

SHS - Creteau Technology Center Renovation Committee
School Department Board Room
March 23, 2016
5:00 PM

Attending: Mike Hopkins, Paul Lynch, Ray Turner, Pam Martin, Sean Peschel,
Bob Nienhouse, Stacey Libby, Jennifer Marsh, Linda Casey, Matthew Pappas,
Lance Whitehead - LaVallee|Brensinger Architects

Introductions and Welcome

Approve minutes from last meeting

Meeting minutes were approved

Project Update: Lance Whitehouse

- Last meeting 3 options were introduced. Since last meeting architectural plans for A and C have been further developed.
- Preferred option was created out of a merged option and is not called Option D
- Last week Mike, Lance and Sean met with CTC DOE
- The DOE has requested that a set budget amount be provided to the state on April 4th, originally the timeline was July, and however the timeline has been moved up.
- One of the benefits of the changed timeline is that the state will be able to encumber their portion of the bill as it is built into their state budget rather than have to have a fund set aside to pay bills in a timely manner
- Legislative support and cycle looks promising. Two of the other schools in the biennium have not been passed and funded which means the Creteau project looks promising.

- Option D details were unveiled:
 - Primarily, the front of the existing building is removed and replaced with newly constructed space.
 - Double bus lanes would go to the side and back of CTE
 - Does provide outside dining area in the front of the Restaurant Mgmt.
 - Plaza area providing gathering space for students are outlined
 - Anything beyond 1 foot of the building falls into local funding responsibility.

- Cost Estimates:
 - Construction costs 19429689
 - Site construction (not covered by CTE funds) approximated at 350,000
 - State Funded portion: 16,820,220
 - Local funding would be 6,366,907
 - Areas highlighted in yellow cannot be funded by CTC funds
 - Truss Replacement – High likelihood that the truss built in original construction have shown that they have a higher rate of failure due to the chemicals used for fire retardency.
 - Concern was brought up that the equipment line seems to be very low. Mr. Peschel shared that the annual amount of funding that is approximately 100,000 per year can be used to buy new equipment.
 - If 1,000,000 were added to the overall equipment line, the community requirement would be \$250,000. Due to the matching funds available for the project, it would be smart to look at adding a higher equipment line to the project.
 - Motion to amend projected budget from 23, 187,127, to 24,187,127 which is 1 million more than estimate. Motion was seconded.
 - Question came up regarding the truss replacement cost. Can we get a better estimate prior to April 4th for this portion of the project?

- Question was asked as to if we feel we need to have a Clerk of the Works. Answer was absolutely. The size of the project requires someone to act as a quality control expert for the project. It is in the best interest of the project to ensure it is done correctly.
- Recommendation regarding marketing. It will be important for the community to understand the benefit for Rochester to move forward on this project. Why is the renovation important to the programs and students in these classes? What is the educational impact?
- Schedule Update:
 - Budgeting schedule was moved up from July to April 4th. This adjustment requires that the plans for individual program plans be reviewed and approved by teachers in a timelier manner.

March 18th Visit to Massachusetts CTC

- Three large Career Tech Centers in MA were visited by the CTC teachers. They were accompanied by 3 school board members. It afforded an opportunity for our staff to see what other centers look like. It was noted that the role of business sponsorship and partnerships was a key aspect of why these centers are successful.
- Recognition of Corporate donors and partnerships were predominately displayed through the centers. Creates such a sense of community involvement and pride.
- Do we have any programs within the center for our own students to help in the construction/renovation of the new building?
- School branding and program was very evident. Created a sense of pride and ownership.