

2.1.1
Bid
Approval

Trustee O'Connell moved, seconded by Trustee DeLaney that the Board of Trustees of Joliet Junior College approve greenhouse bid release 2 –classroom construction: general trades. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he would like clarification from the administration as to why this project is \$1.8 million over the original estimates from which the trustees based their decision for a tuition increase. Mr. Agazzi indicated that the original estimate was \$2.1 million for building the greenhouse and two classrooms and over many months of revisions, the final total budget with the adjustments came to \$3.8 million. To accommodate these extra costs and to stay within the overall budget, we have recommended revisions to other projects most notably classroom renovations as well as the J building remodeling. Mr. Karaskiewicz will address the board on the revisions and costs of the project. Mr. Karaskiewicz indicated that the Board has information in front of them on the master plan budget versus bid summary. As we progressed in the process for the greenhouse, we began working with a user group of the college for their input on what they wanted to entail in the greenhouse and that was incorporated into the specifications, which is what our bid estimates are based upon. We have essentially four packages for the greenhouse project. The board has approved the bid for the initial fabrication of the greenhouse. There is also a bid package for the general trades work; bid package for HVAC, mechanical, plumbing and fire protection; and a bid package for electrical and low voltage work. We did do post bid scope reviews with those low bidders, not just ones on the recommendations, but also the other ones that were subsequently in line as the next lowest bidders. We reviewed the proposal and made sure that they were in line with the requirements of the contract. The recommendations that you have before you is what the market place is saying the cost of the greenhouse is going to be, based on the program as we know it today. Mr. Karaskiewicz indicated that the original \$2.1 million dollar budget was a hard cost figure early on in the phase of the project. Some of the programming issues had really not been resolved at that point in time. This dollar amount was an anticipated budget estimate, but as the greenhouse program developed, there were certain elements that the user wanted to be sure were incorporated into the greenhouse, so we had to adjust the budget to account for those items. Trustee Mihelich commented that he doesn't believe that this answer is correct. One year ago, give or take a month, this board was presented a proposal for the 2008-2009 budget and at that time we received information about the \$70 million plan or tuition increase, and a \$89 million plan for the building referendum. We were presented that information in our 2008-2009 budget document book which I have brought a copy with me today. We approved the tuition increase for the referendum for \$159 million and agreed that there could be a reduction in the tuition if the referendum was passed. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he made the decision to move forward based upon the presentation by the administration and the information provided in the budget document book. The total cost for the greenhouse, including all phases and classrooms as well as demolition. was budgeted at \$2 million. We are at \$3.8 million today not counting the cost to demolish the old greenhouses. So from the budget document that was given to us one year ago, the decision that he made to be part of the process for the tuition

increase is a \$1.8 million budget. We are over budget and we do not have all expenses in yet. In looking at the budgetary materials for the campus center and the facilities building, The budget amount was at \$5 million and that is the next phase in the master plan. We are now at \$7.9 million, \$ 2.9 million over budget. So our first two projects from our master plan are \$4.7 million over budget. We are hearing that the \$4.7million over budget will have to be subtracted from other projects that were part of that \$70 million. Trustee Mihelich feels that additional discussion are still required. We are taking dollars from classroom renovations which increase the capacity to provide additional courses to students. We are taking money for the greenhouse, which will have some classroom effect, but the physical facilities building will have no impact on additional credit hours. We have a \$4.7 million over budget cost with all costs not in yet and we are electing to reduce the other \$70 million that comes out of student tuition that does not benefit students. Trustee Mihelich indicted that he cannot support an action that does not benefit the students. This money was targeted to improve student services. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he feels the Board has not had ample discussion so the priorities could be set in how we want to utilize the total \$70 million. Subtracting money from additional projects funded out of student tuition is inappropriate and is going in the wrong direction. President Proulx commented that anything that has been changed has gone through the building and grounds committee and has come to workshops for discussion. These changes have involved all of the players on campus. The facility services building is a separate issue and there were some major changes made relative to that building. Mr. Agazzi responded that he would like to clarify that the demolition for the greenhouse is covered with the campus center. Mr. Karaskiewicz commented that its actually a separate line item that we have as a project that's for demolition, which includes demolition not only of the greenhouse but also the temporary green buildings. Mr. Karaskiewicz indicated that from memory he believes the budget is approaching half a million dollars. Trustee Mihelich commented that this must have been in the revised budget and was not in the original budget book document. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he feels that somebody is manipulating numbers to make it work. Mr. Agazzi replied that well manipulation is a interesting word, we had to rebalance the budget. The greenhouse has gone through multiple scope changes; our original budget estimate per square foot dollar amount was too low and there have been a good deal of scope changes that have added dollars to the project. These items came up at the committee meeting and it was agreed that we were going to do the facility right. Dr. Ethridge who isn't here today, didn't think that there would be any issues. He wanted a facility that was going to be the highest quality possible and it nearly doubled the cost of the greenhouse. So a combination of those two things are what led to where we are today. We did whatever we could to contain costs: we cut additional classrooms, fences, different types of things that we would have liked to have done in the building. It is a very plain building and it used to be a lot nicer looking, but it's going to serve its purpose as a greenhouse. Facility services also had two issues: one was a scope change because we thought that we would be able to put shipping and receiving into the campus center where the Ag shop is

