

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT #512
COUNTIES OF COOK, KANE, LAKE AND McHENRY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of Wednesday, January 10, 1996.

CALL TO ORDER: The special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 512 was called to order by Chairman Moats on Wednesday, January 10, 1996 at 7:10 pm in the Board Room of the Administration Building, 1200 W. Algonquin Road, Palatine, Illinois.

ROLL CALL: Present: Members Barton, Born, Gillette, Hess, Howard and Moats
Absent: Member Kolze and Student Member Solarte

Also present: Paul Thompson, President; Ed Dolan, V.P. Academic Affairs; Bonnie Henry, V.P. Student Affairs; Vern Manke, V.P. Administrative Services; David McShane, V.P. Information Systems; Harley Chapman; Robert Getz; Bill Howard; Sheila Quirk; Laurie Wren - Harper College. Guests: Charles Burnidge, Michael Murphy - Burnidge, Cassell; M. Van Duch - Chicago Tribune; Keith O'Higgins - Metro Design Associates.

Contract Agreement
Burnidge, Cassell President Thompson explained that there was an interest on the part of the Board to have an opportunity to talk further with the architects about the plans for the proposed Multi-Use Instruction Facility. He introduced Charles Burnidge of Burnidge, Cassell who shared additional information with the Board.

Mr. Burnidge expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work on this project. His firm has been working closely with the Capital Development Board (CDB) since they will be providing funds for the project. He outlined some of the CDB requirements for the facility. Mr. Burnidge noted that he has received input from members of the Steering Committee, the Chair for the Performing Arts Facility and the Chair for the Conference Center.

At this time, there is \$5,229,888 available for the construction of the project. In addition, there is a 5 percent design contingency and a 5 percent construction contingency. The CDB has agreed that if Harper desires, this project could encompass more than one building. Mr. Burnidge noted that there has been some discussion with Harper staff regarding the possibility of the conference center being built as an addition to Building J, whereas the theater has always been considered to be a separate building connected to the facility where the black box theater is located. The CDB has also agreed to the use of these dollars for remodeling, if desired. However, the size of the project, in total, cannot exceed approximately 38,000 square feet. There is also a restriction stating that it cannot be a free-standing building.

Mr. Burnidge addressed the issue of the art gallery. The CDB has stated that because it was not in the original RAMP document, they will not support the dollars for the gallery. They have agreed, however, that it is economically advisable to design the gallery as an integral part of the project. The CDB has also agreed that the art gallery can be included if Harper will fund that segment of the design. Mr. Burnidge estimated that an average cost for approximately 5,000 square feet would be in the range of \$750,000. This would include the display area itself, the different forms of storage needed, flexible display space, and offices. The CDB agreed that Harper may design a gallery as part of the overall building even though the College may not have the funds to construct it until a later date. This would result in a savings for Harper in design fees.

Chairman Moats asked what the \$750,000 would pay for in terms of square feet. Mr. Burnidge stated that it would pay for about 5,000 square feet. The display area will encompass approximately 2,500 square feet. The storage is 2,000 square feet, and the office space is approximately 400 square

feet. The storage area consists of a dock for the delivery and shipping of the art work, as well as other areas for collections that are not on display, some work space for framing and display preparation, etc. Mr. Burnidge complimented the College on the quality of artwork that is currently displayed on the Harper campus.

Member Born expressed her reservations with spending \$750,000 while asking College departments to make cutbacks. She asked if it is possible to incorporate a certain amount of space to display art within the lobby of the theater. Mr. Burnidge replied that there would be space in the lobby for that use. He explained that it is necessary to be certain that the plans were acceptable to the CDB. The space can be designed at the same time as the larger space without going ahead with building plans until a later date. This would be acceptable to the CDB if dollars were put forth from Harper for the design fees. If the gallery is not built, the most logical time to cancel it would be after design and prior to bidding. Harper would spend approximately \$50,000 for design fees and reimbursables, which would be the maximum expenditure if the choice was to build a gallery in the future but not at this time. He noted that there would have to be an agreement reached between Harper and the CDB for those dollars. In that way, you would have the allocation and the drawings and then you would have the flexibility, if the dollars were available and it was the choice that the Board directed the architects to proceed. They would then know how it would be integrated into this new building.

Chairman Moats stated that they would like to have that option available when a decision is made whether or not to build the gallery.

