

**CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
December 16, 2002**

Mr. Roger Larkin called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. with Glenn Duncan, Gerald Bruce, Michael Calta, Stuart Holland, Gary Larson and Paul Andersen present. Andy Anderson arrived at 5:19 p.m. Maurice Ayala, Geoffrey VandenHeuval, Gary Ovitt and Al Valdez were absent.

1. Review/Approval of Minutes, November 18, 2002

After reviewing the minutes, Mr. Calta suggested a clarification to the minutes at section two, paragraph four, the second to the last sentence beginning with "The theory is" He felt it was unclear and suggested the following: "The theory is that the State provides about 25% of what it would cost to build a new building to be used instead for modernizing existing qualified buildings." Gary Larson made a motion to approve the minutes with the change and Glenn Duncan seconded the motion.

2. Public School Construction Process Q & A

Dr. Andersen introduced three members of the planning and construction staff to talk about their roles in building and modernizing school facilities: Sandra Chen, Facilities Planner/Fiscal Analyst; Richard Kroll, Coordinator of Maintenance and Operations; and Bob Olin from B.E. McMurray Construction Management. He explained the handout entitled "Appendix 4: Services Matrix" from the handbook of the Office of Public School Construction. This handout generally explains the tasks involved in a typical school construction or renovation project and who is usually responsible for each task. He explained another handout called, "State School Facility Programs Overview."

Sandra Chen distributed a two-page document that explained the approval process for funding projects, one for new construction and the other for modernization. Using this document, she detailed her responsibilities as well as the district's, architects' and state agencies' roles in this approval process.

Richard Kroll explained that different departments in the district, Food Service, Information Services, Transportation, etc. become part of the design team to fine-tune plans for either new construction or modernization projects. He explained how hazardous material abatement in modernization projects is handled. He explained the need and procedures for hiring a DSA inspector for each project needed to enforce Title 24 codes. He went over the district's management process to oversee the construction and modernization projects as they progress, as well as the interim housing provisions required. He answered a question about how

district maintenance staff is involved in new construction or modernization projects and how the standard maintenance is transferred over to district staff once the projects are complete. He went into detail about the process the district follows for bidding. There was a discussion about the Field Act, how it came into being, and its role in the school construction process.

### 3. Construction Management Q & A

Bob Olin, from the district's construction management firm, B.E. McMurray, spoke to the committee. He said it is the responsibility of the construction management team to coordinate the work of as many as 23 prime contractors to make sure they show up on time with the proper manpower to complete their jobs on time so the next prime contractor isn't delayed. The major difference between CM and a general contractor is the prime contractors aren't working for the CM directly, they're working for the district. CM is working as consultant to the district to coordinate the projects. Savings from value engineering are savings to the district not the CM. He explained from the perspective of the construction management industry how this delivery method aids school districts in saving money during the bidding process by encouraging qualified contractors to bid the job, coordination efforts during construction and getting the project done on time. He explained the procedures for handling payments to contractors. The CM requests a "schedule of values" from the contractor shortly after the bid is awarded, reviews the schedules and enforces them so the contractors don't charge most of the bid price early in the project. There were questions and answers regarding the submittal process followed during construction.

### 4. Finalizing the Quarterly Report

Mr. Larkin explained that Mr. Bruce put a report together in chronological order covering what the committee has done for the first two quarters and attached the minutes for each meeting. Mr. Valdez plans to take that report, summarize it and present a summary to the board. Mr. Larkin offered to email a copy to each member and will let everyone know when the presentation will be made to the board in case they want to attend the meeting.

### 5. Ayala Wrestling Room Documentation

Dr. Andersen gave the background regarding a request for documentation for a wrestling room being considered as part of the second district stadium plans and paid for from Measure M funds. Documentation was given to the members that

the historical plans for this stadium had included a "field house," which incorporated a weight room and wrestling room.

Some of the members questioned whether the records submitted did in fact document that the field house was a part of what was approved by the citizens as part of the Facilities Assessment Report to be paid for from Measure M funds.

