

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOARD
June 1, 2006
Tolleson, Arizona

The School Facilities Board held a board meeting at the Tolleson Elementary School District Office in Tolleson. The meeting began at approximately 10:15 A.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Guests Present</u>
Keenan, Brooks, Acting Chair	Robin Berry, Palo Verde Elementary
Chovich, Cynthia	
Davidson, Frank	
Gober, Patricia	
Ortega, David	
Torrez, Gregory	
Rushin, Tom	
<u>Members Absent</u>	
Taylor, Penny	
Phil Williams, Superintendent's Representative (non-voting)	
School Board Representative Position Vacant	
<u>Staff Present</u>	
John Arnold, Acting Executive Director	
Dean Gray, Deputy Director of Facilities	
Kristen Landry, Public Information Officer	
Amber Peterson, School Finance Specialist	
Debra Sterling, Attorney General's Office	

I. Call to Order
Acting Chair Brooks Keenan called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 A.M.

II. Roll Call and Introduction of Board Members
There were seven Board Members present at this meeting.

Brooks Keenan announced that Kate McGee had resigned as Chair from the Board.

III. Approval of Public Hearing Minutes and Regular Session Minutes of the May 4, 2006 Board Meeting
Frank Davidson moved that the Board approve both the public hearing and regular session minutes of May 4, 2006. David Ortega seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

IV. Consideration and possible vote of 3 Year Building Renewal Plans

Frank Davidson moved that the Board ratify the districts listed in agenda item IV as having successfully met the reporting requirements for Building Renewal and allow these Districts to receive their FY 06 Building Renewal Allocation. Tom Rushin seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

V. Director's Report

a. Legislative Update

John Arnold provided a summary of the current bills that could impact the SFB.

Gregory Torrez asked why the Governor previously vetoed the Building Renewal changes listed in HB2875. John Arnold explained that because the Building Renewal program is under litigation, the Governor, in her veto letter, said it would be irresponsible to change the underlying formula.

Mr. Arnold added that staff is in the process of changing the way we collect data from the districts on building renewal uses and the way they program their 3 Year Plans. Staff hopes this will provide a better understanding of the resources necessary to maintain the buildings at appropriate levels over time.

David Ortega asked what impacts HB2592 would have on a district's bonding. Mr. Arnold explained that the way the bill is structured raises questions as to who is at risk in providing these dollars. The developers are to enter an agreement with the district to decide who is responsible for the remainder of the cost if the SFB does not cover the full amount. This assumes that the SFB is providing some funding. There is the possibility that the district may never qualify for a school, which the bill does not address.

Patricia Gober asked if the land issues associated with this bill have been discussed further. Mr. Arnold explained that the Senate version of the bill, puts the 20% donation factor back in for the district. He believes the bill still assumes the land is donated.

b. Staff Update

John Arnold announced the addition of two new employees: Jim Chang, our new staff demographer and Monica Petersen, our new Finance Director.

c. CM @ Risk Rules

At the April Board meeting, the Board expanded the Inflation Adjustment Policy to allow districts to use alternative delivery methods and still qualify for inflation funding. At the same meeting, the Board asked staff to develop specific guidelines on how the CM at Risk delivery method would be administered.

A proposed process for administering the CM @ Risk delivery method was included in this agenda item. The recommended steps are designed to ensure that the method is employed correctly and that staff receives sufficient data to determine that the presented costs are consistent with market conditions.

The recommended procedure will be posted on our website for comments. Staff will recommend approval of a final version at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

Brooks Keenan said he was in favor of the process and requested that the GMP review be formally added.

David Ortega suggested that districts report monthly on the status of their project.

Frank Davidson asked about the staffing time to oversee this. John Arnold explained that currently staff is working on the 5 Year Inspections and Preventive Maintenance Inspections. He suggested hiring inspectors to measure buildings and other items that do not necessarily need to be done by the liaisons to free up more of their time. He added that one of the liaisons will also be assisting the staff architect.

Gregory Torrez said he was concerned that [CM@Risk](#) would leave out minority owned businesses. He asked if there was a timeline on this process in which the board could reevaluate. Mr. Arnold explained that when this item was first brought before the board in April, the Board said they did not want to set an expiration date, but said it would be wise to look at it in a year. He added that the process does ask the District and Contractor to come up with a plan for minority participation. He added that staff is uncomfortable in dictating how minority businesses are solicited.

Brooks Keenan encouraged districts to send their comments to staff.

d. Deficiencies Correction Update

Dean Gray provided an update on the status of the deficiency corrections projects.

