

Arapahoe-Holbrook Public School  
Board of Education – Regular Meeting  
School Library  
October 9th, 2017 7:00 pm

President Dennis Roskop called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

President Roskop announced that the Arapahoe-Holbrook Board of Education follows the rules of the Open Meetings Act which is posted.

The following members were present: Dan Warner, Chad Carpenter, Rod Whipple, Dennis Roskop, Brad Schutz, and Lisa Anderson.

The following member(s) were absent: None.

Also present was Dr. George Griffith, Superintendent, and Cassie Hilker, Board Secretary. Visitors were present.

A motion was made by Whipple and seconded by Carpenter to approve the agenda as presented. AYES: Carpenter, Whipple, Roskop, Schutz, Anderson, and Warner. Motion carried 6-0.

President Roskop welcomed the visitors and asked for Public Comment. The meeting was turned over to Jesse Volpp, Matt Schendt and Josh Albright of Hausmann Construction to present the amended Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP). Volpp stated that there are two noticeable changes to the GMP. The first is a typo on the cost of the wood flooring for the gym. The original GMP listed it at \$9.00 and it should have read \$90,460. The other significant item is the contingency fee. During the pre-bond efforts the contingency fee was 10% and has gone down as risk is removed. We negotiated and communicated with Derek Aldridge of Perry Law and the prior GMP listed the contingency fee at 2.50%. As we got further into our review process we felt there was more risk involved in the work that hasn't started than the 2.50%. There are a lot of items still outside of our control. For example, the first corridor we opened up there was an existing ceiling above a ceiling. This GMP increases that contingency fee to help offset some of those unknowns. The contingency is the District's money and if no money is spent all dollars are returned to the district. There is no additional risk to the District, it is a guaranteed maximum price on our part. We feel that a 3.50% contingency fee is valid. Schendt reiterated that it is the District's money and whatever is left is returned to the District. To be clear not a single penny is spent out of the contingency without approval from the board with architects chiming in as well. We are not spending it throughout the process and returning what is left at the end. If unforeseen items are encountered or changes occur, we bring it to the table and discuss it. If everyone agrees then an adjustment to the contingency fund is made. That 3.50% is your money but it is set there for usage throughout the project on items that were not anticipated. Griffith asked if the 2% fee had already been calculated. Volpp stated that it had not. A contingency item is not any different than a change order item or a change in scope. It will get priced out by the sub and then if there is supervision or other items that need included for that change it would be applied at that time. It would be a balance transfer in on a change by change basis. Volpp clarified that the contingency on the recap is below the line, meaning that the contingency is only applied to the cost of work. If there was anything that wasn't made in the adjustment, whether it be fee, bond, and insurance would all be part of that change. It's not already in the contingency item. Whipple asked about the 2% fee Griffith was talking about. Griffith stated that it is basically Hausmann's fee. Anderson stated that in the original contract it was called the OPR or overhead. Schendt confirmed that it was one in the same. Griffith stated that he did compare the signed GMP that was delivered to the one made for the board tonight and they are the same. Whipple stated that he sat in on several meetings coming up to the final approval of the GMP and now here we are amending it. He is curious why we even set a GMP. He hears them say that we aren't going to use any of that money unless we have to but let's go ahead and modify the GMP. He asked if they anticipate us going through this process again and what would be required to amend the GMP past this point. Volpp stated that anything after this point would be a change order or a contingency expenditure. An unforeseen would be out of the contingency and a betterment that the District would like to make would be a change order. Griffith stated that the legal side of it is that Hausmann never signed the GMP that was previously approved at a board meeting. We approved to sign it, but were waiting for it to be finalized. We actually approved any changes except on price. Warner stated that there was some discussion on the type of windows being put in and asked if that change was reflected in this GMP. Volpp responded that it was not. Warner asked if they chose to upgrade those windows if it would have to be done through a change order. Volpp confirmed that it would be a change order. Schutz recalled that at a previous committee meeting it was discussed that there were concerns about the type of window that would fit in the elementary. They talked about taking one out and ordering one to see how it would fit. He asked if that has been resolved. Griffith stated that it has not yet been resolved. Volpp stated that they have the materials on order and they are planning on doing one to see how it works. Schutz asked about the windows being ordered with a special film on them for safety. Griffith stated that his preference is to order the type of windows that have the film in the middle of the window. It is basically for security purposes. Schutz stated that we won't know the true cost until one is installed to see if it will work or not. Volpp stated that there are two sets of issues. The first is the effort they are making on the existing elementary wing to take one out

