A: No partnerships are planned for the summer 2013 improvements. However, staff will explore partnerships for future summer improvements. The partnership with Concordia is progressing for the Faubion replacement.

An "aspirational" threshold has been set regarding MWESB business participation at 18% of progress payments on a contract-to-contract basis.

The second objective in equity in public purchasing and contracting is participation by people of color and women in apprenticable trades. Applies to Division 49 procurements only.

The third objective is engaging students in the work.

Q: If the aspirational goal for MWESB businesses is 18%, why does the scorecard have a green score at 10%?

A: Currently the District is under 5% for contracting with MWESB businesses. The District is looking at incremental improvement; 10% or greater would represent real progress. Staff will re-look at the scorecard regarding how this is reported.

Q: How do multiple contracts roll up into the scoring?

A: The scorecards are an average of the data; the contracts are equally weighted. The scorecard measurement is based on dollars paid out in pay applications.

Q: How will the Committee judge the MWESB performance measure? Is 18% representative of this market?

A: 18% is an aspirational goal developed based on experience other large local public agencies have established. Every contract will strive to meet the 18% objective, however, it will take time to ultimately achieve this. For now, staff is looking for continuous incremental improvement on the goal.

Q: Should the Committee also measure the committed contracts in addition to the dollars paid out in pay applications?

The Committee mentioned that they will need a forecast capability for the MWESB measurement. It was noted that since the MWESB measurement is an average, than it can accumulate over time. The Equity Tool was designed to track (after the fact) MWESB aggregate spending.

Q: How much outreach to MWESB businesses is going on?

A: OutTBTa1 0 0 1t9>ıAA11.02(e)-3(the)1tfETBT1 0 0 1 314.93 256.06 Tm[ )]TJ489.43 TcetI

A: Chief Operating Officer, CJ Sylvester, explained that solar panel installation was not part of the 2012 capital construction bond for the summer improvement projects. They are however part of the high school full modernizations and Faubion K8 replacement. The economic environment has changed as well as the BETC program since the 2009 solar roof installations. Not putting solar on the roofs in 2013 does not preclude the District from putting solar on the roofs at a later time if the economic environment changes or if active partnerships can be developed.

Q: Will some solar work be a part of the High School improvements and Faubion due to the 1.5% requirement?

A: Yes.

A: Yes. The design team looks at the entire scope of each project. Historic Building Assessments were performed on all of the District's buildings and are embedded in the design work. The Historic Assessments are available on the District's website.

Bond Sales:

Jim Owens introduced Dan Jung, Operations Manager for OSM. Dan introduced David Wynde, Budget Director, to discuss the upcoming issuance of bonds.
David explained that the District has been meeting with their financial advisor, Seattle Northwest, to discuss the timeline and strategy for issuing bonds
The first bond issuance is tentatively planned for this upcoming spring.

Project Summary:

Dan Jung pointed out the graphic that was used to communicate the bond to the public. He recommended that we continue to report under the categories defined in the graphic. He explained that the five categories depicted in the graphic can be thought of as funding sources.

Cost Summary:

A detailed spreadsheet was provided to the Committee outlining the project budgets, budget changes, encumbrances, expenditures and the forecasted amount to complete each project.

Q: There is a big change in the "Bond 2012" project, what happened?

A: The roofing and seismic projects were over budget, funding was moved from an available contingency funding source to cover the costs.

Q: Where is contingency represented in the spreadsheet?

A: A 15% contingency budget is imbedded in each project. Additionally there are three contingency budgets imbedded within the 2012 Bond Program.
Kevin Spellman recommends we treat the 2012 Bond Program component as a project and forecast costs like any other project.

Q: Will each of the projects have a scorecard?

A: Each of the projects will have a project summary which is completed monthly.

Dan Jung presented and explained the overall schedule of the bond program

Q: Is there a way, to accelerate the Roosevelt schedule to enable the school to be completed by fall 2016? And if the entire school cannot be completed by then, could a portion of it be completed and occupied?

A: Heery International has been looking specifically at the details of the schedule, completing a refined analysis. Schedule details will be provided and reviewed at the next BAC.

Q: How will the Committee see changes to the schedule?

A: Changes to the schedule will be highlighted for the Committee.

Q: How much time is built into the schedule for community outreach on the high schools and Faubion?

A: The conceptual schedule includes 4 months of master planning. In addition, the Design Advisory Group will participate during early design phase thru 100% design development.

Board member, Bobbie Regan commented that she doesn't feel that opening a school in 5 years is aggressive. She urged the Committee to rethink the schedule.

Committee member Tom Peterson commented that it is premature to set the schedule until the CMGC is on board. Staff is considering use of CMGC delivery for the high school full modernizations.

When the schedule is ready to be presented, it will be distributed to the committee members; it will not be held until the next Committee meeting.

Q: Could there be criteria in the RFP for the designer for the timeframe of design?

A: Yes, but in the RFP process it is important to not only consider time, but quality and other factors. Objective is to select and award to the most qualified firm.

- Project Manager, Paul Cathcart was introduced as the project manager for the Educational Specifications (edspec) project. Although the edspec project is not a bond project it's outcome will heavily influence the bond work.
- Paul pointed out that recommendations came out of the Long Range Facilities Plan for Educational Specifications.
- Educational Specifications inform the master planning process for the full modernizations and replacements.
- Consideration will be given to how current and future curriculum is delivered.
- Educational Specifications are typically done at a school level; the District will be the only one in the state (to his knowledge) to have Educational Specifications at a District level.
- Phase 1 begins in March and will focus on engaging school and communities while school is in session.
- Q: What will be the makeup of the Advisory Committee for Educational Specification?
  A: Teaching and learning staff, Communities of Color, neighborhood associations and business associations
- Kevin Spellman asked Paul to report monthly on the progress in order to avoid potential problems with an already compressed schedule.

- Project Manager, Jen Sohm was introduced as the project manager for the Improvement Project 2013
- Jen provided an overview of improvements taking place the summer of 2013 at Alameda, Bridlemile, Laurelhurst, Lewis and Wilson.
- The project is currently in the construction documents phase.
- Bidding and permitting will start in March 2013.
- In regards to the roofing improvements, energy audits were performed. All roofs will be brought to code minimum.
- Committee Chair, Spellman had a concern regarding the dates of the bid period. CJ Sylvester asked of the Committee would like the bid period be added to the milestones reported to the Committee.
- Q: What is the change management process?