

BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Tuesday, May 3, 2011
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

SERNA Center, Indiana Room
5735 4th Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95824

Bond Oversight Committee Members Present:

- o Q- Bob asked if DSA was infamously slow in their approvals?
A- Paul answered that they have been hit with same money and staffing shortfalls as everyone else, and yes they are behind, but District Reps as well as consultants have been in communication with DSA to help them with any concerns along the way.
- x Increment III- Paul explained the components in Increment III, and said they included primarily the sound wall. Paul noted that during the planning stages he had met with reps from the adjacent mobile home community, and then explained to the BOC how the wall component was added and how it would be constructed.
 - o Q- Alex asked about the history of sound wall?
A- Paul explained that an EIR (Environmental Impact Report) process had been implemented and that during that process the mobile home community had issues with the new construction. To appease their concerns it was agreed that a sound wall would be constructed.
- x Paul invited the BOC members out to the site for regularly scheduled construction meeting which take place once a week on Thursdays.
 - o Q- Alex asked if the construction on the classroom building had begun?
A- Paul explained that it had begun.
- x Paul then continued on informing the BOC members about the status of Phase II & III of the LBHS Sports Complex Project. He noted that at this time those phases were on hold pending future funding. Paul explained that the District was tracking some funding through Prop 84, which was approximately about \$5 million, and that application would be submitted sometime in July.
 - o Q- Alex asked about the storm drains in the field, and who decides how big they become?
A- Paul explained that the civil engineers decide, and they base that on calcs of the project/
 - o Q- Bob asked if that was reviewed by the city?
A- Paul answered that yes it was, and that OC Jones completes all work in compliance with city and state standards.
- x Paul then went through the LBHS project timelines handout, and showed the BOC members the weather impact schedule, as well as the recovery schedule. All this was explained to show that the project timelines are being met.
 - o Q- Adolfo asked, whether or not the handover date gave enough cushion for the school to actually use the field in the fall?
A- Paul answered, yes and explained that the LBHS football team would be able to use the field before the actual construction completion and handover date.
 - o Q- Bob asked what type of fencing was going to be used on the Florin Rd. side?
A- Paul answered that wrought iron fencing was to be used.

III. Quarterly Reports- (The Met):

- x Paul went through and discussed the project progress report, and explained to the BOC members that the contract with Turner Construction was due to go to the Board on 5/4/11. He also, explained the transitional plan of the MET program for their fall semester, as construction would still be going on at the 8th & V campus. Paul explained that the MET program would be temporarily housed at Sac HS, until construction was completed in December or January.

- o Q- Alex asked if Allen Young, Principal of the MET, was ok with the kids moving to Sac HS?
A- Paul answered that yes the transition had been approved by Allen.
- o Q- Alex continued in the same line of questioning, and asked if there was good communication with MET parents and community members.
A- Paul answered that yes there was.
- x Paul then explained to the BOC members about how the project funding was going to be obtained, and he stated that there would be a combination of state and district matching funds to include a High Performance Grant that would be issued by the state. Paul also explained that the MET project would be CHPS and LEED certified, as well as a USGBC certified project.
 - o Q- Alex asked whether or not the parking problem was going to be eliminated as a result of the new design?
A- Paul answered that the parking would be expanded, but that it would still be limited. Paul also explained that there would alternative transportation support areas, ie- bike racks.
 - o Q- Adolfo asked if the MET interim housing at Sac HS was going to be done in a way that would protect bond dollars?
A- Paul explained that the new facilities will be minimally updated, to include paint, carpet, and wifi, but costs would kept at a minimum.
 - o Q- Adolfo also asked, if the students would be in a secluded space or would they have access to the entire campus?
A- Paul explained that the details of site usage had not been ironed out, but that he would report back to BOC on the issue.

IV. Quarterly Reports- (LDV, Leonardo Da Vinci, Parking Lot Project):

- x Paul explained to the BOC members the details regarding the LDV Project. He described the scope of the project and necessity for construction, as well as the schedule. Paul also noted that the contractor selected gave a bid that was considerably below the planned construction cost estimates.
 - o Q- Bob asked what the expected life span of the project was?
A- Paul answered that the new sections of the parking lot would have an 8-10 year, but that the life span was dependent on the traffic at the site.
 - o Q- Adolfo asked who the contractor was?
A- Paul answered that David Engineering was the low bidder on the project.
- x Paul then went on to explain to the BOC members that upcoming parking lot projects were in the planning phases and they included Bowling Green, and JFK HS. They had not been approved by DSA.
 - o Q- Carol asked if green techniques were being used in these projects, or being looked at for future projects, like pervious concrete installation?
A- Paul answered that yes, green sustainable planning was taking place on these projects, but specifically for the LDV project, you would not want pervious concrete because of the soil composition, but he did go on to say that other energy saving techniques and sustainability efforts were being examined.

V. BOND FUNDING Update:

x

that staff recommendations for reallocation of the remaining Bond Funds had been mostly approved by the Board. The Bond Fund Reallocation handout was given to