

Minutes for the Bond Oversight Committee Meeting South/Central

October 25, 2004

District Office Boardroom
292 Green Valley Road
Watsonville, CA 95076

5:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Attending Members:

Rodney Brooks - Aurelio Gonzalez - Victor Kimura - Doug Mattos - Antonio Rivas
Peter Stoll

Absentee Members:

Tom Alejo - Roberto Garcia

North Bond Committee Liaison:

Non-Committee Members:

Brian Rasmussen, BMR Construction
Terry McHenry, Associate Superintendent
Rhea DeHart, Board of Trustees President
Darlene Insley, Administrative Assistant

Chair Victor Kimura noted there was a quorum, acknowledged that everyone knew each other, thanked **Board of Trustee President, Rhea DeHart** for the honor of her presence and then called the meeting to order.

Victor then requested the Committee take time to read the minutes of the prior meeting. The minutes were moved, seconded and approved.

It was mentioned that Darlene would like a response, after being notified by her of an upcoming meeting, to verify whether you will or will not be attending; per the Bond Oversight Committee Bylaws.

Victor then asked **Brian Rasmussen of BMR Construction Management, Inc.** to give the status report on the South/Central Projects.

Brian reported that the Board voted to reduce the size of the South/Central Committee as opposed to adding more members. So, the South/Central Committee began with thirteen members and now this committee is officially eight members.

Moving to the **South/Central Bond projects**; Brian stated the Pajaro Valley High School Cafeteria was bid one month ago and came in over budget. Our budget is \$2.3 million in actual construction funds and the low bid came in a little over three million dollars. The intent is to take the project back out to bid in January with an April 1st start to avoid a winter construction.

We are also looking at other ways to fund parts of this project rather than using the Bond money and getting it built within budget and without changing the scope.

Brian also mentioned he was going to talk with Sue Brooks, Director of Food Services and go over all of the equipment that is shown on the plans, to see if all of it is necessary, i.e. deep fat fryers, that Sue Brooks does not typically use.

Terry McHenry added that it is still a 8,000 sq. ft. full size Cafeteria as originally planned. Brian stated that the building would be bid by itself. The patio and lunch structure will be a separate bid to a site work contractor. The South side covered walkway will be bid as part of the building, but the two free standing 30x60 covered eating areas will be put on as part of the site work packages. The building would be bid by itself.

Watsonville High School: Brian explained that the documents for the new gymnasium were submitted to Division of the State Architect (DSA) for approval in the last 30 days. We intend to put the bid out in the spring and start work in the summer; so we are on time for this project. We have a few more meetings to finalize the plans on all of the logistics dealing the moving of the students.

The architects are meeting with the physical education and science staff to finalize the design and renovation of the old gymnasium and decide what will be done in the science rooms.

We intend to begin on the new gym and swimming pool complex this summer going through the school year and half of the following summer. We will then renovate the old gym and try and do the science rooms at the same time. Another six or eight months to do the renovations would complete this project. We will begin the gymnasium June 05 and will be completed and opened the beginning of 2007.

Brian added that they are waiting on the All Weather Surface for the football field due to cost issues.

A discussion opened regarding the hold on the All Weather Surface. Brian said he didn't feel it was prudent to spend \$1.million before knowing *all* the costs of the project. There was mention that the field was being left to die, because a new field was going to be planted. Brian stated that no decision was made to stop maintaining the field.

More discussion regarding the field, sod or synthetic, original plans that were made and paid for, past committees, a concrete block and steel building that is already built. The cost of cement and steel, moving 29 portables off the WHS campus to make room for the projects. Housing for the boys' locker room, bidding without approval from DSA, the Board is not allowed to award a contract without DSA approval.

Concern over the price between synthetic turf and real turf and how it is not necessarily a savings by having the synthetic turf, it has a 7-10 year life span and \$250,000. to replace it. We employ a full time grounds crew, so we don't save on that factor. However, it will take a lot more use and since both WHS and PVHS will be using it throughout the winter, it will always be ready for use.

Terry was asked if a few grounds keepers were laid off, a reduction on the amount of water, fertilizer and other chemicals, over the 7 years, is there a fund in the School District to save this money that could be kept in reserve and in 7 years give to the school to replace the surface?

Terry explained that while it could happen, that most likely it wouldn't due to the liabilities attached and the unknown factors, i.e. when it starts to wear out, are there more injuries? There is no data to check on.

Brian explained the difference between Astroturf and the All Weather Surface in that it has very long fibers. They fill the tall fibers full of sand and leave just the top half inch of the fibers sticking up out of the sand, then rake them back and forth to make them stand up. Where as the standard Astroturf is a carpet like substance. However, there is no specific data on it. No one has testified we played on it "X" amount of times and it has lasted "X" long.

The question was asked, after we finish the building and we had \$400,000 left. would this give us an option of putting a natural field back in?

Brian stated that the original Bond just states Stadium upgrade \$.5 million, you can re-work the field.

A brief discussion on the process of bids and the fees for bids and re-bids, budget checks and how costly and time consuming it is.