and see how a new one will go in. The second is pursuing a betterment in the glazing. Schutz asked when they could expect to know that cost. Warner agreed and would like to try to keep from changing the GMP every time or eliminating a contingency. Griffith stated that he has gotten submittals of the samples, but he has not gotten prices. He has requested it from Micheal Ripp of Clark Enersen. Volpp stated that they had given that cost information to Clark Enersen. It is a square foot cost on the materials; the installation cost would be the same. He thought it ranged from fairly insignificant cost to \$300,000 cost for the higher end security glazing. Albright stated that he received three tiers of pricing information. The lowest was a laminated glass, the middle was a security laminated glass and the third tier was actual security glazing. The last tier was the most costly and is purposely made to keep people from going through the windows. The first and second tiers cost significantly less than the \$300,000 of the third tier. Warner stated that it would take us from \$10.84 million to \$11.1 million roughly. Griffith stated that if the windows are upgraded it would be through a change order. He expressed the desire for more secure windows with Clark Enersen when they were going to initially bid it out. Volpp stated that there was also an allowance in the very first GMP for acoustical enhancements in the existing gym and that was removed per Derek's recommendation and suggested to go through as a change order. Roskop stated there is also a difference of \$20,000 due to an air barrier scope gap and asked that to be explained. Volpp stated that the system on the elementary wing has metal studs and it has a spray thermal insulation which has an integral air barrier. This is not uncommon but is not a traditional system. The line item for that bid tab was about \$30,000 under budget. That system goes so far but at the windows it needs a traditional air barrier to wrap the windows. Only the spray thermal with air barrier was on the bid tab and did not include the conventional air barrier or detail out the windows. Roskop asked if that was something that was outside of what the original architecture was and now needs to be changed and increased in this GMP. Volpp agreed. Anderson asked if any of the contingency has been used up until this point. Volpp confirmed that nothing has been used. Schutz asked if there were any outstanding bids. Volpp stated that everything has been bid out. There are a couple of scopes that have been bid but not awarded for various reasons. One is the gym floor. Schutz asked if they could give a ballpark cost on the acoustical enhancements for the existing gym. Volpp stated that it would depend a lot on the enhancements they would like to make. He believes that \$50,000-\$60,000 would go a long way in that space. Griffith asked if the \$65,000 had been removed for lawn maintenance. Volpp confirmed that it had been removed. Griffith stated that they can get the lawn maintenance and fertilizer a lot cheaper locally. He also checked and it will not void any warranties. Roskop asked if there was any other public comment. Tammie Middagh stated that Demoine Adams was out and spoke with senior Teamates and their parents about scholarship opportunities. Roskop thanked Middagh for the updated and all of the work she does with the Teammates program for the school.

## REPORTS

Griffith stated that Braithwait is supervising the football game and he will be reporting on his behalf. He reported that Homecoming went well. We had nice comments from the DJ on how our kids acted and participated. Health screenings are taking place this week and next week. Parent Teacher Conferences were very well attended with 78% in the elementary and 74% in the junior high/high school. Teacher evaluations are taking place now. All of the first year staff have been evaluated. The ESU 11 Fall Conference went well on Monday. We are hosting cross country districts this Thursday. As always, John Paulsen has everything organized and ready to go. Fall Break is October 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup>. Before the next board meeting we will be into football playoffs and volleyball districts.

Dr. Griffith reported that the auditor was out in September and we are awaiting the report. There are some procedure changes that will need to take place moving forward to meet IRS regulations. The ReVision (Career Technical Education) meeting is set for October 16<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm in the basement of the United Methodist Church. If any board member wishes to attend please let me know so we can have a count for lunch. There will be a community meeting for this process later this semester that will be to receive input from business leaders and community members. Work continues on the foundation but the laying of block that was to be completed on October 6<sup>th</sup> has been delayed due to rain. We are hoping for some good weather the next few weeks. I will be attending a two-day training in early November on Maximizing Educator Effectiveness through ESU 11 and it is presented in line with the Danielsen Evaluation Model. The goal is to make our evaluations more effective and less cumbersome.

Board Member Reports: None.

