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The Board of Governors for Truman State University met on Friday, October 15, 2010, on the University campus in Kirkville, Missouri. The meeting was held in the Conference Room of the Student Union, and the open session of the meeting was called to order shortly after 1:30 p.m. by the Chair of the Board of Governors, Matthew W. Potter.

A quorum was present with all seven voting members in attendance: Cheryl J. Cozette, Mike Greenwell, Karen Haber, Matthew W. Potter, Kenneth L. Read, John W. Siscel, III, and Mark S. Wasinger.

Also participating in the meeting were all three of the non-voting members. Luke Freeland, the student representative, and Mike Zito, an out-of-state member, participated in person. John Hilton, the other out-of-state member, participated by conference call.

Call to Order
Mr. Potter, as Chair of the Board of Governors, called the meeting to order.

Minutes for Open Session of Meeting on August 14, 2010
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes for the open session of the meeting on August 14, 2010, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Haber and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted.

Chair Report
Mr. Potter welcomed all in attendance. He noted a number of activities that he and University President Troy D. Paino had attended together recently including the Governor’s Summit on Higher Education and two advancement activities, one held in conjunction with a St. Louis Cardinals game and one hosted by the Boeing Company in St. Louis. Mr. Potter noted that the Foundation Board of Directors had met earlier in the morning, and he expressed his appreciation to Bright Minds Bright Futures Campaign Chair Chuck Foudree, Vice President for University Advancement Mark Gambaiana, and the other members of the Foundation Board for their good work in the area of advancement. Mr. Potter also noted that he has just learned of the establishment of TruTouch, a free application for Apple products including the iPhone, iPod Touch and iPad that provides convenient one-touch access to a variety of information about Truman for current students, prospective students, alumni, faculty, staff and members of the general public. The application, which was developed by Dr. Chad Mohler, Professor of Philosophy and Religion, is available for download from Apple's iTunes App Store.

Resolution of Commendation—Truman Speech and Debate Team
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Truman Speech and Debate Team was crowned National Champion in Individual Events for the Small School Division at the National Forensic Association Tournament held in Athens, Ohio, in April 2010; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the national championship, the Team also brought home a fourth-place debate award, as well as three individual speaking awards and two debate octafinalist awards (quite an accomplishment for a team of only eight members); and

WHEREAS, the Team was awarded the national champion status by placing above 46 other schools including notable institutions such as Cornell University, University of Michigan, and West Texas A&M University; and
WHEREAS, the Team has maintained a reputation for success under the leadership of Dr. Kristi Scholten, Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Forensics; and

WHEREAS, all members of the championship winning Speech and Debate Team have brought honor and dignity to this institution and to its students, faculty, staff and alumni; and

WHEREAS, the Truman State University Board of Governors desires to recognize student achievement in nationally competitive events;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Governors of Truman State University hereby expresses its great appreciation and commendation to the Truman Speech and Debate Team and to Dr. Kristi Scholten for their extraordinary achievements and for their fine representation of this University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be presented to them as a tangible expression of appreciation and felicitation.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Read and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter declared the motion to be duly adopted. Mr. Potter then presented a framed copy of the resolution to Dr. Kristi Scholten and the members of the Truman Speech and Debate Team.

Audit Report
Mr. Wasinger, as chair of the Finance and Auditing Committee, reported on the committee meeting which was held by conference call on Thursday, October 14. Representatives of RubinBrown LLP accounting firm then reviewed a draft of the annual audit of the University.

President's Report
Dr. Troy D. Paino, President of the University, began his report by sharing with the Board a report summarizing his external and internal relations activities from August 14 to October 14, 2010, along with an email he received from a first-year student which provided a very positive reflection on the Truman community. President Paino expressed his appreciation to the Board for their involvement in the Celebrating Community Installation activities, noting how meaningful it had been for him to be able to have that moment to celebrate with the Truman and local communities as well as his family and friends. President Paino highlighted the Governor’s Summit on Higher Education held in August, and he noted that throughout the Governor’s remarks he focused on four points that reflect his vision for higher education in Missouri: increase the number of Missourians who earn high quality two- and four-year degrees; conduct a systematic statewide program review in order to deploy limited resources strategically; increase collaboration among institutions; and decide how best to fund institutions in a sustainable way that improves coordination of missions, addresses strategic needs, and rewards performance. He then noted how those initiatives would impact Truman and what actions had been taken by the University thus far. President Paino reported that the Mid-Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association (MIAA) approved the expansion of the conference to 16 members, and that Athletic Director Jerry Wollmering has been placed on an MIAA committee to study the implementation of the expanded athletic conference. President Paino then provided a fiscal responsibility report in which he provided an update on the state budget forecast and the initiatives taking place on campus in anticipation of the upcoming budget challenges. President Paino ended his remarks by expressing his appreciation to the staff and faculty for their spirit of dedication. He noted that the University has been asking a lot of individuals during these difficult times, and that thus far people have been very willing to step up to the plate.
Welcome to New Board Member – Michael A. Zito
Mr. Potter welcomed Mr. Zito to his first on-campus meeting of the Board. Mr. Zito, a 1992 alumnus of the University, noted it was nice to “come home” and that he looked forward to working with everyone.

