

**Amended Minutes  
For The  
Bond Oversight Committee Meeting  
North**

October 4, 2004

Aptos High School Career Center  
100 Mariner Way  
Aptos, CA 95003

5:00 PM – 6:30 PM

**Attending Members:**

Michael Barsi/Nancy Bensen/Tere Carrubba/Fred Fischer/Marc Kirby/  
Vic Marani/Bruce Mathias/Jim Miller/Barbara Palmer/Mary Reed/Michael Theriot

**Absentee Members:**

**South/Central Bond Committee Liaison:**

Rodney Brooks

**BCA Architects:**

Paul C Bunton/Chris Lewis

**Non-committee members attending:**

Terry McHenry/Rhea DeHart/Sharon Gray/Evie Volpa/Diane Burbank/Kent Munro  
/Darlene Insley/Doug Maher

**Barbara Palmer** introduced the new applicant for the committee, Doug Maher from Devcon Construction and mentioned that Christine Quinn had also applied, then asked the committee to introduce themselves. The minutes from August 17, 2004 meeting be approved. They were moved, seconded and approved. The meeting began with a discussion about the terms of each member and whether the members that have one year terms would like to continue for another year. Barbara volunteered to contact those with one year term to determine whether they were willing to continue for another term.

Questions were asked regarding the South/Central Bond Committee and whether they had a quorum at the last meeting.

Terry McHenry, Rhea DeHart and Evie Volpa all explained that under the by-laws only 5 members from each zone for a total of 10 were needed for the whole committee. The Board initially appointed 13 from each sub-committee for a total of 26.

On April 28, 2004, at the request of the Central/South Sub-Committee, the Board approved a reduction of membership. The Central/South Sub-Committee will now have eight members, three more than is needed and this will ensure they will be able to meet a quorum.

**Barbara** asked Rodney if he felt comfortable with only eight members. Rodney answered, "Absolutely". He went on to explain that Chair member, Victor Kimura, was financial head of UCSC and Rodney felt very good about their committee.

**Barbara** suggested that the North Sub-Committee be notified on the next South/Central Meeting so those concerned could attend. Vic Marani suggested looking at becoming one committee again, because it was one School Bond.

**Trustee** President, Rhea DeHart asked Darlene to send out an e-mail to everyone on the North Sub-Committee notifying them of the next Central/South Sub-Committee Meeting for those interested in going.

**Bruce** Mathias still felt concern over the fact that South/Central Sub Committee did not have enough members. Trustee Volpa tried to reassure him that they were doing just fine with eight. Again Bruce voiced his concern regarding a quorum.

**Barbara** asked if they have had a quorum at the last meeting? Darlene explained that the committee has yet to meet since their meeting with the Board in April. However, the next meeting will be on October 25, 2004. 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm in the District Board Room, if anyone would like to attend. Several people said they would attend.

**Barbara** asked Rodney if he thought having two sub committees is working? Rodney answered, "I do, because of the difference in the projects."

**Vic** read articles from the Registrar Pajaronian regarding Pajaro Valley High School's cafeteria and that it was getting smaller and could not hold all of the students and another article regarding bidding and offered to pass them around, at which time Barbara added she wanted to share information from a parent on an Oversight Committee from Los Altos District, **Gary Walsh**, who works for a large construction firm in California that built the aquarium in Monterey and is currently working on the San Diego School District. He told her, that as of twelve months ago, it is extremely difficult to come in on any construction budget. That Gypsum/sheet-rock has gone up 10% per month. Metal has gone up 150% in the last twelve months. Kent Munro, from BMR Construction, added that it is actually six months. Barbara asked Jerry why, he told her it is because so many sub-divisions are going up in California, that it is all over the United States, but particularly in California.

Therefore it is important to move along as quickly as possible, with the Committee, the District and the Project Manager. We are fighting time, so I am willing to call each member to see if everyone on this committee to re-confirm in writing that they want to stay on this committee for another two years.

**Terry** responded to the article Vic read by saying, the cafeteria design of the new high school is the original design. We could not afford to build it with the State funds and that is why we had it put into the Bond. As far as the size, it is the same size as Watsonville High School. However, you never have a cafeteria hold the whole student body. Regarding the outside, we envision areas between the buildings and lunch shelters just like we will have here at Aptos High. So the students have outside places to eat as well as inside. Our construction budget was about \$2.3 million out of the total \$2.5 million allocated. The low bid came in at \$3 million. We rejected those bids. We will re-bid the project for \$2.3 million with any additional costs being covered with project savings from the off-site work of about \$700,000 of project money.

**Mike** Barsi asked Terry when he first knew when we were over budget. Terry answered when the bids came in. Mike then asked that the chair members be advised before any issue comes up that may, or may not find their way to the press. Terry agreed.

**Continuing** with the agenda, Terry began by explaining how we are now finishing up Increment I with LPA and beginning Increment II with BCA. He then introduced **Paul Bunton of Bunton Clifford Associates, Inc.** to further explain what they have done to comply with our budget along with the wishes and requirements of the community.

