

# BOARD SPECIAL MEETING OPERATIONS COMMITTEE



2445 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South, Seattle WA 98124

Stanford Center, Board Conference Room  
August 16, 2016

## Approved Minutes

Director Stephan Blanford called the meeting to order at 4:31pm. Directors Burke (substituting for Director Geary) and Pinkham were also in attendance. Capital Facilities Director Richard Best staffed the meeting.

The agenda for the meeting and minutes from the June 16, 2016 meeting were approved.

**Capital financial report – April and May:** Melissa Coan presented both months and discussed information from the May report. She noted that the balance from all capital funds as of May 31<sup>st</sup> was \$155.8 million, which was up slightly over last month due to increased interest earnings.

**Renewal of the refuse disposal and mixed waste recycling collection services:** Bruce Skowrya said that after this action was introduced to the board June 15<sup>th</sup>, King County notified everyone that there was going to be an increased tonnage rate, and the successful bidder wanted to pull out of the bid. Normally the district would award to the next highest bidder, but because of the significant deviation between the two bids and the notice of the rate increase, the district is recommending that the existing contract be extended for one more year. The successful bidder told the district that they could not honor their bid during the 30-day provision to allow the withdrawal. Facilities Operations authorized a two-month extension to continue the contract through the summer board hiatus to ensure that there was no lapse in service; this action is to authorize a ten-month contract to allow the district to get through the upcoming school year and re-bid the service when bidders have an opportunity to see what the rate increase is going to be. In response to committee member questions, Bruce said that:

- Legal counsel advised that there was not an issue with a two-month extension, as staff was bringing this immediately to the school board for approval and the district needed to protect against a lapse in service.
- As noted by members, the renewal option reflects a 15% increase, which was higher than the bid, but less than Waste Management's bid.
- Service and rates have been stable for the last five years.
- The garbage build-up at Loyal Heights was a result of staff moving out and the temporary increase in the normal volume.

Committee members noted that while there was a presumptive approval of the ten-month contract, in this case of a specific service involving significant equipment and labor, there were not many options for the ten-month extension and moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**Architect-engineering services to the Ingraham classroom addition project:** Richard Best said that this item was moving out to a September 7<sup>th</sup> introduction-21<sup>st</sup> approval cycle to allow negotiations to be finalized on the contract. This is a General Contractor/Construction Management (GC/CM) project with construction costs estimated to be at \$22,380,000; six A/E firms submitted their qualifications for consideration for the A/E work estimated at \$1.75-\$2.4 million. Four firms interviewed, one backed out due to receiving an award for a project in another school district. An interim agreement with a defined scope of work was entered into with Integrus Architects to examine the conditions of the existing building systems, and participate in the school design advisory team conversations.

Richard then went on to describe the GC/CM procurement process for this project, as opposed to design/build, noting that the GC/CM process is preferable for this project because of its complexity: one location for the proposed new addition is in the middle of the campus while another proposed location is in the northwest corner. An additional complication is that the school will continue to be occupied during the project. Because the board action was not final, the committee moved this item forward to the full board for consideration.

**Construction management services contract award for Ingraham classroom addition project:** Richard Best said that the recommendation is to award the contract to Shiels Oblatz Johnsen (SOJ) to oversee the addition to Ingraham, including design, permitting, construction and through the warranty period. An interim agreement not to exceed \$58,572 was entered into with them so that work could begin their efforts in June 2016 on conceptual design work, and site conditions assessment. They also helped in the permitting process with the City of Seattle.

The contract was publicly advertised; there were four responses, and all were interviewed. While price was included as a selection criterion, SOJ was selected also because of their familiarity with the GC/CM process, high school design, and cost effectiveness because of their familiarity with Ingraham High school. In response to committee member questions, he said that:

- SOJ was completing the Wilson-Pacific project, Olympic Hills, and the beginning design phase of the Bagley Elementary School historic renovation, and
- The estimated contract price would provide for two project managers, a project scheduler, and administrative support, although none are full time.

The committee moved this item forward to the full board for consideration.

**Resolution 2016/17-3, Racial imbalance analysis for E.C. Hughes renovation:** Richard Best said this action is part of the D-form process utilized to get state construction assistance. The district submits this action in accordance to the WAC as it considers whether the project will either create or aggravate a racial imbalance. He said the district does have a racial imbalance at Roxhill Elementary School. However, the Hughes project will not aggravate the racial imbalance as the boundaries for the school are not changing. He also noted that the racial imbalance has existed for a number of years. SPS falls into the state-defined category of a district with greater than 50% minority; the criteria would change if the district falls below that measure. (Director Blanford asked that the WAC actually be linked to the board action report for the public.) This project would not aggravate the existing racial imbalance. In response to questions, he said that this is part of this project approval, and that Ingraham will not get state assistance funds. The committee moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**Resolution 2016/17-4, Racial imbalance analysis for Magnolia Elementary renovation:** Richard Best said this action is again a situation where the district has a racial imbalance but that the project would not aggravate it. Because there are no current boundaries, staff drew from the Blaine K-8, Coe, and Lawton attendance to come up with the projected student population; the students for this school are going to come generally from this geographic area. Director Blanford noted that this school will not be the least diverse school but close to it. Committee members recommended that the board action report be more explicit about why the district is re-opening this school: the overcrowding relief issue, potential addition of portables at Lawton, and correcting negative numbers and spelling on table. They then moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**Magnolia Elementary Educational Specifications:** Richard Best said the district-wide elementary ed specs including the architectural program developed for elementary schools was the start of this plan. The district is implementing a three-up plan (three classrooms per grade) model, with four classrooms for classroom reduction at the K-3 level and two flex classrooms. Asking that all the documents be included for introduction, the committee moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**View Ridge Elementary playfield renovations final acceptance:** Richard Best reported that the contractor has completed the contractual work and the landscape architect has certified that the work is completed. The project came in under budget, the checklist is complete, and the change orders came in under 20%, larger because they added a retaining wall and more soils. The committee moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**Kimball Elementary seismic improvement project final acceptance:** Richard Best said that this project was over budget, and BEX IV underspends (not BTA III as the draft Bar indicated) would be used to cover the cost. When opening the roof to all connections, there was substantial damage to the covered play area, and the columns had deteriorated – emergency repairs that were not anticipated. Board member questions included:

- Whether this was the same structure the district had at other schools? (No, each school's covered play area is unique to the design of that school.)
- Whether the capital projects folks were coordinating information with Communications, as the current news stories discuss how unprepared state schools are for earthquakes.