currently located and we couldn't. We went through a lot of pain with the Ag/Hort department and we had to abandon that idea. We also had an estimate of \$100 a square foot and it comes to \$147 on soft cost, so we were off on the estimate. We will be preparing a recap of the entire master plan budget, which will include the original budget and the revised budget to date. We have made recommendations to reduce the budgets for J building renovations as well as our classroom renovations. We are confident we will have close to \$2 million in interest revenue for the first bond issue and we should have a little bit more for the second issue. We are also recommending that interest revenue be put back into the J building remodeling, because we have concerns whether the \$3 million is sufficient. Trustee O'Connell commented that he thinks that a large part of the reason we are over budget so much on the greenhouse is because we want to have the greenhouse LEED certified. Although these costs are higher initially, we have been informed that it will be 70% more energy efficient. We didn't give Mr. Ethridge everything that he wanted, but we did give him a state of the art greenhouse with a classroom that is LEED certified. President Proulx commented that we have had extensive discussions and extra meetings with the building and grounds committee which involved Trustee O'Connell and Trustee DeLaney, so it's been out in the open and transparent. Also, faculty have come forth with ideas. In addition you should be reassured that tuition dollars are not involved here, but what is involved is fees. So, when we are talking about credit hours being impacted, no tuition dollars are being touched here and the \$70 million is all from the fee structure. Trustee Mihelich commented that it still goes to tuition and fees so students are paying for it. President Proulx commented that when we look at the operational budget, that's the budget that's funding the faculty that are doing the teaching, that's what's funding the Ed fund, that's what we are protecting, and that's where we are really concerned with next year's budget being sufficient. Trustee Mihelich commented that he disagrees with that statement from the standpoint that last week we were talking whether or not we were \$14,000 under or over budget- that was the figure that was being thrown around last week. Now we are \$1.8 million over budget and everybody's agreeing that we are \$1.8million over budget and that's a far cry from \$14,000. Mr. Agazzi commented that was from bid estimates from actual recommendations. Trustee Mihelich commented that he's concerned with the timetable and relationship to which buildings are next in cue. So if we are starting with the greenhouse being \$1.8 million over budget and the facility services is now \$2.9 million over budget, to me those overages should not fall to the next building in cue. We should concentrate on the buildings that benefit the students and then if we've got money left over, then maybe we can do greater than the \$5 million facility services budget. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he was asking for this information so we wouldn't be in these situations of being forced to vote without having all of the information. Trustee Mihelich commented that it is his opinion and every trustee has their own vote. When it affects students, especially on the tuition bond money, we should be concentrating on those buildings that have the most services for the students and feels that we are zero for two on the first two buildings in relationship to coming in under budget, rather we are significantly over. Trustee Mihelich asked if after

