

**Building Excellence II Levy Oversight Committee
Meeting Notes, August 13, 2004
Stanford Center, Room 2778, 7:30a - 9:30a**

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present

Joey Ing
Ron Jelaco
Mark Melroy
Karin Nyrop
Ed Peters

District Staff

Gary Baldasari
Don Gillmore
John Vacchiery

Heery International Staff

Roxann Robinson
Ralph Rohwer

Members Absent

David Hudd
Jay Keiper
Jim Travis

School Board Directors

Others

Chris Jackins
Shellise Montgomery

APPROVAL OF JUNE 11, 2004 AND JULY 9, 2004 MEETING NOTES

- Approved.

ROOSEVELT PARKING UPDATE, Gary Baldasari

- School Board has asked for a review of Roosevelt High School parking to comply with the requirements per the departures ruling to provide 84 more spaces per the MUP. The matrix was going to be presented to the Board in August and has been postponed to September.
- A draft copy of the parking solution matrix was distributed to the attendees.
- There are five possible solutions.
 1. District designs and builds a below-grade garage at the southwest corner of the site. This area has the largest grade change. Security would be an issue and the facility would have to be gated and locked.
 2. District condemns property and builds a surface lot off site. This is the easiest solution but a surface lot may not be the highest and best use of the property. This does not preclude further development in the future. Property would be leased by District using a joint agreement between District and a private developer for a multi-use facility (long-term option).
 3. Property would be leased by the District with a joint agreement between District and a private developer for a multi-use facility (long-term option).
 4. District condemns property and seeks development for long-term lease (long-term option) which provides the additional parking for the District.
 5. Make an arrangement with QFC to use a portion of their parking lot. QFC might not agree and might not have the 84 spaces needed. A zoning variance might be needed for development.

Options 2, 3, and 4 are the most likely scenarios and have the most potential for meeting the time frame to fit within the construction schedule. A decision would be needed by October 1 to use District-owned property. Construction has commenced and an October 1 decision is needed in order to enter into negotiations with Hoffman for changes to their scope. Hoffman has stated that other than a change order for the cost of construction, it should be able to be absorbing the project within the current schedule.

- An architectural firm was building a new office building and filed suit when it found out the District was considering acquiring the block. The settlement resulted in the District committing to obtaining only half of the block if they pursue condemnation. The property that would be condemned includes a small low-income apartment complex, and two private residences.
- School Board allocated \$5M to this project for site acquisitions, but it was not tied to any specific scope.

Committee discussion and comments:

- Ed Peters noted that a site plan would be helpful.
- A cost-per-stall breakout for each of the options would be helpful.
- Seattle Community College has a similar situation with retail.
- In a condemnation situation there is no way to determine exactly what the per-stall cost is going to be. Condemnation is very difficult and time consuming.
- City expects us to solve the parking problem 3 years after the temporary occupancy permit is issued.
- During departures, we included on the panel a member of the community that would be affected by the condemnation process.
- The assembly area is what drove the parking requirement for Roosevelt.
- There are 10 stalls currently on site. The current plan includes building 82 additional stalls on site. Total staff parking is estimated at 42 stalls. The Departure Committee's recommendation to the Department of Planning & Development was that we provide 84 additional parking stalls than currently planned.
- Ballard planned for half student and half staff parking on site; however, staff has opted to park in the street to keep their cars from damage. A parking lot off-site currently exists for the Franklin High School parking but is not used by staff or students for security reasons.
- Zoning across from the school has changed. The existing QFC has asked for a zoning variance to increase height limit.
- Rooftop parking above the gym is not feasible; this should be listed as an option that was rejected.
- Security concerns are one of the biggest issues; it is very difficult and expensive to provide security for a parking garage.
- QFC has looked at redeveloping the site before. It may not happen, or may not fit our time frame.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM UPDATE, John Vacchiery

- Draft reporting forms are being prepared. All of the projects bid this spring have the requirement for an apprenticeship program. The larger projects will have a direct-entry requirement of one apprentice for every \$5M of project value. The initial report will probably be presented to the School Board in September.
- Shep Siegel, District Technical Education manager, and the Joint Trades Council will implement and oversee the program.

