

Feb. 20, 2019

Report to CLC from Building Expansion Team

On Feb. 1 we received a “final” proposal from Loven Contracting, based on the permit-level construction drawings and specifications in the amount of \$430,870 – which did not reflect a credit for the approximately \$28,000 we have spent on cottage demolition and backyard utility work. We had been anticipating a number closer to \$290,000, based on the 70% complete document estimate.

After an analysis, which included postponing all possible discretionary items from our budget, but including unavoidable costs during construction (such as professional services, construction loan interest, etc.) it appeared that our maximum allowable construction cost would be \$311,396 – a gap of nearly \$119,474 from the contractor’s final proposal.

During a meeting of the Board and the members of the BET, it was agreed that we should meet with Loven to seek a number within our means and according to the congregational guidelines established during the capital campaign.

Our Architect, Steve Dorsett joined Theresa, Barry B., Skip B. and me in a meeting with Loven. We had a list of items that we could delete from the project, or defer and/or accomplish with church volunteers in the future. Working with Mike Loven and his estimator, we reached a tentative agreement to execute a lump-sum contractor for the amended project at \$320,000. Retainage of \$10,000 of that amount could be paid within a year of project completion. Credit is due to our team and to the contractor for working through to a solution that we can afford and that avoids the necessity of finding interested and available bidders in a hot construction market.

On Feb. 6, we received the results from our application for a construction permit. The City’s Building Official and her staff had essentially reversed agreements made during the pre-permit review by the Development Dept. and was now (again) redefining our total building population as 229 people – roughly 100 more than we had previously agreed-upon. This greater population would require rework of the existing bathrooms to add toilets, a water fountain and other upgrades. These changes would push the budget back out of reach.

On Feb. 14, Theresa, Steve Dorsett and I met with Building Official and her Plans Examiner. The results of that meeting are outlined in the attached meeting report. The City representatives agreed to redefine the Vestibule as an extension of the corridor (eliminating over 70 people from the population count) and to reclassify the new upstairs storage as non-occupied because it will now be reached via a pull-down attic ladder in the Social Room. They also agreed to look at a furniture layout as a means of establishing population, rather than the code-based head-count per

square foot. Theresa and Steve collaborated on a layout and it was submitted to the City on Tuesday, Feb. 19.

We are waiting to receive the City's comments (and hopefully permit approval) as a result of our meeting and the furniture layout. The Contractor has prudently suggested that we defer signing a contract until the permit is issued, thus avoiding any possible changes in cost due to City requirements.

We are hoping for a fairly quick response from the City, after which we will prepare a contract for review and approval by the Board.

Carl Taylor
Chair, BET

P.S. **Late-breaking news:** Just heard from the architect that the City has concurred with our furniture layout – and wants a resubmittal of drawings that reflect the various items removed from the project. I have directed Steve Dorsett and his engineers to proceed with making these changes as an additional service costing \$2,500. This will be paid from the \$10,000 we have set aside as a contingency reserve.

CT

February 14, 2019

Permit Review Meeting

Attending:

Amy Palmer, Building Official, City of Flagstaff
Douglas Joseph, Building Plans Examiner, City of Flagstaff
Steve Dorsett, Shapes & Forms, Architects
Theresa DeBoer, Project Manager, Beacon UU Building Expansion Team
Carl Taylor, Chair, Beacon UU Building Expansion Team

Purpose: to respond and resolve issues raised by Douglas Joseph during building permit application review.

- A. Scope of work within the existing building constitutes largely repair, rather than contributing to square footage of “addition”. Specific example includes removal and replacement of problematic front entrance door due to settlement.
- B. Reviewed scope of work items that have been reduced or eliminated during cost management process with contractor:
 - Eliminate two parking spaces in alleyway.
 - Eliminate handicapped ramp.
 - Eliminate new rear porch.
 - Eliminate closure of glass block closure of opening into existing kitchen (becoming staff office).
 - Eliminate dividing partition at minister/library area; now to be one office space.
 - Eliminate upstairs connector to new storage/mechanical room space over Social Room; access to be via pull down attic ladder.
 - Eliminate partial wall closure where one door into Sanctuary was to be removed.
- C. Primary discussion revolved around the actual occupancy numbers of the completed building. Beacon has always taken the position that this addition of two support spaces does not increase numbers of occupants. Members are either in the Sanctuary for services, or in Social Room for coffee after, but not simultaneously. The current maximum stipulated by the City is:

Assembly Area: 112; Classrooms: 28; Offices: 3. Total = 143

Amy and Douglas have taken the position that every space is occupied simultaneously at the maximum number of people per code stipulated square foot. This approach results in a population of 229 – triggering modifications and additions to toilet fixtures, etc.

City is willing to recategorize the existing vestibule as connective space (hallway extension) and therefore it does not contribute to occupancy count. Upstairs storage space will be removed from occupancy calculation.

Dorsett, on behalf of Beacon will resubmit a furniture layout plan as the basis for an alternative occupancy count. City will consider this as an alternative and may revise requirements as a result.

D. Miscellaneous:

Beacon has physically verified that a disabled person in a wheelchair can access the existing toilet rooms without assistance.

The existing small toilet room for children does, in fact have a small sink. This is not currently shown on the existing plan.

Corridor door 04 is a good idea in terms of security and fire safety and can remain in the project.

Coffee bar in new Social Room does not have to be designed to serve disabled persons. There is no cook top.

E. Next steps:

Steve will resubmit a furniture layout plan for recalculation of occupancy. City will look at this as soon as possible and advise.

Carl Taylor