

**CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE BOARD
MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 29, 2010 MEETING**

**Meeting held at:
Colorado Association of School Boards
1200 Grant Street, Denver, CO 80203
Longs Peak Board Room
Friday, October 29, 2010**

I. Call to Order

- 8:55 a.m. Norwood Robb called the meeting to order.

Attendees

Mary Wickersham – CCAB Chair	Erica Weston– CCAB Legal Advisor
Norwood Robb – CCAB Vice-Chair	Vody Herrmann – Staff (CDE)
Mike Maloney – CCAB Secretary	Ted Hughes – Staff (CDE)
Lyndon Burnett – CCAB	Kristin Lortie – Staff (CDE)
Pete Jefferson – CCAB	Kevin Huber – Staff (CDE)
Dave Van Sant – CCAB	Scott Newell – Staff (CDE)
Adele Willson – CCAB	Jay Hoskinson – Staff (CDE)
Tom Stone – CCAB	Dustin Guerin – Staff (CDE)
Greg Randall – CCAB	

- The CCAB Vice-Chair gave a brief housekeeping update and discussed the process for work session meeting. The CCAB Vice-Chair noted there would be a time for general public comments and time allotted at the beginning of each discussion topic for the public to speak.
- Ted Hughes introduced Jay Hoskinson, the Division’s newest CDE staff member, to the CCAB. Ted Hughes told the CCAB Jay Hoskinson is a licensed architect who has experience working with public schools. Ted Hughes mentioned Jay will be working with the northeast part of the state, and said Jay has completed multiple site visits since joining the BEST program.
- Agenda reviewed
- The CCAB Vice-Chair requested to add an action item to the agenda; a motion to provide additional money from the Assistance Fund for the current ALTA and ESA surveys being completed for the FY2010-11 Lease-Purchase projects.
- CCAB Vice-Chair asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended;
 - So moved by Dave Van Sant;
 - Lyndon Burnett 2nd the motion;
 - No further discussion;
 - Motion to approve the agenda as amended carried.

- Minutes reviewed
- A CCAB member asked to amend the minutes and clarify two points from the previous meeting from the Board Report section. The minutes said, “A CCAB member mentioned how he visited schools in the Valley School District”. The minutes were revised to say, “visited schools in the *San Luis Valley*”. The board member also asked to change, “for being one of the top ten school districts, was changed to, “for being one of the *one-hundred largest* school districts”
- CCAB Vice-Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September CCAB meeting as amended;
 - So moved by Dave Van Sant;
 - Adele Willson 2nd the motion;
 - No further discussion;
 - Motion to approve the minutes carried.

II. Action Items

- Approve emergency grant for Guffey Charter School’s roof. Ted Hughes discussed the issues at Guffey Charter School and why they needed to apply for an emergency grant. A structural engineer found engineering flaws at the school and deemed it unsafe. The school has to transport children to another site until the issues are resolved. Ted Hughes told the CCAB three major issues are the roof, some structural work and lead & asbestos abatement. Ted Hughes said Guffey Charter School meets all the criteria required in BEST statute, and the district is able to provide their matching amount for the grant.

Motion by Dave Van Sant

I move to recommend to the State Board that an emergency grant, to correct structural issues at Guffey Charter School, be awarded to Park County RE-2 from the emergency reserve, maintained in the Assistance Fund, in the amount of \$163,114.50 with a matching contribution of \$15,997.00 with the source of match to be cash.

- Motion 2nd by: Pete Jefferson
- No discussion
- Motion Unanimously Approved

- Provide additional funding for ALTA and ESA Surveys

Motion by Dave Van Sant

I move that the BEST Division staff provide additional reimbursement, in the amount of \$11,625.00 from the Assistance Fund, to the BEST2010-11 proposed BEST Lease-Purchase Grant recipients for increased ALTA expenses and a Limited Site Investigation that are required for COP financing. The Assistance Fund will be reimbursed from the COP proceeds as “cost of issuance” if the state completes the COP financing.

- Motion 2nd by: Lyndon Burnett
- No discussion
- Motion Unanimously Approved

III. FY2010-11 Financing Update for BEST Lease-Purchase projects

Ted Hughes told the CCAB the finance team is on track with the established timeline. Currently real estate work is being finalized and a few loose ends on title records are being resolved. The finance team has been meeting with school districts to review documents. Ted Hughes said closing is set for November 16th. There are eight districts going for a bond election. After the election results, we will be able to determine who will be able to provide their portion of matching funds. A CCAB member asked if all districts pass their bond elections, if Akron would still be eligible for financing. Ted Hughes said yes.

Ted Hughes told the CCAB he prepared a comparison sheet to what the CCAB was doing two years prior on October 29th, 2010. Ted Hughes said the CCAB was meeting every week, and trying to establish rules for the Full-Day Kindergarten program & BEST and working on the initial timeline for the BEST grant cycle.

IV. Discussion Items

- General Public Comments

Paula Stephenson, with the Colorado Rural Caucus, thanked the CCAB for having a stakeholder meeting. Paula Stephenson stated the Caucus members believe the BEST program has provided what it promised, grant money and funding for capital construction projects in poor rural school districts, which do not have the ability to raise money on their own. Paula Stephenson stated there are some things that can be improved upon. The Caucus is happy with the changes that have been made. One concern the Caucus has is during the grant review process; only the technical assistance speak to the CCAB during this time. Paula stated some of the applicants feel they were misrepresented. Paula suggested time be allotted for applicants to speak, similar to the DOLA process. Paula also requested that districts have the choice of who represents them during the review process. By giving the district the power to decide who will represent their interests, will ensure confidence and consistency during the process.