Richard said that there is an extensive list of schools that will receive seismic improvements during implementation of BEX IV, as the District has several unreinforced masonry structures. He noted that at the 2019-20 end of BEX IV, the seismic issues will have been addressed at a majority of schools. Committee members encouraged staff to share these good stories and then moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval as edited.

**John Muir Elementary roofing and seismic upgrades project final acceptance:** Richard Best noted that this project was over budget, and BTA III underspends would be used for the difference. Committee members asked about whether the poor condition of the existing roof should have been seen earlier and built into the scope. Richard explained the cost estimating process when a levy is put together several years ahead of the actual project, where the roof is looked at, square footage calculated, 3-4 test cuts performed, and a percentage added for assumed damage. When the project comes forward and the contractor does the work, numerous additional test cuts are performed to identify the scope of work for the project and help reduce unforeseen conditions. The committee moved this item forward to the full board with a recommendation for approval.

**Ballard/West Seattle high schools roof repair and replacement procurement:** Richard Best provided a (revised) briefing paper discussing an upcoming board action report staff will be bringing forward for consideration to replace the roofs at Ballard and West Seattle High Schools. In discussions on each of the projects, Richard said the Ballard clay tile roof is shattering, and staff wants to compress the schedule and lock in a contractor who has the experience with this kind and size of roof, issuing a purchasing cooperative bid to acquire materials for the project. He noted that Ballard has had some problems with ultraviolet degradation. The temperature will affect this roof, and he said the district did not want to have a cold winter this year.

The West Seattle project will be replacing a landmarked roof, and again there are only a few contractors with the experience to do the work on this very complex process. Contractors can bring experience and guidance to the table in the West Seattle planning process regarding life span of materials.

In both cases, Richard said that having the contractor on board and participating in the design process would reduce project risks and have the experience necessary to select a roofing system that would provide durability and longevity. Proposal costs would be known up front for the materials, arrived at through a competitive bid process.

Committee member questions and comments included:

- What kind of warranty was on the 1998 Ballard roof? It could have been a bad batch of tiles or bad installation, but the roof was no longer under warranty. Richard noted that the Ballard roof has been easy for kids to get up on the roof and cause damage.
- What kind of fees are involved with co-ops and does it cost the district to participate? There are two vendors in particular out there – one small, one large. That information would come forward in the bid.
- What are the opportunity costs in using purchasing cooperatives? Please be clear on that in the board action report and show a compelling argument for this change, that there is no perceived bias toward a particular vendor, and that the process is fair.

**Sexual harassment:** Kelli Schmidt, the district's Student Civil Rights Compliance Officer, said this was an oral annual report on policy 3208, Sexual Harassment and said the full board will get the written annual report in a Friday memo. She was also going to be discussing information from policy 3210, Non-discrimination, as part of the report, as the procedure covers all incidents, including sexual harassment. She reported that recommendations from the task force in their August interim report were about significant revisions to the procedure. She then provided some statistics about the formal complaint investigations filed by students or parents that her office addresses, including: 7 complaints employee to employee, 15 between employee and student, and 15 complaints student to student. She noted that there were quasi-formal incidents between staff and students that were either dropped, occurred at non-district activities, and did not include incidents at a school-based level; she said her office does investigate all employee-student complaints but not student to student. She said of the total number of complaints, 33 were either formal or quasi-formal, not employee to employee, and were not handled by her department. In response to questions, she said she will provide a comparison to last year in her written report.

Kelli discussed the organizational changes or process improvements in the district over the past year, including the consolidation of Title IX and civil rights issues into the Office of Civil Rights, notice to all staff provided about changes, principal training in May to provide both reporting

requirements and resources, a mailing to every family in the district in their home language that tells families what issues are and where to get training, the same information given to community partners to help distribute, FAQs for staff, updated and simplified posters for posting in all district buildings, and information and contacts going into back to school documents. In summary, she said the board policy does not need modification but that procedures may need more clarification.

Director Blanford noted that there has been a great deal of activity occurring on this topic. He said the task force has made some recommendations that put the district on the cutting edge of this work and very forward thinking and that there has been some alignment around this board aspirational goal. He appreciated the education of the community about sexual assault awareness and resources and that while the rules have not necessarily changed, the outreach has improved. Director Burke said that the numbers seem low proportionately compared to the numbers we see in societal statistics. He expressed a concern that the district does not have a clear handle on informal complaints and asked for some clarity and more emphasis around how informal complaints are handled. Director Pinkham said that with all this proactive outreach, the district should be prepared for numbers going up, and all directors agreed this should not be used as a KPI measure of performance, as it should be viewed as a positive outreach as reporting increases.

**Bell times update:** In Pegi McEvoy's absence, Joan Dingfield distributed a handout summarizing activities during the summer and noted that the Southeast Seattle Education Coalition is supporting the district in outreach to communities that are traditionally less connected to the district to ensure that information about the change in start times and available support for families is communicated.

The meeting adjourned at 6:43pm.

jd