

**Building Excellence II Levy Oversight Committee
Meeting Notes, February 13, 2004
Stanford Center, Room 3802, 7:30a - 9:30a**

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present

David Hudd
Joey Ing
Karin Nyrop
Ed Peters

District Staff

Gary Baldasari
Don Gillmore
Julie Krick
Nan Stavshoj
John Vacchiery

Heery International Staff

Roxann Robinson
Ralph Rohwer

Members Absent

Ron Jelaco
Jay Keiper
Jim Travis

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 8, 2004 MEETING NOTES

- The meeting notes of the January 8, 2004 meeting were approved.

UPDATE ON CHAIRMAN'S REPORT TO THE BOARD, JANUARY 21

- Ed thanked Committee members, particularly Ron, for input on this presentation.
- Ed reviewed the handout of his notes on the presentation.
- Joey Ing and Jay Keiper attended the Board meeting, although Joey had to leave before the Committee presentation was made.
- Board directors were positive about the makeup of the Committee, especially professional backgrounds and that some were parents of District students.
- There was a comment from a Board member about the lack of Committee oversight when Roosevelt was designed. (There was public testimony earlier in the Board meeting about Roosevelt). Ed explained to the Board the School Design Team (SDT) process of BEX II project design that involves the school and community.
- Because of some public adversity to the District's approach to new construction the Master Use Permit (MUP) appeal process is now built into project schedules. There are appeals on many of the projects and each appeal costs the District between \$5,000 - \$10,000. The District has never lost an appeal.

GARFIELD CONCEPT PRESENTATION, DON GILLMORE

- This presentation was made to the Board several weeks ago. The schematic design (SD) presentation will be made to the Board this summer.
- The north façade and the 23rd Avenue façade, built in 1923 and 1929, are landmarked. The gym addition was built in the late 1960s and blocks the view of the historic façade. This will be demolished.
- Interior landmarked areas are the lobby, clock, entry doors to Quincy Jones auditorium, four interior stairwells, and a corridor between the lobby and stairwells (not the finishes, but that the corridor remain in the same place).
- The auditorium was cut in half horizontally in the '60s and lost the benefits and acoustics of a theatre.
- The two historic gyms will be converted to libraries. The skylights will be rebuilt and terra cotta will be preserved.
- Landmarking drives up prices and compromises the instructional program. The project is constrained by the building envelope and floor plates.
- A major impact of landmarking outside of program issues is the construction phase, which is more difficult because of working with the existing structure. It also becomes necessary to minimize previous construction errors.
- The District and the Landmarks board have a good working relationship. There have been discussions in the past that the Landmarks board probably doesn't have legal

jurisdiction over the District. Rather than challenge the legality, the Landmarks Board and the District work together to achieve educational goals.

- Lorne McConachie, Bassetti Architects, and member of the Landmarks board, has a presentation on the issues of landmarking educational buildings.
- The School Design Team (SDT) planning process has included hands-on exercises, tours of schools, and a two-day summer conceptual workshop working with puzzle pieces. The group came up with three concepts that each had four learning communities plus a world language hub and a student commons. Each small learning community has the same components so that the basic plan would work for each program theme or grade level. Although each learning community serves 400 students they will not all be there at the same time.
- The challenge of the schematic design process is to replicate these four small learning communities in the space of the landmarked building. The academic programs work better in the smaller spaces of the landmarked building than the other program elements. Athletics and the auditorium will be in a new addition. The auto shop is in the northeast corner of the site. A yard will be created so the cars will be off the street.
 - Career and Technical Education hub is comprised of a culinary arts program, wood shop, auto shop, and business labs.
 - The current auto shop program at Garfield is a strong program that trains students to get jobs, e.g. Jiffy Lube. Not all high schools have auto shops - Roosevelt and Ballard don't have auto shops; West Seattle, Ingraham, and Garfield do have auto shop programs. The wood shop at Garfield is a weaker program than auto shop.
 - There is an ongoing discussion in the District at the central administration level about career and technical ed. There is not a master plan for placing these programs in the District. The District programs are individual-centric and rely on the dynamic of the instructor. The District might coordinate with the community colleges that have many career and technical ed programs already established. Finding certificated and qualified instructors is difficult.
 - Ed will e-mail information about the Canby, Oregon High School new technology center that has language and arts instruction in the same building.
 - PE/Athletic hub is comprised of a main gym, small gym, teen life center, weight training, and a classroom. The football field and track will be reconfigured to the proper size. A land swap with Parks will be needed to accommodate the new field. The track is about 20' above the gym building and will be connected with stairs
- There are seven themes and guiding principles of high achieving schools. These put students' needs first. One of the challenges of the SDT process has been to educate the teachers to think differently about the use of the classroom. The seven themes are:
 - learner-centered environment
 - personalizing environment
 - program adaptability
 - community connections
 - aesthetics
 - safety
 - collaboration
- There was a November community meeting and another is scheduled for February 21, 2004. The February meeting will focus on the site plan – circulation and safety.

