

**Building Excellence (BEX) Programs Oversight Committee  
Meeting Notes, December 14, 2007  
Stanford Center, Room 2765, 8:30a - 10:30a**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Members Present

Karin Nyrop  
John Palewicz  
Ed Peters, Chair  
Ed Schwartz  
Pete Wall

Members Absent

Freeman Fong  
Steve Goldblatt  
Mark Melroy  
Craig Smith

District Staff

Don Gillmore  
Kathy Johnson  
Don Kennedy  
Julie Krick  
Eric Sonett  
Eleanor Trainor  
Paul Wozniak

Board Representative

Michael DeBell

Visitor:

Greg Flood

Heery International Staff

Mike Finnegan  
Steve Moore  
Michael Romero  
Wendy Waites

DKA

Chuck Clegern  
Donald King

Guest

Jim Burk, Lease Crutcher Lewis

**INTRODUCTIONS**

- Don Kennedy, the District's new chief financial/operations officer, was introduced.

**MINUTES APPROVAL FOR SEPTEMBER 14 AND OCTOBER 12 MEETING**

- The minutes were approved.

**GCCM AGENCY APPLICATION**

- Don Gillmore reviewed the District's application and interview for GCCM agency certification.
- The District's application was denied. One reason was because the District did not have enough internal personnel to manage GCCM projects. District GCCM experience is primarily provided by consultants. This was an unpublished criteria. If the presentation team had been aware of this criteria they would have submitted the projects instead of applying for agency certification. It's probably too late to do that.
- Another factor for denial was that the four GCCM projects the District has done were over budget. This was because of escalation and had nothing to do with the GCCM process.

Committee comment:

- Karin Nyrop recommends appealing the decision because the review board did not follow the statute and did not rate candidates based on the published criteria. For the next meeting, Karin would like an update on the status of an appeal.
- John Palewicz suggests recommending the projects if it's not too late, and proceeding with an appeal on a separate track.
- Board Director DeBell wonders if the criteria on internal expertise applies to the projects as well.

**PROJECT UPDATES**

HAMILTON: Don reviewed the permitting process to date.

- The Hearing examiner ruled that parking on site was not needed. This is a first. There is adequate parking on the street for staff.
- A 20' setback was granted with the property swap. The setback was not allowed without the property swap. The 7' left with the property swap is not enough to help with an expanded gym so the District has withdrawn from the swap.

- The adjusted gym design has a narrower lobby, and seating for 900 instead of 1,000. Part of a basketball court was lost on the outdoor playground. The outer play area is still to be designed in terms of what activities take place.
- Geothermal wells: because of escalation the well field will now cost \$2.7M instead of \$1.5M. The District and Parks have not yet negotiated a well arrangement. Because of the uncertainty of being able to do the well field, part of the cost would be in exchanging equipment.
- Double-glazed windows could be an alternate to the bid. Landmarks would have to approve the double-glazing. Double-glazing doesn't save that much in terms of energy usage in a large complex building. It is not the same payback as in residential.

DENNY/SEALTH:

- The Denny staff is fine with the project. The SDT is fine with the design. Many of the Sealth staff are against the project for a variety of reasons.
- There was not a lot of community preparation for the co-location.
- It would be helpful if District leadership would address the issues. District Academics has made a strong case for the co-location. Co-location is not experimental.
- Delaying Sealth would be very expensive. An additional \$5M now would help to purchase carpets, theater seats, and other improvements that have been suggested by staff.
- The project is on schedule and the first bid package will be let in the spring.
- Staff would appreciate the Committee being clear about the cost of lack of decision or changing the project.

Committee comment:

- Do not change the plan unless there is an extremely good reason, for example, if fatal flaws have been found. If a change is going to be made it has to be done very quickly.
- The Committee would recommend stating that a delay or a change in the project would have serious financial impacts.
- The Committee can not say the decision is right or wrong.
- Inflation is very expensive.
- Identify the cost to do some of the enhancements Sealth staff wants. Identify where that funding comes from.
- Educate concerned parents, community, and staff about their issues.

*Action:* Eleanor Trainor will draft an e-mail from the Committee to the School Board and Executive Leadership to be sent as soon as possible.

GARFIELD: Steve Moore, Heery, and Jim Burk, senior project manager, Lease Crutcher Lewis, reviewed the executive summary on bid package #91.

- After extensive planning and marketing, the bid was awarded to Lease Crutcher Lewis.
- There were no other bidders on concrete.
- Only one bid was received on reinforcing steel.
- The cost overrun will be known in January. At that time the Committee's evaluation will be requested before it goes to the Board.

Committee comments:

- Committee members requested information on the following:
  - Why time-and-materials is not a bad decision?
  - Why the issues weren't known earlier? These situations have come up before on BEX sites so there should have been anticipation.
  - How much of an issue is escalation?

- How can a bidder be successful if there's not a clear scope?
- What is the status of the MACC and overall contingency?
- Are there unallocated allowances that may be able to help in this cost overrun?

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- None.

**NEXT AGENDA, JANUARY 11**

- Update on GCCM agency appeal and project application
- Update on status of Denny/Sealth project
- Responses to questions on Garfield bid package #91

ss:\bexpoc\poc071214a.doc/jwk