Advancement Report
Mark Gambaiana, Vice President for University Advancement, provided an updated on advancement activities.

Enrollment Management Report
Regina Morin, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, provided the annual enrollment management report.

Financial Report
Mr. Wasinger, along with Judy Mullins, Comptroller, provided a review of the financial reports of the University, which included a review as of August 31, 2010, of education and general revenues and expenditures and auxiliary systems revenues and expenditures, and a review as of August 31, 2010, of the Truman State University Foundation revenues and expenditures.

Early Retirement Incentives
Mr. Wasinger moved the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Board of Governors of Truman State University to establish a one-time retirement incentive for faculty and staff;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the attached document, entitled “Early Retirement Incentives,” shall be policy of the Board of Governors and shall automatically expire on January 31, 2011; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President of the University, or his designee, be authorized to implement the policy; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the document, as reviewed at the meeting, be attached to the minutes as an exhibit.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Siscel and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted, and the Secretary designated a copy of the document as Exhibit A.

Construction Projects Report
Dr. Siscel, as chair of the Budget and Capital Projects Committee, reported on the committee meeting which was held by conference call on October 14. Dr. Siscel then provided an update on construction projects which had been approved by the Board at previous meetings.

Contracts for Construction/Technology Projects Report
Dr. Siscel noted that there were no construction/technology projects totaling $25,000 to $50,000 which had been approved since the last meeting of the Board.

Architectural Services—Miscellaneous Masonry and HVAC Repairs Project
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:
BE IT RESOLVED that the proposal from William B. Ittner Inc. to provide architectural services for the Miscellaneous Masonry and HVAC Repairs Project, with the fees and work for such service to be within the guidelines of the proposal, be approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President of the University, or his designee, be authorized to execute a contract with the firm for the project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the proposal be attached to and made a part of the minutes for this meeting.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwell and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted, and the Secretary designated a copy of the document as Exhibit B.

Energy Conservation Loan Application
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the President of the University, or his designee, be authorized to execute a loan application for up to $250,000 with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources Energy Revolving Fund for an energy conservation project.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Cozette and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted.

Contracted Services—Legislative Consultants
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the President of the University, or his designee, is hereby authorized to execute contracts with Sherry L. Doctorian, Rodney Gray and Harry Hill to work as legislative consultants for the year beginning December 11, 2010, at a cost not to exceed $22,500 for each legislative consultant contract; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in addition to the terms and conditions of the contracts, that the President of the University, or his designee, is hereby authorized to provide reimbursement of approved expenses to each of the three consultants for the year beginning December 11, 2010, as per the University’s Business Travel Expense Policy.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Haber and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted.

Agenda Items for Future Meetings
The Board reviewed a list of proposed agenda items for regular meetings during the next year.

Dates for Future Meetings
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the next regular meeting of the Board of Governors be scheduled for Saturday, December 4, 2010, on the University campus in Kirksville, beginning at 1:00 p.m., with the understanding that the Chair may alter the starting time and/or place for the meeting by giving due notice of such change; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that other regular meetings of the Board during the next year be tentatively scheduled for the following dates:

Saturday, February 5, 2011;
Saturday, April 9, 2011;
Friday and Saturday, June 17-18, 2011;
Saturday, August 6, 2011; and
Friday, October 7, 2011.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwell and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted.

Agenda Items for Closed Session
Dr. Siscel moved the adoption of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that this meeting be continued in closed session, with closed records and closed votes as permitted by law, for consideration of the following items as authorized by Section 610.021, Revised Statutes of Missouri:

1. Approval of minutes for the closed session of the last meeting under Subsection 14 of the statute for “Records which are protected from disclosure by law”;
2. Individual personnel actions under Subsection 3 of the statute for “Hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded”; and
3. Confidential communications with the General Counsel; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any business not covered by the stated reasons for the closed session is raised during the closed session, then this meeting shall be reopened to the public and an announcement about a resumption of the open session shall be made in the hallway outside of the meeting room.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Read and carried by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Potter then declared the motion to be duly adopted.