Board Committee Reports: Griffith stated that the minutes from the committee meetings are in each board members packet. A finance committee meeting was held prior to tonight's meeting and those are not included. Schutz asked if a decision was made during the technology committee on the computer lease. Roskop stated that a decision was not made. The computer lease is up in April. We have asked for them to get us some numbers. We are also looking at setting up a meeting with staff and the technology committee to get feedback from them on the possibility of expanding the one-to-one through the elementary. Get information on how they would use that technology and how it would benefit them. We did discuss purchasing the computers from the lease for \$1 each to get us through the rest of the year. We are not anticipating an increase in the cost, but won't know until we get the numbers. Whipple stated that they talked about iPads in the elementary and what technology would be useful and how they would integrate it if it was provided. Schutz asked how many computers are available in the elementary. Griffith stated that there are three carts in the elementary.

Roskop stated that to the best of his knowledge those computers are some that were purchased from the last lease. The biggest item is determining how they would be used. Roskop also reported that the Finance Committee met prior to this meeting. They reviewed the beginning of year budget information. Some taxes were received. One thing that is different with the claims is that some are shown in triplicate. The expenses are now being broken down by preschool, elementary and junior high/high school. Griffith stated that it is a federal requirement. Schutz asked Carpenter's opinion on the 14A and 14B bus. Carpenter stated that he hasn't seen those buses much, the one they would like to do something different with is the 2003 bus. Schutz asked what happens if the 2003 bus goes down. Carpenter stated that there is still a backup bus that can be used, but the problem we could run into is if something else is scheduled that needs a big bus. That is where we are hoping that the suburbans could potentially come in and help out. Griffith stated that they also need to look at the routes.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

A motion was made by Whipple and seconded by Anderson to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, which included minutes from previous meetings and financial reports. AYES: Whipple, Roskop, Schutz, Anderson, Warner, and Carpenter. Motion carried 6-0.

A motion was made by Schutz and seconded by Whipple to approve claims including the General Fund, Lunch Fund, and Building Fund totaling \$398,593.54. AYES: Roskop, Schutz but abstaining from claim number 29148 to the Arapahoe Public Mirror for \$988.08, Anderson, Warner, Carpenter but abstaining from claim number 29127 and claim number 29190 to W & J Carpenter – Repair for \$95.00 and \$560.11, and Whipple but abstaining from claim number 29145 to Applied Communications Technology for \$110.00 and claim number 29151 to ATC for \$350.73. Motion carried 6-0.

Griffith stated that he does have a signed copy by Hausmann of the amended GMP and it is the same as the one in the board packet. Whipple asked if we are looking to approve this and then the change to the windows would need to be done with a change order. Griffith stated that they are getting samples and cost information. One of the big topics when talking about the project with the public was security. He is still investigating. Warner stated that they are running out of room, unless things come in cheaper. Griffith stated that his goal is to go with the middle option if it is significantly lower. Whipple asked if it would be a change order regardless of the approval of the amended GMP. Griffith stated that it would be a change order because it wasn't included in the original bid. Roskop re-stated the changes to the GMP. A motion was made by Whipple and seconded by Carpenter to approve the amended GMP. AYES: Schutz, Anderson, Warner, Carpenter, Whipple, and Roskop. Motion carried 6-0.

Griffith stated that there is a September request for \$449,333.77 and an October request for \$485,064.00. Schutz asked if these were payment requests based on satisfactory work that has been performed. Griffith agreed and stated that they are also signed off by the architects. A motion was made by Warner and seconded by Anderson to approve payment applications 002 and 003 to Hausmann Construction. AYES: Anderson, Warner, Carpenter, Whipple, Roskop, and Schutz. Motion carried 6-0.

Griffith stated that the payment request from Midwest Restaurant Supply is for the new salad bar. The claim is for \$12,879.00. Warner asked if we take possession of the equipment immediately. Griffith stated that we already have the equipment and have been using it. Warner asked when we started using it. Griffith stated that we have had it since the beginning of the year and started using it when a refrigerator malfunctioned. A motion was made by Warner and seconded by Whipple to approve the payment to Midwest Restaurant Supply. AYES: Warner, Carpenter, Whipple, Roskop, Schutz, and Anderson. Motion carried 6-0.