Mintie White: We are submitting the drawings for the Multipurpose Room to DSA for approval. We have done an estimate and a budget check. The first phase of the project has been completed. The Relocatables have been moved (paid by the District) and we have set the New Library Relocatable in place. (Paid out of Bond project)

E.A. Hall: We have had some issues with the architect on this project and keeping them moving. It looks like we will not be breaking ground until Spring. This makes it a May to December construction. We anticipate having the plans on the showers and locker rooms finished and sent to DSA with in three weeks. We are still submitting them as one job under one Architect and one Contractor.

Aptos High School: We have had a \$4.5 million contract awarded to Granite Construction to do site work on AHS. This work is under way and a significant part is done at this point. The new parking lot will be opened and the old one closed. A small part of the road has to be finished and then the traffic patterns will be what they are ultimately going to be. The tennis courts were just bid last week and will go to the Board this week for award.

We had a mutual agreement with LPA on ending their services after Phase I of this project. The Board awarded a contract to a new architect, Bunton Clifford Associates, (BCA) to take the project over as design of the building. The reason for this was in January, LPA presented the District a set of cost estimates, stating that they were in budget at \$15.4 million. The project was put on hold in April waiting to see the cost of the bids on the first Phase and in June or July they came back and said its \$19. Million to build what was designed.

We sat down with LPA to try and work on correcting the situation. Their solution was to cut off rooms without looking into other issues such as structural system that they were using for the building and finishes, to try and reduce the cost in that manor. They wanted to cut out the music room and the black box and shrink the gym. They didn't want to alter the integrity of their design.

They did some sketches, which we took to the Design Groups, but no one was happy with any of them. So, we solicited architects and BCA actually had been our second choice came in with the lowest bid and the Committee liked their drawings. We are still working on the design and are still about \$.5 million over the budget, but much closer than the \$4 million over with LPA.

The question was asked, if changing architects and ultimately costing more money, could money be expected to come out of South/Central Bond money? Brian assured the Committee that it could **not per the terms of the bond**.

Rhea DeHart, Board of Trustees President, asked Brian to explain to the Committee what the North Bond Committee is doing regarding checks on the estimate.

Brian explained that North Bond Committee is going to hire a third party Estimator to check estimate on the design drawings from BCA. The North Bond Committee is very closely watching their cost issues now. The architect has produced his estimate; BMR has reviewed his estimate and rendered comments on it. So we are pending, waiting for the revised design. The architect will do his own estimate and concurrently a set of plans to go to the District Estimator and if they choose to do so will estimate the plans parallel with the architect. If they come out differently, there needs to be a reconciliation meeting with them to go over their differences and come to an agreement.

A discussion took place regarding the North Bond Committee and why they had chosen to bring in a third party Estimator for the Aptos projects. The pros and cons on the expense of bringing in a third party Estimator for the Aptos projects and not wanting to bring one in on the Watsonville projects. Plus, questions on reviews vs. estimates and the actual purpose of the *third party* estimates.

Another discussion was about the North Bond Committee's last meeting regarding South/Central Committee not having enough members at each meeting to form a quorum to represent the community properly. Some on the North Bond Committee didn't believe having five to eight members could comply with the law and brought up the idea of merger again. However, a Board member reminded them they were *all* part of the same group and only eight members were needed for a Bond Oversight Committee.

Other items that were discussed; the budget on the PVHS Cafeteria project, getting other bids, how they were originally bid, the moisture conditions, on site builders, improving the competition and not building in the winter.

The Committee asked for an updated budget printout for the next meeting.

Terry explained that the Financial Audit shows what the income is, what the expenses are and whether the books are in order. The District has to pay for the Financial Audit; it does not come out of Bond money. This is fine. We talked about getting bids from an outside Performance Auditor. Checking around most Districts have received the same one line Performance Audit, except for a \$50,000 audit, which is a little more than the budget can afford. However, we are looking for a local architect firm or construction firm for a Performance Auditor by the next meeting.

The question was asked if it would cost more than \$2,800 and Terry answered yes and added that it would also be a District cost. It was suggested that Terry go to John Doughty, Director of Planning, in the City of Watsonville for names of someone local. The District

wants to have more of a complete Performance Audit than last year. Terry questioned the Committee, that if the District found a more thorough performance auditor to do the job, will they have the authority to hire them?

Victor Kimura suggested the committee go along with Terry's decision and choice of candidates and to defer the vote to Terry McHenry. Rodney Brooks moved to defer the vote on Performance Auditor to Terry McHenry, Aurelio Gonzalez seconded the motion.

It was mentioned that Roberto Garcia had been absent four times in a row without responding. The members asked that he be removed from the Committee.

At which point, we asked each member if they would please volunteer for another two more years and now go to the Board and ask to have them re-instated each member at the next Board Meeting.

Antonio moved to have Roberto Garcia removed from the Committee and to take it to the Board for approval. Aurelia Gonzalez seconded the motion which was passed.

The Committee asked Darlene to contact Tom Alejo to see if he still wanted to attend the Oversight Committee Meetings.

The next meeting will be January 31, 2005 to review Budget Sheet and possibly discuss the Performance Auditor. The meeting will be scheduled to be held in unknown building and room as of this date from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm.

Chair Member Victor Kimura adjourned the meeting at 7:17 PM.