The closed session of the meeting began shortly after 3:30 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes were approved by the Board of Governors on the 4th day of December, 2010.

Matthew W. Potter
Chair of the Board of Governors
Early Retirement Incentives

Option 1: Phased Retirement with Medical Insurance Benefits

Rationale
This incentive is designed to assist employees who are eligible to retire but wish to phase-in to full retirement while retaining medical insurance coverage.

Eligibility
Full-time employees who are in positions paid by unrestricted University funds and are eligible for full retirement benefits under MOSERS may apply. Applicants must specify a retirement date no later than January 1, 2012. Administrative approval is required and an approved application will be considered tantamount to a resignation on the effective date stated in the signed retirement agreement.

Incentive
The individual will be employed on a half-time basis for up to a maximum of three years. Salary will be based on 50% of the final full-time base salary and the employee will remain on Truman's medical insurance coverage with the university providing the same medical insurance contribution that is provided to fulltime employees.

Application Deadline
The application deadline is January 31, 2011 for individuals wishing to retire no later than January 1, 2012.

Option 2: Full Retirement with Medical Insurance Incentive

Rationale
This incentive is designed to assist employees who are eligible to retire and desire to do so, but are concerned about maintaining medical insurance coverage.

Eligibility
Regular, full-time employees who are in positions paid by unrestricted University funds and are eligible to retire under MOSERS, who have 5 or more years of service at Truman by January 1, 2012, may apply for the incentive. Applicants must specify a retirement date no later than January 1, 2012. Administrative approval is required.

Incentives
The employee will remain on Truman's medical insurance coverage (currently through Anthem Blue Cross) for up to a maximum of five calendar years or until the month the retiree reaches age 65 and is Medicare eligible. Truman will pay the current rate ($5,482.80 annually for 2011) and this amount will be increased annually, by the calendar year Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). If medical insurance rates increase more than CPI-U the former employee will pay the difference. Should rates decrease, Truman will pay the current rate.

The employee will also receive, after the date of retirement, a lump sum payment equal to two months base pay. Such payment will be subject to applicable taxes.

Application Deadline
The application deadline is January 31, 2011 for individuals wishing to retire no later than January 1, 2012.

Other benefits
Any other benefits currently provided to retirees will be available to participants in this plan.
October 7, 2010

Mr. Mark Schultz, AIA, CSI
Campus Planning Office
MC 201
Truman State University
100 East Normal
Kirkville, Missouri 63501

RE: Work Plan and Fee Proposal
Student Union Building – masonry and HVAC repairs
Pickler Memorial Library – masonry repairs

Dear Mark:

We appreciate the opportunity to present our qualifications for Architectural Services to Truman State University. We are interested in establishing an ongoing relationship with Truman State University, providing a full range of experienced services including architectural design, interior design and planning.

Enclosed are our Work Plan and Fee Proposal for completing the intended scope of work. We offer the following benefits to the University.

- **Proven Experience and Expertise** - We provide an experienced team of professionals with Ed Glock, former director of the Masonry Institute, providing additional expertise to determine the root causes of masonry system failures. Mr. Glock is a recognized expert in the field of masonry forensics.

- **A Systematic Work Plan** - We have developed a systematic work plan for identifying and evaluating the root causes for water leakage and the failure of all exterior buildings systems. We will be updating you on our ongoing findings so that you will be kept informed as to the discoveries we make.

- **A Practical Report** - We intend to provide a report that identifies the root causes of the failures and provide options for their repair or replacement. These options are intended to provide you with choices on different methods for repairs or replacement, with each having different budget and schedule implications. We will be searching for affordable solutions.

- **Local Familiarity** - We are familiar with the local contracting community having successfully worked with the Kirkville R-III School District for the past 6 years.

Ross & Baruzzini will serve as our mechanical engineer for the work at the Student Union Building. They are located just 18-minutes from our office on Hwy 44, providing easy access for ongoing reviews and coordination. They are familiar with both the existing and new mechanical systems of the Student Union Building and would provide the familiarity needed to provide a comprehensive solution.

Please note that Wm. B. Ittner, Inc. has designed over 4,000 school facilities since 1899 and is not affiliated with Ittner & Bowersox who designed the library on your campus.

We look forward to an opportunity to work with you and serve the University.

Sincerely,
Wm. B. Ittner, Inc.

