



Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Notes
 April 22, 2019; 5:30-7:30 pm
 Crescent Valley High School
 4444 NW Highland Avenue; Corvallis, OR 97330

x	Rich Arnold, Chair	x	Ryan Noss, Superintendent
	Amy Crump, Committee member	x	Kim Patten, Director of Facilities & Transportation, Oversight Committee Staff Liaison
x	Brad Hamlin, Committee member	x	Olivia Meyers Buch, Director of Finance & Operations
x	Jennifer Richmond, Committee member	x	Brenda Downum, Communications Coordinator
	Chris Rochester, Committee member	x	Dale Kuykendall, Wenaha Group
x	Emily Valdez, Committee member	X	Dave Fishel, Wenaha Group
x	Gordon Zimmerman, Committee member	X	Julie Haymart, Wenaha Group
x	Jay Conroy, School Board Liaison		

1. Tour Debrief & Dinner

Pre-meeting tours were led by district facilities staff and Wenaha Group representatives. School tours included Wilson, Cheldelin, Mt. View, and Crescent Valley High School.

2. Project and Financial Update

Kim Patten presented a project update PowerPoint and Dave Fishel shared procurement, market and bid updates.

Project Updates:

- Lincoln gym disposition discussed- the feasibility of saving the gym and repurposing for the community was explored. It will not be saved due to costs and the site limitations it would create for the replacement school.
- The City will likely require the addition of a block perimeter at Lincoln (driveway along east side of site).
- April 25 board items were discussed: CHS softball improvements, seismic improvements at elementary schools, and boiler replacement at CVHS.

Dave Fishel discussed the developing Master Bond Schedule adjustments reflecting current market conditions, team capacity and impacts to school operations. Equity considerations are always a factor.

Committee member questions and discussion included:

Request to include seismic (non-bond) projects on cost reporting.

Asked about feasibility to perform abatement away from the summers to tap into abatement contractor capacity.

There was general discussion about “risks”. Identified: 1) Market, 2) Escalation, 3) Bond promise definition and pricing (ex: Garfield parking budgeted at \$250k, but likely \$1M+ to fulfil Design Guidance Principles and District’s Core Values.

Request for reporting on contingency usage. Staff will present this topic at the next BOC meeting.

3. Bond Promise Tracking

There is a desire to track bond promises with original estimates and final costs. Dave Fishel’s developing report should accomplish this goal. The usage of the Bond Premium was discussed.

Committee member comments and discussion included:

Suggested an approach of “reserving” a prorated portion for each school that could be used as designs are developed. This would still require board approval but it would provide Bond Leadership and the design teams some flexibility to achieve bond promises and manage important new elements that might arise.

Discussion about allowing facilities funds to be incorporated into bond projects for efficiency. It was agreed that the projects could be merged when it makes sense from a construction perspective. Mechanism for funds transfer was not discussed, although minimal facilities budgets were noted.

Superintendent Noss reminded committee members that the District receives frequent requests on various topics and that any committee emails about bond business are subject to public information laws.

4. Potential Bond Reserve Projects

BOC Chair Arnold expressed a concern that BOC members are not taken by surprise with important bond information that might be shared at a board meeting. The example was the potential bond reserve project list that was shared with the board earlier this month. Superintendent Noss discussed the “order of operations” for communications with the Bond Oversight Committee. Generally, the Board will see things before BOC, unless it is the same week. BOC members will receive board packets which should resolve this issue.

5. Master Schedule

Dave Fishel presented the master schedule and reviewed possible changes to better meet the needs of school operations and due to market forces. Design Advisory Committees are active at Garfield, Hoover, Lincoln, and Crescent Valley High School.

5. Communications

An important role of the BOC is to serve as liaisons to the community and share information about the bond program process. Committee members discussed the key messages from this meeting as follows:

- The bond leadership team has been very proactive about projecting costs and getting information to the board in advance. The Bond Oversight Committee will receive updates that are shared with the School Board on a monthly basis.

- Garfield, Lincoln and Hoover are nearing 90% schematic design. The next step is to get cost estimates.
- Some bid packages are coming in higher than originally estimated. The district has been conservative with contingency funds including project contingencies and program reserves.
- The original design idea was to use a prototype design for both Lincoln and Hoover for cost efficiencies. The sites will require differences in design but there will be some similarities between schools.
- The sequence of projects was driven using the lens of equity. The district is now looking closely at the window for summer work and bid season. The master schedule may shift in the coming weeks- possibly push out a bit to optimize the market.
- June 20 Board meeting will include a design review of all major projects- BOC members are invited.

6. Next Meeting

Scheduled for July 22, 2019 at Linus Pauling Middle School. Tours begin at 4:00 pm at Adams, then to CHS and LPMS.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm