

**Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee**  
**March 18, 2019**  
**4:00 p.m.–5:30 p.m.**  
**ESC Board Room**

**“To become familiar with the 2018 bond program and project list, monitor the progress of the improvements being made, and report the status of the program to the Board of Education on a quarterly basis.”**

**Attendees:** Bill Canterbury, Don Carroll, Jeni Finnigan, Matt Hahn, Jennifer Harrison, Tom Patton, Terry Davis, Diane Doney, Nicole Moyer, Mike Lopez

**Guest:** Brian Ewert

**Minutes:**

1. Welcome and introductions.
2. Remarks from Superintendent Brian Ewert.
3. Review committee charge.
  - a. We will meet monthly; present to the Board quarterly.
  - b. There will be site visits throughout construction.
  - c. Discussion of how information is disseminated to the Board and to the public:
    - i. Quarterly report from Jacobs, and Jacobs will attend all our meetings.
      1. Detailed report to the Board; summary report to the public.
4. Bond program: current status overview.
  - a. Discussed how the budgets were set in the LRPC report and how they may change as the projects move through the process.
  - b. Discussed construction managers/general contractors (CM/GCs) who have been brought on board for the turf projects as well as our “new builds” at Franklin, Ames, and Newton.
  - c. Discussed vendors that are being interviewed for furniture replacements (interviews are happening this week).
  - d. Miscellaneous projects for this summer:
    - i. Highland Elementary:
      1. Wing for preschool (moving in from Ames, as that building is vacated for demolition and reconstruction).
      2. Swing-space wing outside the school.
        - a. Self-contained 10-classroom modular (with bathrooms).
    - ii. Some asphalt and concrete repairs.
    - iii. Three or four kitchen freezers.

- iv. A couple of roofing projects.
    - v. A couple of HVAC units.
    - vi. Some ADA work (ramps to modulars, elevator at Goddard-design, etc.).
  - e. Discussed how we put together a list of pre-qualified architects, contractors, etc.
    - i. Trying to see which firms would be good fits for the different projects and which contractor/architect duos would work well together.
    - ii. Put out RFQ:
      - 1. 22 respondents for architects.
      - 2. 36 respondents for contractors.
    - iii. This is to keep us competitive in this fast-paced construction environment and with several other surrounding districts having passed bonds as well.
  - f. Discussed concern with making sure projects are completed in time for school to convene in the fall.
    - i. This will be a concern every year, but we follow a rhythm that helps mitigate this.
    - ii. We've never yet failed to open on time!
  - g. What is the rationale for using three different architects/CM/GCs for the three major building projects?
    - i. Spreading risk is a factor; if you have an architect/contractor that's failing, they're only failing on one school rather than several.
    - ii. We looked at prototypes (so, for example, a "cookie-cutter" elementary school), but we want to be innovative and get the best possible design for our students and for the future.
- 5. Review sample report to the Board of Education.
  - a. Went through the difference between the report to the Board and the report to the public.
  - b. Discussed what will be in the report and what will be changing.
- 6. Meeting schedule and first presentation to the Board.
  - a. Mondays seem to work best. Hoping for a 4:00–5:30 (or 6:00 at the latest) window.
    - i. April 15.
    - ii. April 29 - run through PowerPoint for the Board presentation.
  - b. First presentation to the Board of Education scheduled for May 9, 2019.
- 7. Adjourn.