There was discussion regarding what kind of estimates were requested and received by the district in the process of developing the Facilities Assessment Report. Dr. Andersen explained that originally the plans for the stadium showed that the weight room and wrestling room would be located underneath the bleachers. But the bleachers that the district acquired don't permit that sort of flexibility. So rather than abandon that idea, the separate facilities were to be built elsewhere as part of the overall project. When the stadium was presented as a \$2.3 million project, at that point it was not known that these buildings couldn't be located underneath the stadium. After an architect was actually hired to examine the situation, the architect informed the district it couldn't be done that way. The district didn't possess this knowledge before it was presented to the voters. He was informed that the cost of trying to build a field house underneath the bleachers would far exceed the budget.

In an effort to resolve the issue, Mr. Anderson asked if the committee thinks that the wrestling room was part of the Measure M Facilities Assessment provided to the voters. He didn't think that the furnished documentation showed that it was part of the approved report and asked for the other members' input. Mr. Larkin also felt the documentation did not show it was part of what the voters approved.

Mr. Duncan said he'd like to hear the rationalizations as to why they want to build it. He thinks that if it ultimately is in the best interest of the students, as a health and safety issue, or a facilities issue that's important to the students, if there is a way to justify it, then it should be approved. But it should not be built at the cost of another project that is definitely on the list. He felt it should be approved if it can be done within the overall picture within the funding available. He stated that if the committee rejects this project for funding at this time, money might be left over in the Measure M funds that could have paid for it. He said the documentation provided and the project's inclusion on the list is questionable but he would like to find a way to make it work.

Mr. Holland said he doesn't disagree that the wrestling room is something that the school needs. But he feels that the committee's purpose is to make sure that the district is spending money on the projects that were approved. If the project is not on the list, bond money shouldn't be spent on it.

Mr. Larson shared that he has been on the stadium committee since it was first instituted and the plans had always included the field house with the weight room and wrestling room. Any discussion of the stadium always included all of those

rooms. Recently it was determined that it could not feasibly be built all in one project and be economically sound. It was found to be much cheaper to build it separately.

Mr. Calta pointed out that the amount being spent on the stadium is constant, budgeted at \$2.3 million, and it may be acceptable as long as they stay within that budget.

Mr. Larkin questioned when the issue came up that they couldn't put this facility under the bleachers, whether it was after they purchased the bleachers or before. Mr. Larson answered that it was determined before the bleachers were purchased. He also said that the district learned that the overall cost savings was significant.

Mr. Larkin suggested that the committee could influence the board and the district to plan more carefully and explain actions more clearly in the future.

Mr. Andersen agreed that he would also hate to see the project fall off the list because there isn't an extraordinary amount of documentation. He pointed out that a lot of the project descriptions are broad in scope. He would suggest that it's a matter of priorities. Maybe it could be moved back in priority and still remain a possibility for funding under Measure M. Mr. Calta said the project was already being done. Mr. Anderson summarized the issue by saying that his perception was that there was no documentation provided at this meeting that responded to the question at hand. He requested that either Mr. Larkin or Mr. Valdez go back and request very specific information.

More documentation that the wrestling room was a part of the architect's estimate for establishing the cost of the stadium for the approved Facilities Assessment Report was requested. It would be helpful to get a breakdown of all of the estimated costs to be spent on the second district stadium. A question was raised regarding the fact that it will be a portable building as opposed to a permanent structure. The general impression was that the district is trying to get away from using portable buildings and build more permanent structures with Measure M funds.

Mr. Larkin listed the following regarding this issue:

- How was the project approved?
- What was the justification?
- Was it originally going to be a modular building or a permanent structure?
- What's the cost breakout for the stadium project?
- If the dollars match what the facilities are going to be then we can assume it was part of the project.

There was some discussion regarding earthquake safety requirements and putting buildings under bleachers.

6. Other Topics/Public Comment

Mr. Larkin had a question regarding board-adopted boundary changes that will affect Walnut Elementary School, causing the school to lose 140 students. If they are losing those students, will they gain students from another school? If so, will that bring the school's population back to what it was intended for and whether they need to move forward with the new classrooms. If the school is 140 students short, why are they building additional classrooms? Dr. Anderson offered to give an update at next meeting regarding the Walnut modernization as well as how many teaching stations are needed for the long haul as the school's population is projected.

There was a discussion regarding members who have missed meetings. So far no members have missed three meetings in a row.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 13 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.