Dennis M. Young
President & CEO
Overview
Water is infiltrating the building envelope of the Library at numerous locations causing significant
damage to several exterior building components and interior finishes. On September 28th, our team
conducted a preliminary onsite inspection which consisted of viewing the exterior masonry, window
system, and roof systems. Then on October 4th we conducted a team meeting to review the existing
drawings, photos of existing conditions, and develop a work plan for proceeding with Phase One –
Condition Assessment and Recommendations. In addition to the visible damage, our preliminary
assessment is that more damage may be occurring within the wall construction than is visually apparent.
The apparent damage includes corroding masonry lintels, deteriorating stone bases at perimeter
walkways, and signs of failed insulated glass units in the skylights and in the exterior windows. The
University has determined that the existing ballasted roof will be replaced as part of this project. The
scope of this project is to address the following: evaluate the existing building envelop; make
recommendations for corrective actions including establishing budgets; assist the University in
establishing priorities for the repairs; prepare the design documents needed to obtain competitive bids;
assist in the bid and negotiation process; and provide construction administration services.

I. Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations
Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee of
$33,890, plus reimbursable expenses. Ittner’s policy is to pass through its out-of-pocket
expenses without markups. Mileage is reimbursed at the IRS standard rates. Our proposal
assumes that this project will progress along the same timeline as the Student Union project
so that certain efficiencies occur that have kept our costs to a minimum. See the attached
Compensation Analysis for a more detailed breakdown of our fee proposal that was based
on the following work plan.

A. Review of Existing Documents
Ittner has already been provided electronic files for some of the existing
construction, specifically the newer addition that was added in the early 1990’s.
The files included the original architectural and mechanical design drawings as well
as some window shop drawings. While this information was very helpful in
preparing this proposal, more detailed information will be required to understand
the entire building envelop in order to identify hidden areas of potential failure that
need to be investigated. A thorough review of all available documents will be given
the highest priority initially.

B. Service History
The service history of the following building components will be reviewed to
determine if there are patterns of performance failures or other problems that
might lead to concealed damage and unsafe conditions.
- Roofing, roof drains and overflows
- Windows and skylights (glass, frames, gaskets, flashings)
- Doors and door frames
- Masonry (brick, block, stone, cast stone)
- Caulking
- Masonry lintels and flashings
- Interior repairs related to leaks (ceilings, walls, flooring)
C. Thermal Imaging
Thermal images will be taken of all exterior wall surfaces in order to identify the location of potential thermal and water leaks in the wall system. This will assist the field inspection team to focus on where leaks occur so that the cause can be determined.

D. Field Inspection Process
After reviewing the above information, a detailed work plan will be finalized to guide the field inspection team to conduct a thorough, yet efficient investigation. The work plan will detail the requirements for the two types of inspections anticipated for the Library: general visual and detailed probes.

1. **General visual assessments** — This will include the base drawings on which field notes can be applied as well as for locating photos that will be taken to illustrate the current conditions in a report. Included in this part of the investigation will be any field tests that can be visually observed and are considered effective investigative tools such as a hose test to determine the watertight integrity of a particular section of the wall.

2. **Detailed probes** — This will involve removing components and/or penetrating specific areas of the building to discover concealed problems. This investigation often involves the use of a contractor to provide the equipment, tools and repair materials needed to expose the concealed condition and then properly repair the area to the University’s satisfaction until the final corrective program is implemented. Our preliminary assessment indicates that two contractors will be required as a minimum to assist us in this part of the investigation: masonry and window glazing. Both contractors will be required to provide the scaffolding or high lift equipment needed for our inspector to access high areas on the building exterior elevations. Ittner will also take core samples of roof areas to determine the existing conditions of the insulation and deck. These cores will be taken and then patched by Architectural Pro Council, an experienced roof expert.

3. **Daily Debriefings** — At the conclusion of each day, Ittner’s field inspectors will debrief the University on its findings for that day. This will provide the University an opportunity to provide input while the team is still on site and to determine if additional investigation beyond the original scope is required based on the conditions that have been discovered. Safety concerns, if any, that require immediate action will be brought to the University’s attention as soon as they are known.

E. Findings and Recommendations
At the conclusion of the field investigations, a detailed report will be developed to: describe the findings; make recommendations for correcting the deficiencies; and to provide a budget and recommended timeline for correcting each deficiency. Our report will be supplemented with plans and elevations locating each deficiency, as well as including photos, test results, copies of industry standards and other documentation that will enhance the understanding the issues and corrective actions that are discussed in the report. Our report will categorize each deficiency...
into one of the following categories to assist the University in determining its priorities.

