONCEPT 3 will review and supplement the report where appropriate given their expertise in this area.

Following this discussion, the Committee agreed by consensus to use the *2010 Facilities Survey Report Cost Summary* presented this evening as an initial Capital Projects List.

- Approve Replacement of Hauser Lift.

Discussion took place at the February Building Committee meeting regarding the need to either repair or replace Hauser's broken handicapped lift. The following options were discussed:

- Remove the broken lift without replacement.
- Remove the broken lift and replace it with a portable or permanent lift.
- Repair the current lift.

The pros and cons of replacing the lift with a portable vs. permanent lift were discussed:

- The portable lift is less expensive and can be transported from school to school, but jostles students when moving between stairs.
- The permanent lift is more expensive, but provides a smooth and comfortable ride for students.

Mr. Radtke noted that several vendors were contacted to provide pricing for a permanent replacement lift. Ultimately, only three proposals were submitted with Garaventa, Inc. submitting the lowest proposal at \$52,898.

Dr. Lamberson noted that funding is available for a permanent lift due to the

exceptional savings realized through the bidding process for this summer's Life Safety work.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed by consensus to recommend the purchase of the Garaventa permanent lift to the full Board later this evening.

Supt. Lamberson requested permission from the Committee to seek bids for the replacement of Hauser's auditorium roof that is leaking. It was noted that the roof has been in disrepair for some time and in an effort to protect the investment of new auditorium chairs being installed this summer replacement is warranted. By consensus the Committee approved this request.

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

The time was 7:28 p.m.

Susan Moorhead, Board Secretary

Giles McCarthy, Committee Chair