Griffith stated that he received only one bid for the suburbans and it was from Faws. The cost per suburban in the bid is \$44,886.05 and meets the specifications in the bid. That includes a \$7,100 fleet discount and \$1,000 profit. With the fleet incentive the cost is a little less than the 2017 model. We are purchasing 2018 models. Carpenter asked if we had the money to make the purchase. Griffith stated that \$100,000 was transferred at the end of the fiscal year for this purchase. Warner asked if there are any routes that these suburbans can be used to replace a midbus. Griffith stated that after we have the discussion on the routes they could be used for sure next year if not this year. It could also eliminate some of the mud route issues. Warner stated that we have had a lot of storm routes called already this year and we are through the nicest part of the year. A motion was made by Carpenter and seconded by Warner to approve the purchase of two 2018 suburbans at a cost of \$44,886.05 each. AYES: Carpenter, Whipple, Roskop, Schutz, Anderson, and Warner. Motion carried 6-0.

Griffith stated that the foundation would like to sell bricks from the existing high school as a fundraiser. They would clean them up and put a plaque on them or have them etched. They would like to know if that is something that would be acceptable now so they could start some pre-selling knowing they won't be available until the spring of 2019. They have had some added operating costs to keep their 403c certification and the fundraiser would be helpful. Whipple asked how that would work with demolition. Griffith stated that they would have to have the bricks moved to a pile somewhere and

then the foundation would have to retrieve them and clean them up. Warner asked if this would be any cost to the District and if there are any liability concerns. Griffith stated that there would be no cost to the district and if there would happen to be a claim it would be a cost of the \$500 deductible. Warner wondered if it would be cheaper to purchase an extra pallet of new brick. Griffith stated that the idea is that people may want a piece of the school they attended. Warner did not disagree. Griffith stated that there are other districts doing the same thing. Mr. Koller had one and brought it in for Griffith to see. Griffith thought if they can get something out of it at no cost to us, it would be a good thing since they issue a lot of grants and scholarships. Roskop asked about the contract with the demolition company. Volpp stated that the contract has not yet been executed, but it has been awarded to Leising Construction. They have disposal and there are some salvage rights for the fume hoods and other fixed equipment that is being transferred to the new school. He recommended coordinating with Leising Construction. Schendt asked if they were talking about getting 100 brick or what amount. Griffith did not know the quantity. Schendt thought it would be a pretty easy coordination with Leising Construction. They would probably set a bucket load off to the side and the foundation could retrieve it. Schutz asked if it was going to be limited only to the foundation so there aren't other requests. Griffith agreed that it needs to be limited to the foundation. Schutz stated that if another entity wants brick, they will have to go through the foundation to purchase it. Whipple asked if the art class would be interested in building something with the brick. Griffith stated that the foundation did discuss something like that as a possibility. He is sure coordination could be made between the art class and the foundation to come up with something. Roskop stated that he thought it would be a good deal, but he doesn't want to get into any battles over something as small as a brick. Schutz wondered if they should only donate a certain amount and then auction the rest off through the foundation. Griffith stated that the brick Mr. Koller brought in cost \$5.00 plus \$1.00 to put the plate on. A motion was made by Warner and seconded by Whipple to approve the donation of brick from the existing high school to the Arapahoe-Holbrook Foundation. AYES: Whipple, Roskop, Schutz, Anderson, Warner, and Carpenter. Motion carried 6-0.

Carpenter asked how many students would be attending the National FFA Convention. Warner stated that he thought Mr. Kuntz told him 8 students. Roskop stated that in the past he has appreciated a representative of the group presenting the request to the board. Griffith stated that was his fault. Mr. Kuntz asked him and he told him he would take care of it. Roskop stated that it doesn't need to be the advisor, but he would appreciate a member or members of the group making the request. It doesn't have any effect on whether we should or should not do it, but it is appreciated. They are representing our school. Griffith will remember that in the future. A motion was made by Anderson and seconded by Carpenter to approve per diem funds for the FFA students attending the National FFA Convention. Schutz asked what the cost is per student. Griffith stated it is \$35.00 per day per student. He thought the breakdown was \$7.00 for breakfast, \$12.00 for lunch and the remaining amount for dinner. Whipple asked where the convention will be held. Griffith stated that it is in Indianapolis. Warner asked if they were driving. Griffith confirmed that they are driving. AYES: Roskop, Schutz, Anderson, Warner, Carpenter, and Whipple. Motion carried 6-0.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Public Comment – None.

