

**Building Excellence II Levy Oversight Committee
Meeting Notes, July 8, 2005
Stanford Center, Room 2765, 7:30a - 9:30a**

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present

Joey Ing
Ron Jelaco
Mark Melroy
Karin Nyrop
Ed Peters

District Staff

Gary Baldasari
Don Gillmore
Ron English
Julie Krick
Fred Stephens

Heery International Staff

Mike Finnegan
Steve Moore
Roxann Robinson

Members Absent

David Hudd

School Board Directors

Mary Bass

MINUTES APPROVAL FOR MAY 13 AND JUNE 10 MEETINGS

- Notes were approved from the May 13 and June 10 meetings.

UPDATES ON BOARD MOTIONS

- A. Reconciliation of capital budget programs. Adopted 5-2, with the following changes: add more money to debt service to resolve Stanford Center debt, add promise to have recommendations for a resolution of South Shore academic program issues by first meeting in September, and agreed to place Hamilton construction at the beginning of the BEX III schedule. Hamilton design would begin in BEX II. There will be some minor maintenance repairs to Hamilton this summer.
- B. BEX I program budget close out. All program activity ceases at this time. Any additional expenditure will be out of the CEP fund.
- C. Capital budget, 2005-2006. Mark and Fred will meet with Board members to explain how the project list was developed.

Comments:

- The motions presented at the Board meeting were the culmination of an eight-month process including meetings with individual Board members and several work sessions. Hence, there was not a lot of discussion at the Board meeting to approve the motions.
- Mark Green presented a letter promising that recommendations to resolve South Shore academic issues would be presented at the September 7 Board meeting.
- There is now discussion that Lincoln could be better used in a different way than as Hamilton middle school. It has to be determined if the Hamilton project could be built on the Hamilton site.
- Debt service transfer: the levy has a provision that the Board can acknowledge changed circumstances and change the plan. The \$4M transfer to general fund was a transfer of investment earnings to the general fund.
- Various Committee members agreed that a "PR" problem could result with the voters if projects are changed because they are not getting what they voted for.
- Various Committee members expressed the need for a report that clearly shows why BEX II projects were scheduled as they were. The rationale should be in writing so that when changes are made, the background is understood. This would apply to BEX III planning as well. Timing is one issue, as well as available interim sites, but there are other important issues that affect prioritization and these reasons should be clearly written and understood. An "importance" framework should be developed.

- Fred plans to include a lot of public involvement and to have a better upfront process of communicating the plan to the public and Board. He also plans to review the design team process. We can't continue to create expectations that can't be met with a designs that exceed the budget.
- Karin requested an update on the design and planning for the World School. If the money isn't going to be used for World School then it can be used for other projects. Staff response: The Academic division has to make instructional program decisions. There has not yet been a decision on the World School.

COMMITTEE REPORT TO BOARD

- Director Bass likes the matrix update of projects. She would appreciate more communication to the Board during the planning process and wants to see a comprehensive plan to get to overall District goals, particularly a larger group discussion on how District parts fit into the District whole.
- Director Bass is very appreciative of the staff's work.

BEX II EARLY WARNING UPDATE

- Review of handout. Although a project is going well, at least one item will be shown that indicates what the "worst case" is at the project at this time.

COMMITTEE CHARGE

Discussion points:

- There should be continuity of members so that lessons learned get passed on from one levy to another
- Savings are easier to capture earlier on in the program. It is important to have the Committee working at the start of the program.
- The new capital director will be responsible for both BEX II and BTA II. Capital is now being thought of as one unit.
- A facilities standing committee of the Board would provide for more frequent and in-depth dialogue with the Board. A standing committee would include three Board members. The BEX II Committee would meet with the standing Board committee periodically.
- The Committee should have subcommittees to work through different issues. There is not enough time at the monthly Committee meetings.
- This Committee should consider itself a success. From the staff point of view the original scope of the committee has been met in the narrow focus of the construction projects. From the Committee point of view the construction projects were managed perfectly but the program was still \$34M over budget. Could the Committee have helped prevent this? The issue now is to determine what is the best scope of the Committee.
- The Committee could retain its current focus on the remaining six BEX II projects but approach BEX III differently. For BEX III the Committee would be part of the planning and the levy as a whole. This approach would reflect the restructuring and new focus of the facilities department (i.e. capital as one unit).
- The Board and staff would like the Committee to review capital not just BEX II. The Committee must define a charge that is not too broad in scope in order to be effective. The Committee needs to reflect on this and address this as item 1 on the next agenda and take 15 minutes to complete the discussion.
- The Committee should have the ability to be able to focus as broadly as they need to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION WAS HELD

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM

- Is GCCM the correct approach?

Meeting adjourned 9:35a

ss:\bexiiovercom\oc070805a.doc