Cynthia Chovich asked about the deadline to complete these projects. John Arnold explained that the statute calls for the balance of the deficiencies to be completed by June 30 of this year. However, the State Comptroller has said that as long as those projects have outstanding contracts, the state has to meet those obligations.

e. Financial Report

John Arnold updated the board on the financial report.

f. Upcoming Meetings

August Meeting: The August meeting has been moved from the 3rd to the 10th and will be held in the Marana District. Staff plans to hold a study session on energy and environmental issues following this meeting.

Cynthia Chovich asked if the energy efficiency standards would have any impact on existing schools or just new schools. John Arnold explained that renovations are not available at this time and this session would focus on new buildings only.

- g. Full Day Kindergarten Capital Grants
Tom Rushin moved that the Board approve the district's Full Day Kindergarten Expenditure Plans as outlined in agenda item Vg. Cynthia Chovich seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

VI. New School Construction

- a. Consideration and possible vote of New Construction Projects Review, Bids, and Bid Packages

Frank Davidson moved that the Board approve Dysart Unified District's request to proceed with [CM@Risk](#) Project 070289000-9999-013N, upon staff receipt of necessary documents, in the amount of \$12,034,176. David Ortega seconded.

Mr. Ortega asked why there were no pre-construction costs. John Arnold explained this was a prototype school and the contractor has already built the same design.

Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

- b. Consideration and possible vote of New Construction Expansion of Scope and Increased Project Cost

Tom Rushin moved that the Board approve additional funding in the amount of \$240,527 for site specific requirements for the Vail Unified School District, project number 100220000-9999-006N. Gregory Torrez seconded.

Mr. Torrez asked if the district had explored the possibility of giving the dirt to someone who may pick it up for free. Dean Gray said staff would work with the district on that, but added there is a lot of dirt that needs to be moved.

Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

VII. Consideration of Request for Land or Real Property Purchase, Lease, or Donation, including requests from:

- a. Steps I and/or II

David Ortega moved that the board approve Wickenburg Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 13.9 acres for an elementary site and move to Step III for necessary testing. Frank Davidson seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

- b. Step III

Frank Davidson moved that the board approve the following:

1. Coolidge Unified School District's request to accept a donation of 15 acres for and elementary site (project number 11022100-9999-014L)

2. Santa Cruz valley Unified District's request to purchase 11.881 acres for a middle school site (project number 12035000-9999-007L)

Cynthia Chovich seconded. Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

VIII. Consideration and Possible Vote of Emergency Deficiency Projects

Cynthia Chovich moved that the Board approve Palo Verde Elementary School District's request for permission to spend up to \$38,912 for a kitchen hood replacement. David Ortega seconded.

Ms. Chovich asked how long the hood had been in existence and if modification would be possible. Robin Berry of the district said the hood is from 1954 and cannot be replaced.

Gregory Torrez asked if the new hood had a warranty. Ms. Berry said it had a 2 year warranty.

Motion passed on a 7-0 voice vote.

IX. Future Agenda Items

None

X. Public Comment

None

Adjournment

There being no further business, Brooks Keenan, adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:15 A.M.

Approved by the School Facilities Board on _____, 2006

Chair

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOARD
Campus vs. Single Style Building Design
June 1, 2006
Tolleson, Arizona

The School Facilities Board held a study session at the Tolleson Elementary School District Office in Tolleson. The session began at approximately 1:00 P.M..

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Guests Present</u>
Keenan, Brooks, Acting Chair	Carl Jordan
Chovich, Cynthia	Rick Carr, EMC2
Davidson, Frank	Bill Johnson, Laveen ESD
Gober, Patricia	Calvin Baker, Vail USD
Ortega, David	Don Brubaker
Torrez, Gregory	Scott Thompson, Dysart USD
Rushin, Tom	Phil Swaim, Swaim & Associates
	Tim O'Brien
<u>Members Absent</u>	Vispi Karanjia
Taylor, Penny	Cathy Rex
Phil Williams, Superintendent's Representative (non-voting)	
School Board Representative Position Vacant	
<u>Staff Present</u>	
John Arnold, Acting Executive Director	
Dean Gray, Deputy Director of Facilities	
Kristen Landry, Public Information Officer	
Amber Peterson, School Finance Specialist	
Debra Sterling, Attorney General's Office	

- I. Call to Order
Acting Chair Brooks Keenan called the session to order at approximately 1:00 PM

- II. Roll Call and Introduction of Board Members
There were seven Board Members present at this meeting.

- III. Study Session on Campus Style vs Single Building Design
 - a. Staff Presentation
John Arnold presented on the differences in costs and amount of materials between campus style and single style designs.

David Ortega asked if the majority of K-8 schools are one or two story buildings. Mr. Arnold said the majority are single story.

Brooks Keenan asked if districts could buy more buildings with their own funds. Mr. Arnold explained that staff could compare the requested number of buildings with the hypothetical design to find the cost difference that the district would pay.

