

Building Committee  
Minutes  
10/10/16

Attendees: Kevin Markwell, Al Brunsting, Nate Burke, Jim Davidson, Brenda DeGeer, Rich Fleming, Garth Lawson, Jim McCloud, Paula Overstreet, Ollie Taylor, Leo Waynick

1. Tuesday Thermostat will return to publication on either 10/11 or 10/18. Any requested topics should be sent to Kevin for future inclusion.
2. Letter to the congregation will be submitted for email/mail shortly after resumption of the Tuesday Thermostat. This will include information on the current status of the Building Project along with a path moving forward for completion.
3. Comparison of options
  - a) Brenda DeGeer: We have \$1.5 million for this project without assuming any debt.
  - b) Al Brunsting presented an initial comparison (Attachment 1) of whole project costs for Plan J & K ), using interpretations of (1) "Architect's Estimate of Probable Costs". 7/24/15 (see pages 7 – 10 of the attachment), and (2) "Community United Methodist Church — Scheme J Budget", 8/19/16. These costs are initial estimates are require additional refinement.
  - c) Items 12, 14, & 15 need to be challenged
  - d) We need to consider the list of 14 -Add-on Alternate Bids" on page 3 of "Architect's Estimate of Probable Costs." (See page 8 of the attachment.)
  - e) Contingency costs are included in item 11. See page 11, 5 lines up from the bottom.
  - f) Plan J. was developed shortly after announcement that costs for original planned phase were significantly more that the funds available.
  - g) Plan K
  - h) Pastor Leo presented sketches "Original First Floor of two story addition
4. All costs need further investigation to determine relative costs using comparable costing methods.
5. Next BC team meeting: Oct. 31, '16, 6:30pm, Room 101.

Note taker: Al Brunsting

Appendix

Jim Davidson asked that the following be added to the minutes:

Like Jim & Paula, I fully appreciate Al's work on this project and I also appreciate all the committee members' hard work in trying to come to a consensus opinion. I really was impressed with all the concerns expressed by EVERY committee member present at our last meeting. It was a great free exchange of opinions and concerns in a welcoming format. It was obvious that we all had done considerable preparation in reviewing the document and there were many honest disagreements with regard to the validity of the numbers used, omissions, e.g., no contingency amounts, some items that should have been "not applicable" and needed to be removed, and some 9 items, according to my notes, where there was concern about contradictory data both in the reports submitted and used for the calculations and prior data from both the architect and general contractor, as well as concern about what was properly included in some of those numbers. Until these matters can be resolved with full consensus of the committee, any conclusions in my opinion are very premature.

On a personal note I would like to express my appreciation to Pastor Leo for presenting a totally new approach by considering a new plan which incorporates many of the features of Scheme J. As Kevin expressed early in the meeting and I too have experienced, some members of our congregation are really excited about the new scheme because of the addition of a drop off area and some have expressed to Pastor Leo a willingness to help fund the additional cost that would undoubtedly come from the new plan. I know you have taken some real heat for asking for consideration of a new plan and I appreciate your determination and patience in seeking to have respectful consideration and time given to fully understand your plan. Your willingness to stay on and exercise your expertise to help secure funding is very much appreciated. I wish you and Kevin luck in your meeting with our

architect and am confident he will make a sound business decision with regard to pricing and thus give him the ability to continue to serve this church in its future architectural needs. I would also like to point out that we shall not have the \$1.5 million in full until very late 2017 or early 2018 and this should give us plenty of time to resolve these differences with full committee consensus without imposing unnecessary time constraints in our mutual goal to give our congregation our best collective judgments.