Member Barton asked how heating and cooling would be handled in a building with a high traffic flow. Mr. Burnidge stated that the gallery would have its own climate control system which would be independent of the

balance of the building. The lobby would have more flexible conditions because of its usage. He noted that some artworks are more sensitive than others.

Mr. Michael Murphy, project manager for Burnidge, Cassell, entered the meeting.

There was discussion regarding the location of the building in relation to the black box area. Member Barton noted that if a larger facility was to be built in the future, there is not enough space there to use the same staging, backdrops, dressing rooms, etc. She stated that there is some interest in a larger facility with 800 to 1000 seating capacity. She noted that some schools which were visited had used the common stage and dressings rooms for both the small and large facilities instead of having to rebuild those portions.

Mr. Burnidge stated that in keeping with the facility concept document, the initial design will incorporate planning for the anticipation of future expansion. This expansion would include a larger adjacent facility with the elements that are incorporated into this building.

Member Gillette asked if building a larger lobby would limit the size of the actual theater because of the CDB size limit of 38,000 square feet, even if Harper agrees to pay for the difference. Mr. Burnidge stated that he was not positive, but he felt that if Harper joined their dollars with those of the CDB, this would be acceptable. Mr. Murphy added that the 38,000 was a number that CDB came up with to coincide with the available dollars based on the per square foot cost of building the facility.

President Thompson addressed the comment that putting planning money together with the CDB would reduce the percentage of fees that Harper would have to put into the total project. If the buildings are planned together, the final fee for Burnidge, Cassell

would then be 8.6 percent, which would be less than the amount charged if the design fees are charged separately. Mr. Murphy noted that there are other savings to be realized in terms of the mechanical systems, the structural conditions, etc. because much of it can be built into the original building and transferred into the art gallery in a cost effective manner.

Mr. Burnidge stated that there are different groups in the College vying for the available dollars and area. The theater is the most expensive to build per square foot, so decisions will be needed regarding the allocation of the square footage and dollars for the different areas. He noted that although they are committed to design this project with the available dollars, \$5.8 million is a very limited budget for this undertaking. Mr. Burnidge stated that it is very important that they bring these ideas to the Board so that they understand through this process what Harper will receive for these dollars. The architects will furnish designs and estimates at different stages during the review process so that the Board and the administration will have a clear understanding and be in complete agreement with what is being done.

Member Barton asked who at Harper has final say on the design decisions and the allocation of space. President Thompson stated that this has not yet been decided.

Mr. Burnidge explained the schedule. The architects were to complete their contract with the CDB by January 12. The CDB would like Burnidge, Cassell to complete the programming for the project by March 15, 1996 and have the preliminary design completed by June 15. The drawings would be ready to go to the contractor by January 15, 1997. The bids would be back to the contractor by February 20, 1997. Construction would be completed by December 15, 1998 with occupancy by January of 1999.

Member Barton asked when the CDB would have the money. Member Gillette asked if that was an issue because everyone is on the same schedule. Member Barton replied that the CDB is somewhat unreliable on this point. Chairman Moats stated that there are two issues: 1) Money -- because Harper does not have the construction money and there is no guarantee when the funds will be received; and 2) the schedule -- and whether the architects feel that it is a realistic schedule. Mr. Burnidge stated that they agree that the best time to put these documents out for construction bids is in January or February of 1997. In order to give ample time to the staff and Board to make decisions, however, he recommended changing the program analysis to April 15 and the preliminary design to July 15. Member Barton asked if it was possible that the CDB would let Harper go out for bids and then not come up with the money. Mr. Burnidge stated that they would not do that.

Member Howard asked Mr. Burnidge if this is too ambitious a project for the available dollars. She noted that they do not want to end up with an unsatisfactory result because of limited dollars. Mr. Burnidge stated that there is flexibility in the CDB contract for amendments, but that they need to start the design process with the money available. If it is determined at a later date that changes need to be made, they will have to go back to the CDB at that time. In reference to Member Howard's question, Mr. Burnidge felt that the project can be done with the available dollars based on the involvement of decision-makers at Harper and the architect's cost consultant.

