

value situation. We will evaluate on what is the best value. The intent is to get this RFP issued by next Monday and, recognizing this is over a two-week holiday, many of our businesses are not going to be available and will be concerned. We will have a prebid meeting scheduled for January 6th. We may see some issues that will cause us to change the end date after that meeting. Jeff Friedman asked about having enough time to have a clean proposal to save the number of change orders later. Ray Amsden replied that it should be adequate.

John Steiner asked if a percent contingency can be added to the proposal if it is later realized that something was left out of the specs. Ms. Comeau commented that it would not look good to the public. If the RFP is approved to go out and our estimate is erroneous, the Administration would ask for a special board meeting to discuss the issue before going to the Assembly. Ray Amsden added that we establish a threshold dollar figure to that. Mr. Steiner stated that it is not inconceivable that we might see it down the line. Ms. Comeau stated that her concern is that we are going to be very conservative and even use the furniture from the current administration building. If the cost is more, we would have to go without certain things. Ray Amsden assured Mr. Steiner that we will hold back contingency funds and have a very minimal furnishings/equipment budget. We will have a small contingency to take care of those issues that come up.

Tim Steele agreed with Ms. Comeau and stated that we have passed a figure, and we have credibility with the public. We should go with the \$30,000,000 figure and what that buys. Hopefully what will be offered will have some capability to expand.

Jake Metcalfe asked Mr. Amsden to explain best value. Ray Amsden replied that we are asking for spaces like Kmart and also opportunities for people who have land. You could see the price of a new building would be higher, but it could fit our needs better. Whereas, a Kmart might be cheaper but does not meet our needs. Mike Price explained the information we provide - general design philosophy, amount of space needed, things that are important in relationship to site, efficiencies of the public interacting with the district, specifics that describe the standard of quality of the design and the materials involved. Site location is worth 0-10 points; mechanical/electrical, long-term usage costs, make up the technical qualifications of the proposal. We try to make it as specific as possible.

Carol Comeau added that we do not have a preconceived notion on what we want. We are not wedded to one thing or another. We want

something that will be efficient and work for our employees and the public.

The Board members strongly suggested that the evaluation committee consist of business leaders and members of the public as well as ASD employees. Mr. Amsden assured the Board members that members of the community would be part of the evaluation committee.

VOTE:

Ayes: Marks, Kennedy, Steele,
Metcalf, Friedman,
Steiner, Roberts

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

D. EXECUTIVE SESSION - (PERSONNEL, FINANCE, NEGOTIATIONS, LITIGATION)

ACTION:

Moved by Jeff Friedman
seconded by Mary Marks

to recess to Executive Session for the Superintendent's evaluation.

Motion was unanimously approved with no objection.

Tape #12/15/03-2-6 The School Board recessed to Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of the Superintendent's evaluation.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The Special Meeting of December 15, 2003, was adjourned by unanimous consent, at 4:30 p.m.

Jake Metcalfe, President

Mary Marks, Clerk

Robin Siegfried, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approved