

Minutes
Board Facilities Committee
June 22, 2009, 5:00 p.m.
College Gallery, College Mall

Present:

Brian Pennington, Chairman
Dale E. Rice, Jr.
Sandy Sims
Vercell Vance
Esteena K. Wells
Wesley Wilkerson
Joseph Lorenz, Board Attorney
Jill J. White, Interim President

Others present: Mike Mattimore of Allen, Norton, and Blue; Troy Speegle and Chuck Mitchell of Speegle Construction, Mike Griffith of The Bay Beacon; David Alsop, Sam Marshall Architects; Gary Yancey, Vice President for Administrative Services; Mickey Englett, Dean of Student Services/Athletic Director; Sam Jones, Facilities Director; and, Carolyne Laux, Executive Assistant to the President.

Call to Order Brian Pennington

Introductions Dr. White introduced Mike Mattimore, Attorney; Troy Speegle and Mr. Chuck Mitchell of Speegle Construction, and Mike Griffith from The Bay Beacon.

Update on Community Services Complex

Mr. Pennington stated that he had met with Mr. Speegle and college staff concerning the project and the schedule for the project. He indicated that he would be meeting with the same group routinely on the project. He stated that this is a highly visible project in the community and with the county as a party. We have some concerns as to where we are and where we should be and with some of the quality of the project so far.

Mr. Speegle and Mr. Mitchell presented a PowerPoint on the status of the Community Services Complex Project. Speegle is investigating the possibility of delivering the EOC portion of the project early and are actively pursuing that option.

Mr. Pennington asked about a timeline that was agreed upon during his previous meeting with Speegle and staff. Mr. Speegle indicated that the timeline should be ready by the end of the week – they are reducing it to a 2-page document with the major dates which will be provided to the architect and be forwarded to the Board. Mr. Pennington

commented that we are 39% completed at the end of May, but where are we supposed to be? This is what we hope the timeline can show us.

- Ms. Wells asked if the EOC building would be the first building to be completed. They are working toward that end.
- Ms. Sims asked if they were looking at June 2010 for the EOC portion. Mr. Speegle indicated that July 15, 2010 is their target date.
- Mr. Pennington asked if the date for substantial completion is October, 2010 based on best estimate. Mr. Speegle indicated that it was dependent on requests that they have put in for structural delays. They believe there will be a contract adjustment to move the completion date to the October timeframe.
- Mr. Pennington asked if Speegle had considered double staffing the project with two crews stating that there is plenty of daylight from 6 p.m. in the morning until dusk at night – which should catch the project up significantly.
- Ms. Sims asked if there was time built into the schedule at the front end. Mr. Speegle indicated that there was time built in – but there have been issues that have required clarification before proceeding which took time; “float” time that was available, but was used on the front end of the project.
- Mr. Pennington asked if the clarifications they needed had been provided and the response was “yes.”
- Mr. Wilkerson asked if the contractor had taken on more than they could deal with. He stated that he was not receptive to extending the contract by three or four months. The initial contract was for almost two years to completion. We are going to be looking to our architect on this project for his approval or non-approval on requested extensions before the board approves such.
- Mr. Vance commented on the schedule of the project, citing quality as the most important issue. Mr. Pennington had alluded to quality earlier. Please address quality of this project, if there is an issue. Mr. Vance expressed that he cared less about schedule and more about quality of the project. Mr. Pennington stated that there had been some concern about quality regarding the concrete masonry units, in particular. Some of the concrete masonry walls have been unacceptable to the architect, engineer, and to Mr. Jones in the field inspections. The project has to meet the quality desired by the college.
- Mr. Speegle stated that there had been some issues on the project; with the intent of moving quickly, some details were missed. Speegle bears full responsibility for those omissions. Speegle has added more staff and has

employed, at their expense, an independent threshold inspector that is on the project to do pre-inspections.

- Mr. Pennington asked if Speegle had gotten a quick response from the architect when submitting requests. The answer was “yes.”
- Mr. Pennington asked Mr. Speegle to assure the Board that the concrete masonry quality issues have been resolved. The answer was “yes.”
- Mr. Wilkerson asked how many superintendents that have been on this project. The answer is two.
- Dr. White asked about the comment regarding the earlier completion of the EOC – and that we might sign off on and accept the opening of the EOC earlier than the rest of the project. The systems are so integrated that it does not seem feasible – and would hope that there is no goal in schedule planning to do that without a very clear direction from both the county and the college that partial acceptance of the facility would be the choice.

*Mr. Speegle indicated that they were going to move as fast as they can on the EOC facility – even though complex, it is not as complex as the arena portion of the facility. Whether or not the county accepts it, Speegle is still going to move as fast as possible.

*Contractor will look at it from a technical standpoint to see if it can be done this way. Whatever the answer, it continue to be at the full discretion of the college whether or not they accept that.

- Mr. Pennington asked if the college was responding appropriately with respect to the project funding. The answer was that the college pays faster than any other client they have.
- Mr. Pennington asked there were any concerns with the subcontractors and payment to the subcontractors that we need to be aware of. The answer is “no.”

Mr. Alsop responded to questions on behalf of the architectural and engineering status of the project. In response to a question from Ms. Sims, he stated his opposition to the college’s acceptance of a partial completion of the project rather than full completion.

Mr. Alsop also stated his office is reviewing Speegle’s request for time extension and supplemental funding and will provide a recommendation when all information has been received and reviewed.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.