Member Barton asked about the likelihood of cost overruns in building the theater. Mr. Burnidge stated that the budget includes a 5 percent design contingency and a 5 percent construction contingency. The Board will need to determine if the money for fixed equipment costs (seating, sound systems, lighting, etc.) is in the initial

construction budget or in a separate FF&E budget. Member Barton asked that the Board receive estimates of those costs before making that decision. Mr. Burnidge stated that they are presently compiling those figures.

President Thompson questioned whether it would still have to be a CDB project if the College decided to provide funds for the art gallery -- or if the College could get its own bid and do the art gallery project from then on. Member Gillette asked if Harper can then use the drawings to proceed with the project if the CDB decides not to fund it. Mr. Burnidge responded that he had proposed various scenarios to the CDB which included Harper building the art gallery with a separate gallery, and all were acceptable. He noted, however, that this only pertained to the issue of the art gallery and not the rest of the project. Mr. Burnidge will get information pertaining to the options.

Mr. Burnidge briefly explained the design phases. Program analysis relates to meetings with the Board, staff and administrators for the purpose of data collection. At this time square footage of the various spaces is determined, as well as their relationships, location and budgets. The second phase involves preliminary design with floor plans, building elevations, space relationships, and cost estimates. Mr. Murphy noted that the dates in the timetable are specifically when Burnidge, Cassell has completed the documents and sends them to the CDB. The decision-making and viewing of the material prior to that and Harper's acceptance or modification of the material must occur earlier than that period. Ideally, changes should be made at least three weeks before the target date so that the architects can have everything ready for the state. Mr. Burnidge stated that they will devise a schedule for this process. Chairman Moats noted that the schedule can be altered. Mr. Burnidge agreed, and noted that the timetable revolves around scheduling the bidding process for early 1997. He added

that the CDB wants the architects to adhere to this schedule, and that if this cannot be done, the College needs to send the CDB a letter stating the reasons. Mr. Burnidge stated that it would be advantageous to his firm to have an extra month in the beginning phases of preliminary design.

Member Born felt that her discussions with area legislators have indicated that, for political reasons, there would be no CDB money approved this year; therefore, a discussion of exact deadlines for the schedule may be premature. Chairman Moats stated that he would be willing to extend the schedule in order to get a quality result. Member Gillette felt that if the schedule goes three or four months beyond the proposed timetable, the price would increase by four or five percent. Chairman Moats agreed, but stressed that a quality result is still the ultimate goal. It was the consensus of the Board that a one-month delay at the beginning phase of the process would be agreeable as long as the solicitation of bids would be done in January or February 1997.

Member Born asked if the entire project could be delayed a full year if they do not get the money approved from CDB this year, with an extra five percent added in light of the fact that the legislature did not approve the money when planned. Mr. Burnidge stated that the Board can always ask the CDB for additional funds.

Mr. Burnidge stated that although he has signed a contract with the CDB, Harper is the ultimate user and he will be working toward their best interests.

Mr. Burnidge stated that funding decisions do not have to be made at this time because this is not the crucial period of budget line items. Member Barton asked how this is handled at other institutions. Mr. Burnidge replied that other Boards usually debate this at these junctures because they often do not always have the funds to take care of everything. Because it is desirable to have all of these things in place when the facility opens, oftentimes a campaign is taking place parallel to the process so that benefactors can be found. Member Born suggested a joint meeting be held with this Board and the Foundation Board. Member Barton asked if the building costs usually include the equipment. Mr. Burnidge replied that equipment is usually over and above the construction costs.

Mr. Burnidge stated that they could not negotiate the fees with the CDB to cover all the costs of their special consultants. He added that he would go back to the consultants and negotiate their fees. Chairman Moats felt that it would be appropriate for the administration to work with Burnidge, Cassell regarding this issue.

In response to Chairman Moats, Mr. Burnidge stated that reports would be submitted to the Board and the administration on a regular basis. He added that this is a creative process and their input would be appreciated.

Chairman Moats thanked Mr. Burnidge for his presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

Member Born moved, Member Gillette seconded, that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Chairman

Secretary

BOARD REQUESTS

JANUARY 10, 1996 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

- 1) Member Barton asked that the Board receive estimates of the fixed equipment costs (seating, sound systems, lighting, etc.) before making a decision as to whether these funds will be in the initial construction budget or in a separate FF&E budget. Mr. Burnidge stated that they are presently compiling those figures.
- 2) Mr. Burnidge will provide information pertaining to options if the CDB does not fund all or part of the project.