- Category #1 - Unsafe Conditions
- Category #2 - Requires Repair/Stabilization (Rank 1 to 5)
- Category #3 - Ordinary Maintenance (Rank 1 to 5)

II. Phase Two - Design and Bidding Services
Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee that will be determined after the University reviews the report and decides upon a final scope of work to be designed. The basis of our lump sum fee will be 6.4% of the Cost of the Work being designed, as typically defined in the current AIA standard Owner-Architect agreements, plus reimbursable expenses. The following services are included in this phase.

A. Based upon the University’s priorities and direction, we will develop the design of the corrective measures in two stages: Preliminary Design and Final Design. Each stage of the design process will include updates to the cost estimate and project schedule.

B. We will assist the University throughout the competitive bidding process and subsequent contractor negotiations. Our services shall include:
   - Prepare the bid advertisements. Arrange for the printing and handle the distribution to bidders. The cost of printing and mailing shall be a reimbursable expense.
   - Answer bidder questions, prepare and issue addenda to all plan holders as needed.
   - Review product substitution requests.
   - Conduct the prebid meeting and the bid opening meeting.
   - Review the bids and make recommendations for award to the University.

C. Budget for Reimbursable Expenses (Ittner pass-through at cost, without markups)
   a. Misc. review printing, couriers & express mail........ $ 1,000
   b. Bid Advertising and Printing ........................................... $12,000
   c. Mileage (at IRS standard rate)...................................... $  750

III. Phase Three – Construction Services
The scope of services for this type of work requires that compensation for construction services be provided in the following two categories.

A. Category #1 – General Administration. Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee that will be determined after the University reviews the report and decides upon a final scope of work to be designed. The basis of our lump sum fee will be 1.2% of the Cost of the Work being designed, as typically defined in the current AIA standard Owner-Architect agreements, plus reimbursable expenses. The following services are included in this phase.
   - Answer questions of contractors and prepare/issue Clarifications, Change Proposal Requests, Construction Change Directives and/or Change Orders.
   - Review Shop Drawings.
• When the Contractor notifies Ittner that the project is ready for a development of the punchlist, Ittner will inspect the project with the District in attendance. Ittner will provide a single punchlist and will be make two return trips to confirm that deficiencies noted in the punchlist have been corrected. Additional punchlists and return trips will be considered additional services.

B. **Category #2 - Field Observations.** While field observations services for new construction are relatively predictable, the nature of renovation work to correct concealed deficiencies makes it impossible to predict the field time that will be required. We plan to visit the site at least weekly during the construction to assess contractor’s compliance with contract documents and to resolve issues that are discovered during the renovation. However, our experience tells us that unforeseen construction deviations are often discovered in this particular type of renovation that will require additional unplanned trips to develop timely and appropriate solutions. Therefore, the fee for field observation services is not included in the lump sum fee for Category #1 – General Administration. We recommend that the compensation for our periodic field observations be based on a daily amount of $800 per person, plus reimbursable expenses, and that 20 field visits be budgeted for the construction phase.

C. **Budget for Reimbursable Expenses** (Ittner pass-through at cost, without markups)
   a. Misc. review printing, couriers & express mail........... $ 1,250
   b. Mileage (20 trips @ IRS standard rate).......................... $ 5,000
   c. Lodging and meals (12 days @ $200/day)..................... $ 2,400
### Compensation Analysis

**Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations**

**Pickler Memorial Library Building Envelope Renovation**

**Truman State University**

**Date:** October 7, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Manhour Budget</th>
<th>Billing Rate (avg)</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Ittner services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Review of existing construction documents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review of service history</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thermal Imaging coordination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Field inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop detailed field inspections workplan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review field inspections workplan w/ University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review workplan w/masonry contractor &amp; mobilize</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assemble materials to facilitate field inspections</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General visual assessments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observe and document probes into concealed areas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Develop report of findings and recommendations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Quality Checking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Review report w/University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Incorporate University’s comments into final report</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Presentation of final report to University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ittner's labor cost: 186 x $115 = $21,390

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Masonry Consultant (Glock Architecture)services:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Review of existing construction documents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review of service history</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Review thermal images</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Field inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Review detailed field inspections &amp; comment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review field inspections workplan w/ University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review workplan w/masonry contractor &amp; mobilize</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General visual assessments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observe and document probes into concealed areas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Develop report of findings and recommendations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Quality Checking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Review report w/University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Presentation of final report to University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masonry Consultant's labor cost: 100 x $125 = $12,500