Committee discussion and comments:

- There is a 15% requirement regarding compliance.

UPDATE ON BIDS, Ralph Rohwer

- Roosevelt – Still opening bid packages. Mechanical and electrical was slightly higher than the target. The concrete package, which is to be self-performed by Hoffman, was significantly higher than budget.
- Energy Management Control System. The District has been working the past two years to put controls out to bid, to move away from a sole source provider and move to newer technology. AEI and McKinstry, consultants hired by the District, reviewed the current District controls program and recommended that the District put it to public bid. The program was bid recently with good competitive results.
- Using this process allowed the District to get technical information from the vendors, who were asked to submit technical information and also conduct capability demonstrations.

- Submittals were received from five firms; two did not meet the requirements of the District. The bids are unit costs for a specific number of components. Each project has a total based upon those units. This bid is for six schools: Roosevelt, Garfield, Cleveland, South Shore, Hamilton, and World School.
- The current vendor had the highest number on pricing, which indicates that using a single source vendor does not always get the best pricing.
- McKinstry is to do the procurement and be the “watchdog” once the controls technicians are on site. AEI is doing the systems design. They are a national company and are very sophisticated at industrial design control.

Committee discussion and comments:

- The GCCM uses these numbers for their packages. The vendor is assigned to GCCM based on these bid numbers. A specific design will confirm or modify the project bid allowance.
- Karin noted that the UW Health Department Building received bid protests from all three vendors. Hoffman was GCCM and the low bidder was Johnson Controls; ATS was second. The Bid protest went to a hearing; the result was that the low bidder and second-low bidder were rejected, and it was awarded to the next bidder.
- John noted that to date there have been no bid protests.

CAPITAL FUND BUDGET ISSUES, John Vacchieri

- A copy was distributed of the materials provided at the School Board work session on July 29 regarding a global look at the capital fund program.
- Using 1995 as a starting point and an end date of 2012, the revenues to expenditures were compared. It was assumed that there would be no further funding measures during that time.
- John Vacchieri explained the structure of the report and the assumptions included in the report in more detail and explained the sources of revenue for the District, such as property taxes, state match, sales of real estate, etc.
- The State allows the District to spend interest earnings for the District’s operational revenue shortfall for certain prescriptive items.
- An in-depth analysis was done of the individual projects in BEX which showed the program is \$11 million behind; which included \$4.1 M in interest charges charged against that program, and other impacts due to the earthquake, the Coe fire, delays, site acquisitions, and uncollected revenues (in the form of property tax delinquencies). This gap will be ultimately be closed by transferring funds from other programs and may affect BEX II and BTA II.
- BTA I will show a net positive at the end of the program.
- BEX II currently shows a revenue gap of negative \$2.4 million in 2011 due to slightly lower revenue projections (based on lower interest rates than projected). The District has now taken a much more conservative estimate on interest earnings than at the beginning of the program. The District is looking at different options to bring the budget into balance.
- Ingraham, Brighton, Graham Hill, and Sealth will be complete by this fall. The Beacon Hill addition will be bid in the fall. Cleveland construction will start in the summer of 2005. Summer of 2005 will also be the start of construction for Dearborn Park, and Maple,
- Ed Peters encouraged the Oversight Committee members to talk to the School Board about long-term planning, including BEX III, on how budgets are structured.
- The water issue is a capital issue and the School Board has not yet decided from where the funds will be transferred.
- Beacon Hill is projected to be \$700K over budget and a lot will depend on the bid results. It is not anticipated that the pricing will come down.

REVIEW OF MONTHLY REPORT AND CHANGE ORDER SUMMARY REPORT

- No items discussed.

SITE TOUR

- September 17 has been picked as the next date for a site tour to Brighton, Cleveland, and Dearborn Park. An invitation will be extended to the School Board to attend.

NEXT AGENDA, SEPTEMBER

- Update on Cleveland GMP negotiation (allocation of risk)

Meeting adjourned at 9:33a.

ss:\bexiiovercom\oc081304b.doc