

Facility Committee Notes from Meeting on 11/10/22 @ 6:30 PM

Attendees in person:

Board Members:

- Brandon Hall
- Tony Lucido
- Jim Decker
- Brad Group

Administration:

- Dr. Kevin O'Donnell
- Tina Darchicourt
- Ryan Frey

Notes:

Primary business discussed was the GESA Project

- Responses to RFP were received by McClure & Company and Schneider Electric
- CM3 did not respond
- Presentations by McClure & Schneider Electric
- McClure presented two options:
 - Both options include:
 - Rice Domestic Water Heater Upgrade (Past Life Expectancy)
 - YB Major Air Handling Equipment Upgrade (8 years past useful life)
 - YB Terminal Equipment Upgrade (Some of the components have reached their useful life and are experiencing failures)
 - YB Automatic Temperature Control System Upgrades (Past Life Expectancy)
 - YB Domestic Hot Water Heater Upgrade (Single Point of Failure & original to the building)
 - YB Security Camera System Upgrade (Existing system dates back to 1999, obsolete and lack adequate coverage)
 - YB LED Lighting Upgrades
 - BSHS Bathroom Renovations
 - BSHS Underground Sanitary Piping Replacement (Repair won't cost as much as anticipated, McClure did a further scope of the pipe and only found a small section needing repair)
 - BSHS Domestic Water Heating Loop (Units are beyond or near the end of their life)
 - Option 1:
 - Total Hard costs = \$5,375,996 + Soft Costs (Engineering, Permit & Bonds, Commissioning, etc.) \$463,092 = \$5,839,088
 - 20 Year Energy Savings \$868,368
 - Actual Project Cost with assumed savings = \$4,970,720

- Option 2:
 - Total Hard costs = \$6,059,477 + Soft Costs (Engineering, Permit & Bonds, Commissioning, etc.) \$519,761 = \$6,579,238
 - 20 Year Energy Savings \$858,616
 - Actual Project Cost with assumed savings = \$5,720,622
- Difference between Option 1 and Option 2:
 - YB Major Air Handling Equipment Upgrade would be an Enhanced Replacement
 - YB LED Lighting Upgrades would be LED Flat Panels
 - Difference of \$750K, Air Handling unit would potentially last longer, wouldn't run as constant/as much, indoor air quality better, components of a higher grade, industrial vs commercial which should last 20-25 years compared to Option 1 of 15-20 years. Failure rate/maintenance issues decrease with better products
- Questions/comments from committee members and answers from McClure:
 - Aside from the major items to be replaced, did you observe additional smaller items that needed replaced or repaired as well?
 - Yes and no, if so, the items were included in costs provided
 - Just had the roof refinished, any issues with new units?
 - No, roof will be fine, adjustments needed are included in the cost.
 - BSHS bathroom, will the exterior walls be gutted?
 - Needs brought up to ADA code, exterior walls will stand, inside completely gutted and new.
 - Dr. O'Donnell said he would like the administration to review the plans for efficient ideas.
 - Discussion about ceiling tiles being removed, if a lot maybe proceed with upgraded lighting project in Option 2.
 - There will be a commissions report detailing those costs
 - Warranty
 - 1 year bumper to bumper
 - 5 years on specifics
- Schneider Electric
 - Responded to the RFP with ranges in pricing for each unit except for the BSHS Domestic Water Heating Loop. They asked for clarification on the purpose of this item before giving a price.
 - Total costs summed to \$7,048,500 (excluding the item above), however would need to refine their pricing if given the opportunity.
 - They had never seen a process run this way, almost didn't respond to the RFP, but thought they should. They had concerns that the board was moving too fast, that we should do more due diligence, we should get contracts and compare, reading the fine print.
 - They go through a public bidding process for sub-contractors, offer fixed price contract and had concerns about any number that was represented by another competitor as potential savings.

- They were concerned about the timing of the project, that ordering some of these items this late in the year, with the lead times would put them 30-35 weeks out. Concerned about delivery too late to get started in the summer and then what does the district do with the items upon delivery.
- McClure & Company and Schneider Electric left the meeting, the remaining committee members and administrative staff discussed what was proposed.
- Discussions:
 - Timing of the project:
 - The committee agreed that we should move forward with the project, that the risk of getting a unit too late is a risk worth taking. Jim disagreed with Schneiders comments about being too late, projects are still being priced and decided on like ours. The administration expressed concern about waiting until 2024, especially with some of the items being failure points.
 - Pricing:
 - Based on the comments made by Schneider Electric regarding their pricing, it was not an apples-to-apples comparison to McClure. We felt McClure provided more detail and harder numbers to the items that could be relied upon.
- Motion was made by Tony Lucio and seconded by Jim Decker to proceed with McClure as the Energy Service Company.
- The committee recommended the administration review the original presentation by McClure to see if there should be other items added for consideration of repair based on a bond ask of \$10MM. Specifically to involve Jim Decker.
- Dr. O'Donnell said that he would work with McClure to understand what options the district has if the items are delivered late and we are not able to install in summer 2023.
- The committee will be recommending at the next board meeting which items we should seek McClure repair based on additional feedback from the administration and a financing discussion tonight.
- At our next Facilities meeting, known topics as of now for discussion include access to the track/football field and banners.
- Meeting was adjourned at 8:38 pm.