Grand Total Lump Sum Fee, excluding reimbursable expenses: $33,890
## Compensation Analysis

### Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations

**Pickler Memorial Library Building Envelope Renovation**

**Truman State University**

**Date:** October 7, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Description</th>
<th>Unit Expense</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Budget for Reimbursable Expenses</strong> (ittner pass-through at cost, no markup):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Review printing, couriers and express mail</td>
<td>$ 750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mileage (4 trips @ IRS standard rate)</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lodging and meals (6 days @ $200 per day)</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Thermal Images (20 hours @ $115/per hour + printing)</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
<td>$ 5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Budget of Reimbursable Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IV. Allowances for University provided services:                                    |              |              |
| A. Masonry labor and travel expenses (4 days @ $1,108/day)                          |              | $ 4,500      |
|    John Smith Masonry 1 Bricklayer & 1 laborer costs                                |              |              |
| B. Miscellaneous repair materials (brick, stone, mortar, flashings, weeps, etc.)   | $ 1,700      |              |
| C. Use of a 60 foot boom lift and 2 days for a truck crane                          | $ 4,500      |              |
| D. Window contractor labor and travel expenses (2 days @ $1,100/day)                | $ 2,200      |              |
| E. Miscellaneous repair materials (brick, stone, mortar, flashings, weeps, etc.)   | $ 1,500      |              |
| F. Use of a boom lift                                                              | $ 2,000      | $ 16,400     |
| **Recommended Budget for University provided services:**                            |              |              |

**Recommend Budget for Phase 1 Services:** $ 55,740
Overview
On September 28th our team conducted a preliminary onsite inspection which consisted of viewing the exterior masonry, window system, and roof systems. Then on October 4th we conducted a team meeting to review the existing drawings, photos of existing conditions, and develop a work plan for proceeding with Phase One – Condition Assessment and Recommendations.

The exterior masonry of the Student Union has never been tuckpointed, there are cracks in several locations and some of the stone façade is shifting. The original part of the Student Union that was constructed around 1967-1968 is a barrier system while the newer additions tended to use brick veneer with CMU backup design. In addition to the envelop repairs, the University wants to complete the renovation of the building’s HVAC that was renovated several years ago. The preliminary scope of the HVAC renovation anticipated at this time is the following.

- Replace the three existing air handling units in the lower level mechanical room and all associated piping, ductwork and controls within that mechanical room.
- Install new VAV air terminals for the new air handling units and associated hot water reheat piping, connecting ductwork and controls above the ceilings in the office space immediately adjacent to the lower level mechanical room, due to the fact there will likely be insufficient space in the mechanical room for their installation
- Install a new outside air duct for the new air handling units up to the roof of the building, due to poor air quality in the dock area immediately outside the lower level mechanical room
- Replace the existing 2-pipe fan coil units in both the east and west stairwells with new 4-pipe fan coil units and piping.

The scope of this project is to: evaluate the existing building envelop and HVAC system; make recommendations for corrective action; assist the University in establishing priorities for the repairs; prepare the design documents needed to obtain competitive bids; assist in the bid and negotiation process; and provide construction administration services.

I. Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations
Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee of $28,230, plus reimbursable expenses. Ittner's policy is to pass through its out-of-pocket expenses without markups. Mileage is reimbursed at the IRS standard rates. Our proposal assumes that this project will progress along the same timeline as the Library renovation project so that certain efficiencies occur that will keep our costs to a minimum. See the attached Compensation Analysis for a more detailed breakdown of our fee proposal that was based on the following work plan.

A. Review of Existing Documents
Ittner has already been provided electronic files for much of the existing construction. The files included the original architectural and mechanical design drawings as well as the window shop drawings. More detailed information will be required to understand the entire building envelop in order to identify hidden areas of potential failure that need to be investigated. A more thorough review of all available documents will be given the highest priority initially.
B. Service History

The service history of the following building components will be reviewed to determine if there are patterns of performance failures or other problems that might lead to concealed damage and unsafe conditions.

- Masonry (brick, block, stone, cast stone)
- Caulking
- Masonry lintels and flashings
- Interior repairs related to leaks (ceilings, walls, flooring)
- Chillers
- Pumps
- Cooling Towers

C. Thermal Imaging

Thermal images will be taken of all exterior wall surfaces in order to identify the location of potential thermal and water leaks in the wall system. This will assist the field inspection team to focus on where leaks occur so that the cause can be determined.