UPDATE ON BID RESULTS FOR CHIEF SEALTH AND FOR THE GARFIELD GCCM

- Chief Sealth bids from four bidders were very close together but higher than the architect's estimates. There are additional funds available from the 2004 new capital levy so that the project scope can be completed. The budget will be \$3.6M. An

architect and estimator new to the District may have resulted in a low project estimate. Architects prepare a final estimate of construction costs based on the construction documents. The drawings must have been good since the bids were so close together. The bid overage was about 25%. The choices were to re-bid, reduce the program, or borrow funds from BTA II. Borrowing funds seemed to be the most time-efficient.

- It was intentional that Sealth be put on the BTA II levy. It was known that what was needed at Sealth would not fit into BEX II so part of the project was programmed in BTA II and will also be programmed in BEX III. There are two strands of funding, programmatic upgrades and major maintenance items (flooring, roofing, glazing). Even though BTA II will fund part of the BEX II scope, both BEX II and BTA II scopes should be accomplished.
- There were five submittals for Garfield GCCM. The short-listing meeting is today and will probably result in interviews for four of the submitters. All are good candidates that can do the work.

REVIEW OF MONTHLY REPORT BY EXCEPTION

Beacon Hill

- The project is over budget due to contaminated soils, water line replacement, and deferred maintenance that has to be done to do the addition.

Brighton

- There is a schedule concern. The contractor continues to revise the schedule as dates are missed. Ralph and Don have met with the owner of the company about the District's concerns. More and more activities are being pushed to the end of the project schedule.
- The contractor will have to put \$1.5 to \$2M of work into the project in the last two months to finish on time if they continue with a late-start schedule. This is impossible unless they work 24 hours a day, which is also impossible.
- The worst-case scenario is that they will finish the end of July instead of end of June. This would make moving-in difficult but it has been done before. Since the contractor is responsible for its schedule the District can identify concerns but can't interfere. The District simply reminds them that the school opening date is non-negotiable.
- The contractor is facing liquidated damages. This is a good contractor and they will make every effort to finish on time. There is no exposure for the District. The site is flat and there are no construction problems at all. The contractor has not suggested that schedule delays are the District's responsibility.
- Drywalling will start earlier using diesel-powered heat.

Garfield

- The SDT is still working on the design, specifically square footage. The design needs to get from 258,000 to 250,000 square feet.

Graham Hill

- Move-in is occurring now. The addition will open February 23.

Maple

- Fire flow is still being investigated, and the situation is not looking good. A water line upgrade would be \$100,000. Street improvements and the water line might be absorbed by the off-site improvements.

Roosevelt

- MUP is delayed from the City. It is supposed to be out next week, about two weeks late. This is an issue because there will be appeals and the sooner the process gets started the quicker it is over.

South Shore

- The project is still on hold until central administration makes program decisions. Escalation will have an effect. Although the money is earning interest, there will be a negative effect. There are also costs related to stopping and re-starting the project.
- There is a Board work session about South Shore instructional program issues on March 10.

Wing Luke

- Additional scope of work that is desirable but not necessary is segregated in additive alternates. None of the alternates are awardable. The bid date is the middle of April.

Program Budget Forecast Scenarios - Optimistic and Pessimistic

- Projects with figures in red are projected to not end in budget.
- Budget transfer surplus column – These are projects that could finish with a surplus.
- Subtotal of budget forecast column is the forecast of the funds available at the end of the program.
- A very pessimistic scenario would result from adding \$.5M to each project that is an addition.
- World School – at this time the project is undefined.
- Hamilton – Hamilton will move into Lincoln sometime after Garfield moves out. The amount of work needed to ready the building for Hamilton is yet to be determined. A lot of work has already been done on Lincoln and it's possible that Hamilton can move in without spending the full amount allocated for the project.
- The funds projected as surplus are actually set aside and not used except in emergency. It is hoped this fund will be given back to the program budget.
- The high school improvement fund was committed to undefined projects and there is now a \$4M shortfall. The Board has a high level of concern about the Center School project and how that happened.

Comments/discussion

- There is a project contingency line item that generally runs 2% – 3% in addition to the other construction contingency. Garfield has \$2.8M in project contingency.
- Scope is not added in the middle of a project. This would almost guarantee that projects would end “in the red”. It requires diligence to resist scope “creep” and to reserve the project contingency for emergencies.
- Project surplus is used to balance other projects that have ended up in the red. At the end of the program if we are plus or minus 1% or 2% that would be success.
- Ed Peters commented that this is a very useful document for the Committee.

SITE VISITS

- It was suggested that a visit to West Seattle (a historic completed project), Madison (a historic building under construction), and Roosevelt (a historic project that hasn't started yet) would be instructive for the Committee. A visit to Hale might also be worthwhile.
- Julie will arrange a schedule.

BOARD DIRECTOR FOR COMMITTEE

- John will discuss with the Board president the possibility of assigning a board member to this committee and having them attend some of the meetings.

AGENDA

- Standing items
- Involvement in development of BEX III; the internal process for developing BEX III
- Maple and Dearborn Park concept presentations

Adjourned at 9:30a