**Paul** began his presentation showing the committee drawings of the new design of the **Performing Arts Center**, explaining that they have been working closely with Diane Burbank on the design, keeping in as many of the amenities possible from the initial design. ***Both the Gymnasium and the Performing Arts Center combined square footage is now 43,000 sq. ft., as opposed to the original design of 48,000 sq. ft. So, approximately 5000 sq. ft. have been cut from the original plan in order to keep within budget.*** We are taking the plans to the Board Wednesday, October 13<sup>th</sup> for final presentation and approval. After that we go into the design and development phase and to the state architect office by late February. It should be out of DSA in three months and we will then seek competitive bids and start construction in June '05 and open before fall semester of '06. Paul then passed out packets on the design shown.

**Amendment** asked by Mary Reed to state what design.

**Amendment** asked by Barbara Palmer to describe what was meant by new facilities.

**Trustee Volpa** asked if there was truck access to the back of the theater and if there was an area for storage for sets in the back? Paul answered yes to both.

When going through the costs, concern about estimates and cost changes came up and whether buyers can be locked in as far as material costs? Paul indicated that BCA has put in construction and escalation costs in the estimates, plus a design contingency of 5%.

***Jim Miller felt his concerns were not addressed in these minutes regarding the new architects design and estimates. Including a 5% contingency, Paul Bunton stated that the project after adjustments was 5% over budget. Jim questioned that the 5% contingency was gone, due to the 5% over budget. (Please see footnotes for more information regarding Jim's additions to the Agenda.)***

**Paul** also talked about the end of **design** stage, that they could have as many as 200 sheets of drawings, plus a lot more data that the estimators will see on the plans. You can see all of the detail we have today and we will have much more detail as we go. That's why we have so many more contingencies today.

**Paul** was asked if BCA does the estimations?. He said no, not as architects, they hire a third party construction estimator from San Francisco and have used them for 12 to 13 years.

**Kent** from BMR, also mentioned that he also has been reviewing their estimates for reasonableness and making comments on them. He went on to say that he believed that although he felt that it was a good idea to have a third party to do an estimate and a review, he felt it may be a bit premature right now. That there will be more drawings to look at later and that may be a better time.

Questions and brief discussion from Mike Barsi regarding interaction with LPA and when the next bid on construction was happening. Paul answered that the competitive bid will open May '05 and they are not interacting with LPA at all. We do not want to disrupt what this community has agreed to other than size and space.

**Paul** indicated that in the back of the packets were the latest estimates. He went through the **Increment II** project and explained from the general summary page through most of the detailed summary sheets.

**Barbara** requested an updated site plan from Terry..

Another change on the site plan, was snack bar with outdoor serving. Paul showed the committee that it was separate from the concession stand. Sue Brooks, Director of Food Services, has been working with Paul and giving him her input on how she wanted it set up. He continued with more explanations on the exterior of the buildings.

The question on the outside material of the buildings was brought up.

**Chris Lewis** of BCA answered that a combination of materials, a hardy pine siding and stucco cement plaster cal wall.

More discussion among the committee regarding time-line, budget, wants, needs and changes. No more surprises.

**Terry** reiterated that after Paul has his estimator, Hanscomb F & G go over the estimate, Kent will go over it again, but having a third party do it at the same time would be reasonable. At that phase, Kent has indicated that the construction firms are use to using the final construction documents. They are not use to the design and development phase which uses a lot more projection as opposed to take off, if you know what the plan really is. So, the question is, who do we use?

**Barbara** suggested to get a list together between the committee. Then get a few people together to select an estimator.

The question was asked where the money would come to do the estimate?

**Terry** said it would be part of the soft cost.

It was concluded that the Committee wanted to have a third party make an estimate after the design phase to be correlated with the BCA and BMR estimates. Documents won't be ready for that for about six weeks but a company should be selected prior to that time to be ready.

Next meeting will be November 1, 2004. The time will remain 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Barbara thanked everyone for coming.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

\*Bylaw Section 5. Membership 5.1

**Footnote:**

**Jim Miller adds, "The solution to the \$4 million over budget by LPA \$15 million to \$19 million was solved by combining the two buildings, the Gymnasium and the Performing Arts Center and change the material from concrete to steel."**

**Jim also stated concern was voiced about the legitimacy of the estimating process, i.e. New High School Cafeteria had two bidders and the low bidder was 50% over estimate budget. He noted there was discussion whether the Oversight Committee should hire their own estimator, still having BMR do their random estimate validations. Doug Maher was to investigate the possibility of acquiring a cost effective estimator.**

All of these items were discussed at other times during the meeting and I do not feel comfortable placing them in the 5% design contingency area. However, while playing the tape back, to see where they went, it broke, so I placed them here for all to read.

***Please note:***

***The amendments and additions are in bold italics.***