D. Field Inspection Process

After reviewing the above information, a detailed work plan will be developed to guide the field inspection team to conduct a thorough, yet efficient investigation. The work plan will include investigating the condition of the existing chillers, pumps, heat exchangers and cooling towers to see if replacement is warranted. These items were serviceable 5 years ago at the time of the initial renovation project, but may need replacement now. In addition, we will detail the requirements for the two types of building envelop inspections anticipated for the Student Union: general visual and detailed probes.

1. General visual assessments - This will include the base drawings on which field notes can be applied as well as for locating photos that will be taken to illustrate the current conditions in a report. Included in this part of the investigation will be any field tests that can be visually observed and are considered effective investigative tools such as a hose test to determine the watertight integrity of a particular section of the wall.

2. Detailed probes – This will involve removing components and/or penetrating specific areas of the building to discover concealed problems. This investigation often involves the use of contractors to provide the equipment, tools and repair materials needed to expose the concealed condition and then properly repair the area to the University’s satisfaction until the final corrective program is implemented. Our preliminary assessment indicates that two contractors will be required: masonry and window glazing. The masonry contractor will be required to provide the scaffolding or high lift equipment needed for our inspector to access high areas on the building exterior elevations.
3. **Daily Debriefings** – At the conclusion of each day, Ittner’s field inspectors will debrief the University on its findings for that day. This will provide the University an opportunity to provide input while the team is still on site and to determine if additional investigation beyond the original scope is required based on the conditions that have been discovered. Safety concerns that require immediate action will be brought to the University’s attention as soon as they are known. As an example, the limestone columns on both sides of the front entrance have shifted and deteriorated so severely that there is a concern with the structural stability and safety of people passing below. The work required to open these two columns in order to understand the reason for the deterioration represents to majority of the cost to repair the columns. We recommend that the mason contractor that be authorized to fix these two columns on a time and material compensation basis as soon as possible.

E. **Findings and Recommendations**

At the conclusion of the field investigations, a detailed report will be developed to: describe the findings; make recommendations for correcting the deficiencies; and to provide a budget and recommended timeline for correcting each deficiency. Our report will be supplemented with plans and elevations locating each deficiency, as well as including photos, test results, copies of industry standards and other documentation that will enhance the understanding the issues and corrective actions that are discussed in the report. Our report will categorize each deficiency into one of the following categories to assist the University in determining its priorities.

- Category #1 - Unsafe Conditions
- Category #2 - Requires Repair/Stabilization (Rank 1 to 5)
- Category #3 - Ordinary Maintenance (Rank 1 to 5)

II. **Phase Two - Design and Bidding Services**

Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee that will be determined after the University reviews the report and decides upon a final scope of work to be designed. The basis of our lump sum fee will be computed as a percentage of the Cost of the Work being designed, as typically defined in the current AIA standard Owner-Architect agreements, plus reimbursable expenses. Two different percentages will be used in the computation. For the design services being provided for the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems being replaced and/or renovated, the lump sum fee will be computed as 8.8% of the Cost of the Work. The lump sum fee will be computed as 6.4% of the Cost of the Work for design services being provided for the balance of the work (i.e., envelope renovations, plenums, chases, doors, louvers, repairs to miscellaneous finishes). The following services are included in this phase.

A. Based upon the University’s priorities and direction, we will develop the design of the corrective measures in two stages: Preliminary Design and Final Design. Each stage of the design process will include updates to the cost estimate and project schedule.
B. We will assist the University throughout the competitive bidding process and subsequent contractor negotiations. Our services typically include:
   - Prepare the bid advertisements. Arrange for the printing and handle the distribution to bidders.
   - Answer bidder questions, prepare and issue addenda to all planholders as needed.
   - Review product substitution requests.
   - Conduct the prebid meeting and the bid opening meeting.
   - Review the bids and make recommendations for award to the University.

C. **Budget for Reimbursable Expenses** (Ittner pass-through at cost, without markups)
   a. Misc. review printing, couriers & express mail........................ $ 1,000
   b. Bid Advertising and Printing ................................................. $10,000
   c. Mileage (at IRS standard rate).............................................. $ 750

III. **Phase Three - Construction Services**

The scope of services for this type of work requires that construction services be provided in the following two categories.