Frank Davidson asked if there were any components of single building design that are more expensive than campus style. Mr. Arnold said he was unaware of any particular components that were less expensive, but added there could be trade-offs. He explained that if a district brought in a four-building prototype and it would cost an extra 3% to redesign, that 3% would be credited to the original design.

Tom Rushin also noted that seismic issues should be taken into account. Mr. Arnold said districts can certainly make a case on the advantages in choosing multiple building design.

Tim O'Brien asked if staff has contacted educators on the educational advantages of one design over the other. Mr. Arnold said that he has asked, but there is not an agreed upon answer.

Calvin Baker, of the Vail Unified District, agreed that every district will have a different answer. He added that open spaces create fewer discipline issues.

Mr. Arnold indicated that as with all the minimum guidelines, districts can go above the guidelines.

David Ortega asked what percentage of districts have a choice in selecting something other than what the SFB provides. Mr. Arnold explained that the current school inventory chart shows 20% of schools as functioning within the model. He said the campus style is expensive and added that almost every district has added their own funds to projects in the last year and a half.

Brooks Keenan noted that early on in the Students FIRST program, a study was done to determine if certain types of schools had higher academic achievement. That study did not show any correlation between school type and academic achievement.

Vispi Karanjia explained that there are certain functions of the school that need to be taken into account such as the location of the library and cafeteria. Mr. Arnold said the SFB is looking to the architect community for an appropriate shape.

Carl Jordan said the most efficient building is one in with back-to-back classrooms with exterior entrances.

Bill Johnson of the Laveen District said the exterior perimeter is the same regardless of whether or not the corridors are exterior or interior as load bearing walls are about the same cost as exterior walls. He also said there would be the same amount of roofing.

b. Scott Thompson, Dysart Unified

Scott Thompson spoke to the single building design. Dysart Unified has built 13 SFB schools, all which have come in at budget.

He explained that Dysart uses a prototype and so they fall below average in the area of operation costs.

David Ortega asked if Dysart works to the formula then stretches the project. Mr. Thompson said the district has enough experience to get the project into the ballpark, then re-engineer if necessary.

John Arnold noted that staff is trying to meet with districts earlier in the process to identify elements that are more expensive.

Rick Carr asked if the use of a prototype is the explanation for the lower cost or if there are other reasons.

Don Brubaker explained there is some additional expense in two story buildings such as elevators and stairwell space.

c. Phil Swaim, Swaim & Associates

Phil Swaim spoke to the campus style design.

He explained the downfalls of interior corridors, which include significant wear and tear on the floors and walls, acoustics, and wasted space that could be better used for academic or vocational space.

Frank Davidson asked about areas of refuge. Mr. Swain explained that there could be safety hazards with interior corridors with all students exiting at the same place and doors swinging into the classroom as opposed to out.

Calvin Baker said when the Students FIRST legislation was passed, the state did not want to design schools. Now districts cannot build within the formula. All architects will have a different answer. He suggested resolving the issue legislatively. Brooks Keenan agreed that Mr. Baker had a good point, but there needs to be a way for the SFB to determine what additional costs are necessary. If the SFB needs to go over formula there has to be a way to do it equitably. Gregory Torrez agreed that if the SFB is going to put in additional money, he wants to understand why.

Scott Thompson said he thought the answer was in the schedule of values and knowing what the average of the various components are.

Bill Johnson explained that the board is simply trying to improve the process so there is a reasonable way to determine what is above the formula. He added that the number of buildings is not the only thing that increases the cost and the board needs to identify those issues.

Mr. Keenan said he wants to avoid districts having to redesign schools multiple times.

Dr. Davidson said he is a proponent of the campus style, but there are costs associated with it and the Board needs some type of uniform approach.

Cathy Rex said she was concerned that this becoming a micromanagement issue. She also added that contractors are part of the community and part of the solution. They may be putting in extra effort that the board does not see. She said the SFB needs to be a resource to the districts.

Dr. Davidson asked Ms. Rex to elaborate on the schedule of values being too late. She explained that the schedule of values needs to be done up front and not after a district has a contractor, the design, and the commitment with subs.

Mr. Thompson said the schedule of values gives you the targets to meet.

John Arnold said the program was not intended for the board to have to develop new construction design standards, but it is necessary as there is no other way to differentiate above formula costs. He explained that the State has a fiscal interest in these projects. As for the schedule of values and substituting that information for design guidance, he said the statute and lawsuits do not discuss average costs. They set a quality standard regardless of the cost.

He summarized the questions asked by the Board including: Identifying ways to reduce costs in campus plans; Identifying building styles over the last 5 years; and academic studies that have been done.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Brooks Keenan, adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:30 PM.

Approved by the School Facilities Board on _____, 2006

Chair