

**Building Excellence Levy II Oversight Committee**  
**Meeting Notes, October 8, 2004**  
**Stanford Center, Room 3802, 7:30a - 9:30a**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Members Present

Ron Jelaco, Acting Chair  
Mark Melroy  
Karin Nyrop  
Jim Travis

District Staff

Gary Baldasari  
Ron English  
Don Gillmore  
Julie Krick  
Nan Stavnsjoj  
John Vacchieri

Heery International Staff

Bruce Herr  
Roxann Robinson  
Ralph Rohwer  
Mitch Romero

Members Absent

David Hudd  
Joey Ing  
Jay Kieper  
Ed Peters, Chair

Board Members

Brita Butler-Wall  
Jan Kumasaka  
Sally Soriano

Visitor

Chris Jackins

**APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2004 MEETING NOTES**

- Approval of notes was delayed because of lack of quorum.

**UPDATE ON BEACON HILL BID OPENING (handout)**

- Ralph updated the group on the recent bid opening for the addition at Beacon Hill. Please refer to the memo in the meeting packet.

Heery's Action Plan to Bring Project Within Budget

- Reduce square footage by a total of 5,000 sq. feet. Total square footage is 8,400 sq. ft. The SDT will have to prioritize and eliminate space.
- Ensure a contractor reviews the new plans before completion to ensure that risk issues have been resolved. This would be a contractor that will not bid the work and that has experience bidding public works. The project did not attract the usual contractors that bid district elementaries because it's a small project.
- Board of director's approval of new ed specs.
- Bid in the spring of 2005 so construction can begin when school ends.
- Design and Planning Department would have to agree to a new MUP. The current EIS would have to be applicable.
- Relocate the addition away from the existing building. Relocating as far north as possible would mean shallower foundations and a more level grade.

Committee comments and discussion:

- Ralph thinks the inconsistency between estimators' and contractors' numbers is a lack of understanding on the part of the estimators of the order of magnitude of contractors' issues, like laydown space. This is a one-story building on a two-acre site and the lot coverage is high.
- Contractor issues that came up in the first bid were addressed in the separate bids and the reduced-scope second addition bid. Scope reductions were not reflected in the second bid.
- The Board has said that all projects need to be kept in budget. Inflation is already putting budget pressure on the remaining projects and to increase this budget significantly would have a serious affect on other projects down the road.
- It is possible for the SDT to agree on a solution before January to meet the bid schedule. This did happen at Coe after the building was destroyed by fire. The school community is very motivated to not miss the construction window of summer 2005. It is hoped that move-in would be February 2006.

- The daycare is a model B, “before and after”, 2,200 sq. ft. There is a lot of daycare capacity in the Beacon Hill area. However, it has not been decided that the daycare will be eliminated.
- The bathroom space near the slope has been redesigned inside the building.
- If Parks property is rented for laydown there is a cost to repair the damage and probably provide some upgrades. The playfield is sloped and there will be challenges to overcome. The community uses the field so there will be pushback to this idea.
- The closest interim site would be in West Seattle. There are costs involved with an interim site. Moving the school off site doesn’t alleviate very many contractor issues. There have not been safety or laydown issues on other tight sites, e.g. Graham Hill. If the school remains on-site in the main building the move-in is much less complicated and less expensive and it’s much easier for the parents.

### **REVIEW OF CHANGE ORDER SUMMARY REPORT**

- Ralph reported that change order percentage is very good at this time.
- On Graham Hill the bid alternates were not taken at bid opening because the budget was so tight. However, during construction alternates were purchased when budget became available.
- Generally, if there are alternates not covered at the bid and there is available money the project team does review them.
- If there is underspend it goes into the project contingency and then to program savings. The district has a responsibility to build each project within scope but also has a responsibility to the program as a whole.
- “Forecasting” is figured against a project budget, which is a stable number, not against expectations.

### **PROJECT REVIEW**

#### Brighton:

- The project is ready to go to the Board for final acceptance. It is in the warranty period. There are no claims; it finished on time and below budget.
- It is hoped there will be savings of \$850K on the project.
- There are Smartboards in all the classrooms. A suggestion from the Committee: check a year from now to see if they are being used.
- Director Kumasaka reported that the school is far beyond the expectation of the community and they are thrilled and very proud of it. She also noted that the outside benches are wobbly.

#### Cleveland

- The GCCM, Absher, and the District are negotiating the guaranteed maximum price (GMP). Escalation has been a major issue in the negotiation. At this point the delta is \$500,000 negative. The team continues to work on reducing the delta. The Board will approve the GMP in November.
- Construction documents (CDs) will be completed in December 2004.
- Although the pre-design bar on the master schedule shows over-schedule the impact to the design is negligible because work is being done that applies to design as well. The key is finishing design and bid documents on time.
- The Cleveland SDT has struggled in terms of membership. The school has a new principal who overlapped with the outgoing principal for one year. Cleveland has not had a strong PTSA. There are language barriers and a large commercial district. There is a representative from Gates foundation on the SDT but she is not from the community. There is good outside participation on the SDT. There is good

representation from academics, plus there is support from central administration in educational speciality areas.

#### Dearborn Park

- It has been decided that the District will not acquire the right-of-way. The addition will be built west of the right-of-way.
- This is also a difficult site and will have to be watched for budget. The site has room for laydown.

#### Garfield

- The project is still in design. The program may be reduced because of escalation. The cost was estimated at \$200 sq. ft. but now is being estimated at \$250 sq. ft.
  - A current construction source shows escalation at 8%. In May it was 1.5%. The BEX II escalation figure of 4% may work for the life of the program, but if there's a high window in the middle of the program it will affect those projects.
- ❖ The Committee suggests that each project have a more detailed timeline that shows completion percentages for various phases.

#### **GMP**

- Once a GMP is negotiated it is a fixed number. It does not change unless the design is changed. For example, Hoffman (Roosevelt) has been slow to buy out. Materials have escalated in price and Hoffman has submitted a claim for \$3M to the district because of the escalation costs. The district's position is that a contract has to be adhered to by both sides.

#### **COMMITTEE ROLE**

- Karin Nyrop said that in her opinion the staff is doing an admirable job and is to be commended. Karin has been involved in many public works projects and this is an excellent project management group. She reviewed the BEX program numbers and in her opinion it was not poor project management that caused the overage.
- The Committee is an oversight committee. It is not a committee for managing, but for watching. This is what Karin thinks the Committee should be doing:
  1. The budget is important and the Committee needs to understand how the budget was set and how it is progressing for each project. More information is needed on revenues. In the BEX I program revenues exceeded expectations. This may not happen for BEX II. It would be helpful to track revenue at a broad level and at a project level. Staff needs to give a recommendation to the Committee on just how revenue should be tracked.
  2. Policy oversight: What are the policies that form decisions? Does the Board agree with these policies? For example, it may be time to revisit the decision to do historical renovation and to revisit the design review process to be sure they are achieving the expected outcomes.
  3. Project management oversight: Is the District using generally accepted quality project management processes?
  4. Critical issues oversight: The Board needs to be advised of, and given an opportunity to review, critical issues in a timely fashion. These could include bidding issues, unforeseen conditions, and parking problems.

- Board member comment on Karin's' comments.

These are excellent suggestions. Thank you for identifying these areas that the board and staff can agree on.

**Future Agenda Item**

- How school design teams (SDTs) are constituted.

Adjourned at 9:40a

ss:\bexiiovercom\oc100804.doc  
jwk