A. **Category #1 – General Administration.** Compensation for the services provided under this phase shall be a lump sum fee that will be determined after the University reviews the report and decides upon a final scope of work to be designed. The basis of our lump sum fee will be computed as a percentage of the Cost of the Work being designed, as typically defined in the current AIA standard Owner-Architect agreements, plus reimbursable expenses. Again, two different percentages will be used in the computation. For the construction services being provided for the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems being replaced and/or renovated, the lump sum fee will be computed as 2.2% of the Cost of the Work. The lump sum fee will be computed as 1.2% of the Cost of the Work for design services being provided for the balance of the work. The following services are included in this phase.
   - Answer questions of contractors and prepare/issue Clarifications, Change Proposal Requests, Construction Change Directives and/or Change Orders.
   - Review Shop Drawings.
   - When the Contractor notifies Ittner that the project is ready for a development of the punchlist, Ittner will inspect the project with the District in attendance. Ittner will provide a single punchlist and will make two return trips to confirm that deficiencies noted in the punchlist have been corrected. Additional punchlists and return trips will be considered additional services.

B. **Category #2 – Field Observations.** Field observations services for the mechanical systems renovation are based on one field visit per month and therefore the compensation will included in the 2.2% lump sum fee. However, the nature of renovation work to correct concealed deficiencies makes it impossible to predict the field time that will be required for services involving the building envelope. We plan to visit the site at least weekly during the renovation of the building envelope to
assess contractor's compliance with contract documents and to resolve issues that are discovered during the renovation. However, our experience tells us that unforeseen construction deviations are often discovered in this particular type of renovation that will require additional unplanned trips to develop timely and appropriate solutions. Therefore, the fee for field observation services related to the building envelope and the non-MEP interior design features is not included in the Category #1 — General Administration lump sum fee. We recommend that the compensation for our periodic field observations be based on a daily amount of $800 per person, plus reimbursable expenses, and that 14 field visits days be budgeted for the building envelope during the construction phase.

C. Budget for Reimbursable Expenses (Ittner pass-through at cost, without markups)
   a. Misc. review printing, couriers & express mail.......... $ 1,000
   b. Mileage (at IRS standard rate)............................... $ 3,500
   c. Lodging and meals (8 days @ $200/day)................... $ 1,600
## Compensation Analysis
### Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations
#### Student Union Building Renovation
Truman State University
Date: October 7, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Manhour Budget</th>
<th>Billing Rate (avg)</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Ittner services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Review of existing construction documents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review of service history</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thermal Imaging coordination</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Field inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop detailed field inspections workplan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review field inspections workplan w/ University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review workplan w/masonry contractor &amp; mobilize</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assemble materials to facilitate field inspections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General visual assessments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observe and document probes into concealed areas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Develop report of findings and recommendations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Quality Checking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Review report w/University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Incorporate University's comments into final report</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Presentation of final report to University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ittner’s labor cost: 122 x $115 = $14,030

| **II. Masonry Consultant (Glock Architecture) services:** | | | |
| A. Review of existing construction documents | 4 | | |
| B. Review of service history | 2 | | |
| C. Review thermal Images | 2 | | |
| D. Field inspections | | | |
| 1. Review detailed field inspections & comment | 8 | | |
| 2. Review field inspections workplan w/ University | 4 | | |
| 3. Review workplan w/masonry contractor & mobilize | 4 | | |
| 4. General visual assessments | 8 | | |
| 5. Observe and document probes into concealed areas | 8 | | |
| E. Develop report of findings and recommendations | 16 | | |
| F. Quality Checking | 4 | | |
| G. Review report w/University | 4 | | |
| H. Presentation of final report to University | 4 | | |

Masonry Consultant's labor cost: 68 x $125 = $8,500

| **III. MEP Consultant (Ross & Barruzini) services:** | | | |
| | | | |

Grand Total Lump Sum Fee, excluding reimbursable expenses: $28,230
Compensation Analysis
Phase One - Condition Assessment and Recommendations
Student Union Building Renovation
Truman State University
Date: October 7, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Description</th>
<th>Unit Expense</th>
<th>Grand Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Budget for Reimbursable Expenses (Ittner pass-through at cost, no markup):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Miscellaneous (review printing, couriers and express mail)</td>
<td>$ 750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mileage (4 trips @ IRS standard rate)</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lodging and meals (6 days @ $200 per day)</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Thermal Images (20 hours @ $115/per hour + printing)</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Budget of Reimbursable Expenses:</strong></td>
<td>$ 5,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Allowances for University provided services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Masonry labor and travel expenses (1 day @ $1,108/day)</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith Masonry 1 Bricklayer &amp; 1 laborer costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Miscellaneous repair materials (brick, stone, mortar, flashings, weeps, etc.)</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Use of a 60 foot boom lift and a truck crane</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Budget for University provided services:</strong></td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommend Budget for Phase 1 Services:** $ 37,680