facility services will the next building be way out of line as well. Mr. Agazzi replied that the campus center is at \$42 million and we are watching that very closely. Trustee Mihelich replied that he wants to make sure that the master plan is done correctly and stays on budget for each of the projects, as part of the strategy for funding the master plan was his suggestion. The city center campus could be at the bottom of the cue and we already don't have enough money. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he would like to see a recommendation of what the cost for a tuition increase would be to do it right instead of reducing the allotted amounts for the project. We want the students to have the best that is available in our marketplace. If we were off on our budget because of some estimates by whomever, we should at least be getting recommendations that would have options to fund those areas that are making the cuts in. Trustee Mihelich indicated that he wants to see the information of where the cuts are being made and doesn't want to have the budgets modified to reflect point in time situations. Trustee Mihelich would like to do the entire project right the first time. Trustee Mihelich indicated that if it is believed that LEED certification with the extra expense warrants that expenditure, he will trust that recommendation, but does not want to see LEED certification being done at the expense of something else. If we want LEED certification as an additional item, then lets vote as a board to fund it. Mr. Agazzi responded that what we have before us today is just the greenhouse and recognizes that it impacts other parts of the budget, but just to get moving on this, unless we think that there is going to be substantial change in the greenhouse, it would still be our recommendation to move forward with this to keep on schedule. Chairman Wunderlich commented that he concurs with everything that Trustee Mihelich said as far as the total project of where we are going to be and what we are going to do we should be given something in writing. Chairman Wunderlich indicated that Trustee Mihelich is a 100% right regarding the original budget book that was given to us. If things change at least give us a note just like our board policies, so that we can put it in our books with a rationale behind it and then decide as a board if it would be okay. Trustee Mihelich is not out of line and the rest of the board members can tell administration to come up with information that the board wants. Trustee DeLaney commented that she would like to add to what Chairman Wunderlich has just said because Trustee Mihelich and all of the points that he has made he are correct and wondered if the campus center should be next on the list as this is something that is going to be used for our students, rather than facility services and asked if there is a reason facility services is next. Mr. Sronkoski indicated that phase 1 in the master facility plan is sequenced with parts and pieces of the project tied together. We need to complete the new greenhouse first so that we can move from the old greenhouse; therefore making way for construction for the campus center. The facility services building also needs to be constructed in time so facility services can abandon the existing facilities and move into the new facilities so that in the summer of 2010 it is planned to take down the existing temporary buildings and make way for the new parking lots. So, it's a timing sequence. If we complete one building before going to the other to see where the dollars lie, it would mean delaying the construction start of the facility services building past when we would receive the

bids for the campus center. This bidding process is scheduled to have the balance of the campus center bids out before the winter of this year. If we were to put off the facility services building, it would hamper the construction activity for the parking lot work that needs to be done in 2010. For the campus center there are plan for incorporation of geothermal for heating and cooling and the area where the existing temporary buildings are will be used to accomplish this plan. So, again we need to be able to do things in sequence to be able to make way for subsequent pieces of the whole master plan. Chairman Wunderlich indicated that and asked that this information be brought back with updated information for the Board. This information indicated when one group starts and one group stops. Mr. Agazzi stated that this information will be coming in on next Tuesday we will have each process scheduled and thanked Trustee DeLaney for the suggestion and this information will help the Board see why we sequenced it the way that we have. The motion **carried**. Ayes: O'Connell, DeLaney, May and Wunderlich. Nays: Mihelich (He cannot support \$4.7 million over budget for the first two phases without having the entire plan for the entire project.) Trustee May commented that he is sorry that he is late, but he was discussing a budget plan for community colleges in the state.

- 3.0 Remove from Table **Trustee Delaney moved**, seconded by Trustee May that the Board of Trustees of Joliet Junior College approve removing from the table of agenda item 4.2.8 Greenhouse Bid Release 2 – Classroom Construction: Electrical (Tabled March 10, 2009). The motion **carried**. Ayes: DeLaney, May, O'Connell and Wunderlich. Nays: Mihelich.
- 3.1.1 Bid Approval **Trustee May moved**, seconded by Trustee DeLaney that the Board of Trustees of Joliet Junior College approve Greenhouse Bid Release 2 – Classroom Construction: Electrical . The motion carried. Ayes: May, Delaney, O'Connell and Wunderlich. Nays: Mihelich. (No for the same reason as 2.0)
- 4.0 Remove from Table **Trustee DeLaney moved**, seconded by Trustee May that the Board of Trustees of Joliet Junior College approve removing from the table of agenda item 4.2.9 Greenhouse Bid Release 2–Classroom Construction: HVAC Plumbing and Fire Protection (Tabled March 10, 2009). The motion **carried**. Ayes: DeLaney, May, O'Connell and Wunderlich. Nays: Mihelich.(No for the same reason that he objected to 2.0 and 3.0.)
- 4.1.1 Bid Approval **Trustee May moved**, seconded by Trustee DeLaney that the Board of Trustees of Joliet Junior College approve Greenhouse Bid Release 2–Classroom Construction: HVAC Plumbing and Fire Protection. The motion **carried**. Ayes: May, Delaney, O'Connell and Wunderlich. Nays: Mihelich. (No for the same that he objected to 2.0 and 3.0)
- 5 Adjourn **Trustee May moved**, seconded by Trustee DeLaney for the meeting to adjourn at 12:11 P.M. A voice vote was taken. The motion **carried** unanimously.