Call to Order
6:00pm

Welcome and Introductions
Superintendent Dr. Don White introduced himself and asked the Task Force members to introduce themselves.

The following members were in attendance:

- Dr. Don White - Superintendent
- Kerry Leonard - Construction Owner’s Representative
- Mike Duggan – Director of Facilities
- Gary Clarin – Clarendon Hills resident, Board of Education member, and Chair of the BOE Facilities Committee
- Jerry Mejdrich – Hinsdale resident and member of the BOE Finance Committee
- Paul Sporleder – Hinsdale resident and parent of an HMS student
- Steve Cashman – Hinsdale resident, parent of a CHMS student, and member of the BOE Facilities Committee
- Kathleen Turnbull – Hinsdale resident and parent of students at HMS and The Lane School
- Brian Guerin – Hinsdale resident
- Craig Cassell – Hinsdale resident and parent of a Madison School student
- Fred Regnery – Hinsdale resident
- Brian Kronewitter – Architect with Cordogan Clark & Associates
- Bill Truty – Project Manager with Bulley & Andrews
- Peter Kuhn – Project Executive with Bulley & Andrews

HMS Project Update
Superintendent Dr. Don White provided an update on the potential timeline of the litigation court process and how the signing of Senate Bill 3319 impacted the lawsuit. He also shared that the Plaintiff’s Response to the District’s Motion to Dismiss was filed on March 16, 2017 and is posted on the website. The Board’s attorney would be filing a response to this motion on or prior to March 20, 2017. The next date in the litigation process is the hearing on March 27, 2017. Dr. White then outlined the potential timeline following the hearing on March 27. The judge may rule that day or she may
later provide a written decision. Once the judge rules, the plaintiff or the defendant (the District) has 30 days to file an appeal with the Illinois Appellate Court. If an appeal is filed, there is no way to expedite the 30 days. Once the case is in the Appellate Court, there is a set time schedule by court rule. At that point, the District could ask for an expedited schedule, which would be at the discretion of the court. Dr. White noted that an appeal process could take up to one year, but it is hard to know at this point in time. Committee members discussed the projected costs of the delay as related to the litigation. Dr. White noted he would provide the committee with the estimated costs to date.

Dr. White shared that the Board approved using approximately $3.1 million from reserves to pay for project costs through Bid Package #2 (approximately mid-May). This will allow for the potential approval of shop drawings.

Peter Kuhn of Bulley & Andrews shared initial news on Bid Group #1, which was opened on March 13, 2017, and read publicly by Mr. Leonard. He explained that Bid Group #1 included 11 base bids (i.e. earthwork, concrete, site utilities, steel, precast, elevator, temp power, asphalt, general trades, temp fence, and earth retention) and several alternates (running track, larger basement for storage), representing approximately $10.5 million of the total project. He noted that they did not receive a bid for waterproofing and would be re-bidding this. He commented that the preliminary review of bids show that they came in at approximately $1.7 million under their estimates, including the alternate bids. The team was very pleased with these results.

Mr. Kuhn shared that they would be working with the Village of Hinsdale on the cost of the site utilities as related to the parking garage and retention wall. He also noted that his firm has worked with the majority of the sub-contractors who submitted bids for the project.

Mr. Kuhn explained that two bids were received for precast. He then explained that a third bid was delivered to the District Office on time but was not delivered to the Superintendent’s Office prior to the bid opening. The bid was unopened. He shared that it is in the District’s best interest to accept and open the bid. He notified the other two bidders and the plan was to open this bid publicly. Mr. Leonard confirmed that he spoke with the Board’s attorney and documented the process of the discovery of an additional bid.

Mr. Kuhn shared that the plan was to open Bid Package #2 around mid-May with the plan to make a recommendation to Dr. White and Mr. Leonard. All bids are good for 90 days.

Brian Kronewitter of Cordogan Clark explained the two alternate bids: one for a running track and the other for an increase in basement storage. He explained that the Village
of Hinsdale has committed to a larger parking deck (135 spots – upper; 190 spots – lower; 15 spots on upper level for visitors to school; 100 spots for staff on lower level). The Village has requested that they use the upper level (minus 15 spaces for visitors). He noted that there is an opportunity to have an entry area to the lower level. The alternate bid was to include the entry and hall area to get to the already designed storage area as well as expand the much needed storage areas in the lower level for Buildings & Grounds/custodial equipment. The Committee discussed the option and recommended expanding the proposed storage area an additional 2,308 square feet from the design included in the alternate bid. The estimated cost was $365,000. They discussed the one-time opportunity to make such a change and noted that the entire District could benefit from an increase in storage for Buildings & Grounds.

Mr. Kronewitter then explained the alternate for the running track and increased storage area within the school. He shared that the preliminary Bid Group #1 results included costs for concrete and steel, which came in lower than expected. This design change would allow for some additional design changes that would increase P.E. and custodial storage within the school. Mr. Kronewitter emphasized that this is a one-time opportunity and highlighted that the Village of Hinsdale would be paying for the earth retention and the deeper foundation as a result of their desire to have an increase in parking. There is also an opportunity to increase outside storage space for maintenance support.

There was consensus with no dissention to move forward with the two alternates, noting that the District would not have this opportunity again and it would benefit the students and staff. He noted that it is best to schedule a Special Board meeting to approve the shop drawings prior to the next regularly scheduled April 17, 2017 meeting.

Mr. Leonard shared information as a follow-up to a committee member’s request regarding whether liquidated damages are included within any of the bids. He noted that there were not any liquidated damages clauses within any of the bids and felt confident that although his was not included, the District was protected.

Mr. Bill Truty of Bulley and Andrews noted that there were not as many alternates in Bid Package #2 and that it contained mostly base bid items. Mr. Kronewitter noted that there would be two operable window alternate bids (one for the entire building and one for science, art, and FACS).

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 7:01pm.