

Revised
Building Excellence II Levy Oversight Committee
Meeting Notes, January 14, 2005
Stanford Center, Room 2765, 7:30a - 9:30a

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present

Joey Ing
Ron Jelaco
Mark Melroy
Karin Nyrop
Ed Peters
Jim Travis

District Staff

Gary Baldasari
Ron English
Don Gillmore
Mark Green
Julie Krick
Nan Stavnsjoj

Heery International Staff

Brian Berard
Mike Finnegan
Roxann Robinson
Ralph Rohwer

Visitor

Chris Jackins

Members Absent

David Hudd

School Board Directors

Mary Bass
Sally Soriano

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 10, 2004 MEETING NOTES

- Notes from December 10, 2004 meeting were approved.

UPDATE ON JANUARY 13, 2005 BOARD WORK SESSION

- The work session on capital projects was reviewed. Committee members Ed Peters and Joey Ing attended the work session.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD:

- It is the consensus of the Committee from the construction standpoint that the District should move ahead with the Cleveland construction project. The motion was seconded. The vote was unanimous (6 attending).
- ~~It is the consensus of the Committee that the Board proceeds with bidding for Dearborn Park with the additive alternates. It would be acceptable to delay the bid until April when more is known about school consolidation.~~
- *There was a discussion on when to bid Dearborn Park. Two opinions were expressed by various Committee members; either to bid now or bid later when more information is available about potential school closures.*

MEETING DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS:

School closure:

- A discussion is needed of how school closure meshes with the BEX II program. The Board wants a review of demographics for BEX II projects.
- Enrollment projections indicate a loss of enrollment in the central cluster. Assuming a new building would not be closed, the new schools impact the way the District can make closure decisions. The assumption of the levy was to do away with portables. That is why the new additions were planned.
- It is not known that the newness of a building will be a closure criteria.
- The superintendent will make a recommendation of potential sites to close in April. The Board takes action on the criteria in March. The final decision on closures is mid-July in order to be effective.
- The District has had a flat demographic for a long time and this is not the time to add capacity.

- The Board sees a relationship between the capital budget and the operations budget in relation to school closure.

Cleveland:

- If the Cleveland project is built for 1,000 students the GMP (guaranteed maximum price) negotiation with Absher (GCCM) will be valid. If the project is reduced to 750 (current enrollment), the negotiation would not be valid as the project would be substantially changed. The current campus can hold 1,000 students using portables.
- It is true that new buildings usually attract more students.
- If the project is delayed escalation would make the project more expensive. Eighty percent (80%) of architect fees have been spent.
- *A question was raised about the completion rate (graduation rate) of Cleveland.*

Dearborn Park:

- The project is \$1M over budget with the current scope. The SDT (school design team) is willing to allow the western addition to be an additive alternate (\$800K + sales tax) to stay in budget. An independent contractor has provided an analysis. The SDT has been fully involved in this decision making. The larger community will be informed.
- The Board may have to approve a reduction in scope or the addition of \$1M to the project budget. There is not enough in the program contingency to cover the extra cost in Dearborn Park with all the other budget overages.
- The City does not use the right of way nor does it appear to ever plan to use the right of way. Using it would require clearing a woodland and filling a wetland. The city was unwilling to assign a price to the right of way until a building was built. The District had it appraised at \$650K. The City transportation committee now expects full value for all property and the District no longer gets a discount.

World School:

- This is another name for the secondary BOC (bilingual orientation center). The BOC provides a cultural acclimation to the U.S. Students generally stay for about six months. It serves grades 6 – 12 and peaks at 250 students twice a year. There are primary BOCs in several locations. The current secondary BOC is on Queen Anne hill which is not the best location for where the population is.
- World School might also provide community services.

Garfield:

- In order to retain the instructional program, \$4M in VE (value engineering) has been identified and the project is still \$8M over budget. The project team is moving forward with the hope that the \$8M will be approved by the Board. The Board does want to be assured that Roosevelt and Garfield are comparable before the approval.
- At this time Roosevelt and Garfield are comparable high schools in space, aesthetics, and other things. The VE was done on Roosevelt 1.5 years ago before escalation hit.
- High schools must meet the needs of the constituents and they may not need to be comparable in order to do this.

QUARTERLY REPORT TO THE BOARD

- Board members Bass and Soriano think it's important for the Board to hear Committee views ASAP. Ed is not available on January 19 so Karin and Mark volunteer to present.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

- The first phase of the construction management (CM) contract with Heery is coming to a close. The contract calls for the parties to meet and discuss whether Heery moves forward on phase 2. A Board decision has to be made by mid-March so that, if necessary, a new CM can be in place by the end of June.
- It's a \$5 – \$7M contract to go forward. More than half the work on the BEX II program has been done.
- The evaluation will include Board members and Oversight Committee members. A meeting will be scheduled with an ad hoc review committee.

NEXT MEETING AGENDA

- Update on quarterly report
- Update on construction management contract review

Adjourned at 9:38a