Griffith stated that Schutz asked him to add the beef to school program to the agenda. He also provided a handout. Schutz knows it has been talked about in the past and he knows Griffith has a lot going on and wondered if forming a committee would be a good idea to get something started. Anderson has thought about it too and thought a good committee would include a member of the kitchen staff, the FFA instructor, a couple area cattlemen and a couple students. Schutz thought about the FFA to and wondered if it could be incorporated in the curriculum somehow. Warner stated that he has visited with Mr. Kuntz and there is a desire to do something. Once he gets on board and they get the farm back on board, it could be a project that the FFA does in terms of raising beef for the school. He stated that Mr. Kuntz has a great deal of interest in that. Warner thinks the first hurdle and the biggest one is determining if the kitchen staff is on board and willing. He thinks they are and there are guidelines that we will all have to go through. He likes the idea of a committee to move forward and research what can be done. Schutz thought a committee would be good since Griffith has so much to do. Griffith stated that he would work with the committee as well. Schutz thought Anderson's recommendation of committee members was good. He just brought it back up to see if it was something the board wanted to pursue. Anderson stated that she thought most area schools are trying it. Warner and Anderson thought they are behind a bit, but they have had a few things on their plate. Warner stated that it is feasible and something that can be done. It's a good way for our community or our Ag program to take pride and ownership within our lunch program. Roskop asked how they wanted to move forward setting up the committee. Anderson, Schutz and Warner agreed to help. Griffith will visit with some people and get something set up. Warner stated that the target date for implementation would be the beginning of next school year anyway, so there is time. Whipple stated that there was a good break-out session at the State Conference last year.

A motion was made by Roskop and seconded by Whipple to enter into executive session at 8:06 pm for the purpose of negotiations. AYES: Schutz, Anderson, Warner, Carpenter, Whipple, and Roskop. Motion carried 6-0.

A motion was made by Whipple and seconded by Carpenter to exit executive session at 8:31 pm.

Roskop stated that they discussed negotiations and setting up time schedules to start primary meetings with certified staff.

Griffith stated that they currently make quite a few accommodations with bus routes for various situations and some aren't able to be done anymore due to full buses. Another item to discuss is house to house drop off and pick up in town. Griffith is wondering if we need to look into pick up and drop off sites instead of house to house in town. A possibility would be sites on the east and west side of town south of the highway in town. This would keep students from crossing any major highways for safety reasons. This would also apply to Edison and Holbrook. Currently, there are some requests that require extended travel due to split families which includes going out of district. His thoughts are to establish pick up and drop off sites in Arapahoe, Holbrook and Edison and then use the suburbans for the rural routes. It is not something that we will probably be able to implement this year, but it is something that he would like the transportation committee to get together and discuss. Another issue is getting bus drivers and substitute drivers when our drivers are gone, cost of fuel and other items. Whipple asked if there could be any backlash from doing this. Griffith agreed that there could be. Roskop stated that there used to be drop off and pick up sites. He recommended going back through the preschool policy. He thought that is when the change was made. He feels it is now expanded beyond the preschool. He thinks we need to go back to what is in the policy. The transportation and superintendent need to go back to what we have. He feels that flexibility was given to transportation and the superintendent. The prior superintendent was all in favor of going out of district because he wanted every student he could get and that was funding the transportation costs associated with the extra travel. But, there comes a point where we don't want to be driving across the state to get a kid. He feels it was left up to staff to determine what that figure is and how far we want to go. Griffith stated that he is not opposed to establishing a site in Beaver City. Roskop feels they have done as much as they could and have been bending over backwards and we may need to pull that back in a bit. Warner agreed and stated that they need to look at common sense and what is financially prudent and what our obligations are. Roskop recommended reviewing the preschool policy because he felt that is where the individual delivery has been pushed. Griffith will look into that and special ed requirements and may come up with a hybrid policy. He will set up a time to meet with the transportation committee to discuss this further.

Roskop and Griffith presented the first reading of Policy 4135, Expense Allowance. Griffith stated that one of the changes is increasing the per diem amount from \$35 per day to \$40 per day, \$10 for breakfast, \$13 for lunch and \$17 for supper.

OAC Meeting, Thursday, October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017 at 1:00 pm in the Hausmann Trailer.

Regular Board Meeting, Monday, November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017 at 7:00 pm in the Arapahoe-Holbrook Public School Library.

NASB State Conference, November 16-18, 2017 at the La Vista Conference Center / Embassy Suites. Please let Cassie or Dr. Griffith know as soon as possible if you plan to attend.

A motion was made by Whipple and seconded by Anderson to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 pm.

---

Respectfully submitted,  
Cassie Hilker, Board Secretary