



BEX Oversight Committee

February 10, 2017, 8:30 -10:30 am
 Conference Room 2750, John Stanford Center
 2445 3rd Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98134

Minutes:

1. Call to order: Chair John Palewicz called the meeting to order at 8:33 am. The change in agenda to move Lessons Learned Projects Opening Fall 2016 until after the BEX V Presentation was approved.

Committee Attendees:	Present	Absent	Staff	Present	Absent
Fong, Freeman	X		Bath, Chris	X	
Goldblatt, Steve	X		Becker, Eric	X	
Williams, Daniel	X		Best, Richard	X	
Griffin, Duncan	X		Coan, Melissa	X	
Palewicz, John	X		Herndon, Flip	X	
Prentke, Richard	X		Kennedy, Mike		X
Schwartz, Ed	X		Kokx, Sherri	X	
Stephenson, Robert		X	Mardock, Allen	X	
Tatge, Steve	X		McBee, Mike	X	
			Moore, Steve		X
Board Attendees:			Morello, Lucy	X	
Rick Burke	X		Skutack, Mike	X	
Jill Geary					

2. Approval of Minutes (John Palewicz)
 - The January 13, 2017 minutes were approved unanimously.
 - Guests of the BEX Oversight Committee meeting introduced themselves.
 - The City of Seattle’s Master Use Permit (MUP) approval process was briefly discussed. An added benefit from the ruling exempting the University of Washington from City of Seattle landmark purview is that it also caused the City of Seattle to review and revise their MUP process. Depending on the City’s interpretation, a major institution can fall into a different process, which could possibly have a positive result for Seattle schools. Mr. Best will be following up on this topic.

3. Budget Update (Melissa Coan)
 - The *BEX IV Program Cost Summary –January 2017 (Activity through December 31, 2016)* was reviewed.
 - Richard Best reviewed the “Budget Pressures” document. Shaded items are resolved and the unshaded have not been resolved.
 - The committee expressed concern that the BEX IV program contingency appears 75% spent, while SPS has only expended 50% of the BEX IV program funds. Mr. Best acknowledged concerns noting that additional funds from BTA IV (\$100M from BTA IV) placed in BEX IV program budget are skewing the BEX IV expended percentage. He noted that BTA IV also has a program contingency of approximately \$30M. He indicated that he is carefully tracking expenditures every month with Capital Projects Accounting personnel and has recently brought Senior Project Managers into that conversation to confirm project expenditures and better project forecasts.

4. Project Status Reports/Board Item Reviews (Richard Best)
 - Project pictures, renderings and data are available on the BEX IV website: [BEX IV Reports](#)
 - Cascadia and Olympic Hills Elementary School and Meany and Robert Eagle Staff Middle School projects were reviewed.

5. Lessons Learned Projects Opening Fall 2016 (Senior Project Managers)
 - This topic was moved to the March BEX Oversight Committee meeting.

6. Status of BEX V Planning (All)
 - A presentation of the status of the BEX V Master Plan was shown and discussed.
 - The SPS team contributing to this plan involved staff from Enrollment Planning, Teaching & Learning, Capital Projects & Planning and Facility Operations. The Bassetti design team involved participants, Lorne McConachie, Michael Davis, Amanda Clausen and James Moehring, with consultant team consisting of Cheri Hendricks (Broadview Associates), Charlie Palmer (AHBL Engineering), Bruce Guenzler (Associated Earth Sciences), Craig Stauffer (PCS Structural Solutions), Josh Robishon (Metrix Engineers) and Fred Long (Tres West Engineers).
 - Schools selected were determined by facilities assessment provided by Meng Analysis. The facilities in the worst condition were brought forward for master plan consideration. Selected schools were reviewed with Enrollment Planning to confirm that they also addressed capacity needs. Bassetti Architects did not have input of which schools were selected. There are also three projects “yet to be determined” to allow consideration should a surprise develop as it relates to capacity or Board or public concerns. A year is being allowed for master planning process, and then an additional year allowed for the programmatic environmental impact statement.
 - Projects were considered by type, i.e., elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, etc.
 - Considerations include neighborhood context; site size as relates to the number of students in each school; programmatic adjacencies; technical standards; and green resolution. From facilities perspective, building standards and mechanical

systems were included. Land use and zoning issues are being identified and will be reviewed with the City.

- Mr. Best stated this is an initial conversation with and is well before any final presentations/recommendations.
 - A committee member suggested that departures be a consistent part in discussion with the city, i.e., building a portable will have an impact on the parking capacity.
 - One problem, pointed out by a senior project manager, is that the previous BEX estimates did not necessarily allow adequately for the costs specific to each site.
 - There was concern expressed that the architects working on the future projects would be limited in what they are able to do. Michael Davis responded that there is room for architect planning. There will be SDAT teams, which influence plans within the requirements of the educational specs.
 - In response to the question about implementations of a pathway to net zero, it was stated that both options are being priced out. Capacity needs and facility needs will be balanced into the equation.
 - The committee felt this was the best timely preparation by SPS for the BEX levy.
 - It was recommended by one member that layouts of the buildings be looked at in a radically different way, the layout of the buildings, allowing for passive design. Showing a relatively simple passive designed layout would be more helpful to future architects.
 - Dr. Herndon stated that site and building conditions are considered in the light of how they meet the program needs of the students. What the neighborhood, students and staff want must not be lost. The function of the building serves the needs of the students. Sometimes the orientation of the building passively is not possible, sometimes it is. He noted that the primary function of the building is to facilitate the education of the students.
 - It was recommended that the passive design orientation be illustrated for consideration. Develop what is wanted, then show what doesn't work.
 - It was agreed that guidance for the architects would help bring what is wanted.
 - It was also mentioned by staff that looking at what the needs are and landing at an appropriate project budget is essential. There needs to be adequate money to cover the project if a passive building is integrated into the project.
 - It was also recommended to staff that it is important to confirm there are goals that are clearly understood so there are not things layered on in the future causing things to go sideways.
7. Meeting Re-cap and Next Meeting Agenda Items (John Palewicz)
- Lessons Learned Projects Opening Fall 2016 (Senior Project Managers).
8. Adjournment
- The meeting adjourned at 10:30