



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
Wednesday, November 16, 2016

**Special Board Meeting – 5:30 pm**

**Conference Room ABC**  
**Redmond School District Office**

145 SE Salmon Drive  
Redmond, OR 97756  
Telephone: 541.923.5437  
[www.redmondschools.org](http://www.redmondschools.org)

**Redmond School Board Members**

Rick Bailey    Shawn Hartfield    Travis Bennett  
Tim Carpenter    Johnny Corbin

**OUR VISION:** A relentless commitment to academic achievement and personal growth for every student.

**OUR MISSION:** A commitment to rigorous and relevant instruction which leads to mastery and the development of productive citizens.

**\*CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:** Redmond School District (RSD) 2J welcomes public participation at school board meetings. Individuals who wish to comment will be given an opportunity to do so at the beginning of each meeting. Please put your name and topic on the sign in sheet provided at the meeting. Because time available is limited, there is a three minute time limit placed on each person who wishes to speak. If you have a group attending regarding the same topic, you will need to appoint one speaker. The Chair has authority to keep order and to impose any reasonable restrictions necessary to conduct an efficient meeting. The Board reserves the right to delay discussion on any item presented until later in the meeting or at a subsequent meeting. Objective criticism of operations and programs will be heard, but not complaints concerning specific personnel. The visitor will be directed to the appropriate means for filing complaints involving school district employees. Thank you.

**AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT:** Please contact Gina Blanchette at the district office at 541-923-8250 if you need accommodation to participate. Please telephone at least three days prior to the scheduled meeting date. Thank you

## AGENDA

### **SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

(Estimated Times)

### **PROCEDURAL ITEMS**

5:30 pm Call to Order, Establish Quorum, Welcome to Guests and Visitors, Flag Salute Rick Bailey  
5:31 pm Corrections, Additions, Deletions and Questions Regarding the Regular Agenda

### **LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD**

5:32 pm Evaluation of Hartman School Remodel Project (pages 1-2) Jerry Milstead

### **PRESENTATIONS**

5:42 pm Parent Advisory Committee Kelly Jenkins

5:55 pm Board Self Evaluation Steve Kelley,  
OSBA

8:00 pm Adjourn

### Upcoming Schedule

Date	Meeting	Time	Location
December 14, 2016	Board Meeting	5:30 pm	District Office, Conf Rm ABC
January 11, 2017	Work Session	5:30 pm	District Office, Conf Rm ABC
January 25, 2017	Board Meeting	5:30 pm	District Office, Conf Rm ABC
February 8, 2017	Board Meeting	5:30 pm	District Office, Conf Rm ABC

## EVALUATION OF HARTMAN SCHOOL REMODEL PROJECT

Oregon Revised Statutes 297C.335 requires that all projects not contracted by competitive bidding must, upon completion of the project and final payment, have an evaluation submitted to the local contract review board; the local contract review board for Redmond School District is its Board of Directors. The Remodel of the Hartman School to house the Redmond Early Learning Center was accomplished using the CM/GC method of contracting and not competitive bidding. The following is the evaluation of the project covering the various subjects required by the Statutes:

**1. The actual project cost as compared with the original project estimates.**

The original project was budgeted for \$1,100,000 and was revised to \$1,176,200. The final project cost is \$1,138,038

**2. The amount of any guaranteed maximum price. (GMP)**

The original GMP for the remodel of the school was \$800,266.

**3. The number of project change orders issued by the contracting agency.**

There was one change order written during the course of construction for a total of \$30,751. This change order brought the total GMP to \$831,017. At project close out the Contractor issued a credit of \$5,008.80 resulting in a final GMP of \$826,008.20.

**4. A narrative description of successes and failures during the design, engineering and construction of the project.**

There were several design suggestions from the Construction Manager (CM) during the design process that resulted in savings; one included changes to the original structural system that supported the "Clouds", which are large wooden structures, that are suspended from ceiling of the main corridor. The CM suggested that we use "airplane" cables attached to the walls in order to stabilize these structures in lieu of unistrut. This made the structures easier to construct, install and less obtrusive than the original solution. The building was ready for students by the first day of school in September.

**5. An objective assessment of the use of the alternative contracting process as compared to the findings required by ORS 279C.335.**

The requirements of ORS 279C.335 at the time the "Findings" for the Renovation of the Hartman School were approved required two primary findings as follows:

- **The process will not substantially diminish competition or encourage favoritism.**
- **The District should anticipate substantial cost savings.**

In response to the first item, the District developed a Request for Proposal and advertised in the Daily Journal of Commerce (a "Publication with State wide circulation) as required by Statute. Only one General Contractors responded to the RFP, Griffin Construction of Prineville, and it was determined that they were qualified and had the construction experience to perform the work. The results of the RFP were available for public review and the process was in accordance with the District's Model Contract Rules.

In response to the second bulleted item, it is the opinion of the writer that there were cost savings as a direct result of the selected construction delivery method. This method allowed the CM to work with the architect and owner's staff to maximize the existing systems such as repurposing existing casework in lieu of new; working with District IT personnel and the low voltage sub-contractor to upgrade the data system and purchase and install the security camera system; also, the CM worked with the District's custodial personnel to provide final cleaning of the building. This type of cooperation is not possible with a Design-Bid-Build type contract Another indication is the final cost of the Project; various improvements were provided in approximately 40,000 sq ft of the building resulting in a cost of \$20.65 per sq.ft. The project was completed on time with students in class as scheduled.