Paula Stephenson discussed issues pertaining to facility master plans. Two issues Paula noted: first, there seems to be a great deal of discrepancy within master plans, and second, master plans can cost upwards of \$50,000 to \$100,000 to complete without any guarantee a grant will be awarded. Paula said the Caucus wants a clear master plan model that districts can follow and build upon or adapt to their specific needs. The Caucus wants some additional clarity and assistance, so time and energy can be devoted to the items both the district and the BEST board want to address. Lastly, Paula told the CCAB, in a perfect world, the Caucus would like BEST to pay for the master plans, as most rural districts that cannot afford to pay for a capital construction project, also cannot afford \$50,000 in nebulous start up costs. However, we understand this may not be something BEST can accommodate at this point in time.

Paula Stephenson discussed the Rural Caucus's concerns pertaining to Historic Society issues. Paula stated of critical importance to the BEST grant process is the disengagement of the Colorado Historical Society. Presently, every BEST application that is approved is routed through the Colorado Historical Society for CHS's stamp of approval, which at times has obscured and subverted the goals of BEST, local school districts and their communities. The Caucus believes a small victory was had with the Center School District ruling, but in general we think there is a need to ensure that the mission of the CHS is not being fulfilled at

the expense of our rural schools in particular. We realize, given the division of governmental entities, there may be nothing CDE can do about this process. However, if a legislative solution is the only option, it would be helpful to know whether or not the BEST board would support us in our efforts to seek that type of remedy.

Vincent Badolato, with the Colorado League of Charter Schools addressed issues with the CCAB. First, Vincent said several schools commented that they were not asked for financial records until after the applications were completed and turned into CDE. The schools commented that the request was a short turn around. Also, at least one school commented that the financial representative of CDE erred when presenting their financial information to the BEST board during the deliberation process, stating the school was not financially viable. The school asked their staff representative to make a correction to the board that the financials were in order and this was not done. Given the magnitude of the financial decisions being made, there is no place for incorrect information to come before the board. Vincent suggested financial information should be requested in a timelier manner. Applicants must have the opportunity to review the financial information that will be presented to CCAB by CDE and correct inaccurate information prior to a CCAB meeting. Vincent told the CCAB that charter schools differ financially from traditional districts. The League supports rigorous and meaningful financial criteria for all applicants and BEST funds should not be awarded to applicants that are not financially viable and stable. Financial requests and criteria however should be objective and clearly communicated to applicants in advance.

Second, Vincent Badolato discussed concerns noted by applicants that the BEST staff did not provide a realistic expectation of the process or their chances at funding. Some commented that it would be helpful if they were allowed to view other applications before the BEST hearing so they could understand where their project truly ranked, or if the Division staff was more realistic in setting expectations. A school that ranked near the bottom commented that had they known their project would not even be reviewed by the CCAB, they probably would not have spent the time and resources on the application that they did. Vincent suggested allowing staff the ability to set reasonable expectations with applicants, with an understanding from the CCAB of the priorities in the application review and selection process. Vincent said the BEST process is time consuming and expensive for schools. Applicants should be provided with an understanding of how much funding is available and where their project would reasonably rank earlier in the process so an informed decision could be made as to whether the application process is in the school's best interest. If possible an initial screening of applications could be done to save applicants the resources of completing the full application process.

Vincent Badolato briefly discussed issues pertaining to the consistency of staff. Vincent told the CCAB the league requests that all charter applicants be assigned to the one person who is in charge of the charter schools for the BEST program. Next, Vincent said some schools commented that there were no guidelines on things like cost per square feet. After the BEST selection process some schools commented that had they known what an acceptable range for cost per square feet (for example) they could have ensured that their project met the acceptable range. Vincent suggested the CCAB or Division staff anticipates applying determinative metrics to the assessment of an applicant's proposal; it has to be known in advance.

Last, Vincent Badolato noted during the BEST selection process some applicants noted that it appeared as if staff was getting unanticipated questions from the CCAB. Vincent suggested the CCAB and the Division staff communicate in advance of the BEST hearings to ensure that the Division staff is adequately prepared on the issues that the CCAB will highlight. Vincent said there should not be any determinative issues /questions coming to Division's attention for the first time during the CCAB hearing. Vincent said applicants should be given an opportunity to provide their representative with information during the selection process, if such information is not provided by the Division representative. All efforts, however, should be made in advance of the hearing to prevent inaccurate or incomplete information being presented to CCAB.

- Discussion pertaining to BEST Construction Guidelines. The CCAB Vice-Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. There were none. The CCAB briefly discussed the guidelines. A CCAB member said he is happy with the BEST guidelines. Another CCAB member stated there are unique schools in Colorado who have trouble complying, and the CCAB needs to keep that in mind.
- Discussion pertaining to BEST Program Rules. The CCAB Vice-Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. Jessica Johnson, with the League of Charters Schools, discussed section 3.2.3.5 of the BEST Program Rules with the CCAB. Jessica said Charter school applicants do not have the same access to local tax revenues as district applicants. According to information distributed during the FY 2010-2011 BEST selection process, less than half of the charter schools whose applications were selected for review for Lease-Purchase grants by the CCAB cited a bond election or bond proceeds as the source of matching funds. This is compared to 68% of district applicants that identified such as the source of matching funds. Every one of the district projects selected for Lease-Purchase grants cited the source of matching funds as bond proceeds (one district applicant cited a DOLA grant in addition to bond proceeds). Of the three charter schools selected for funding, only one cited bond proceeds as a the source of matching funds (one cited "district proceeds.") Jessica suggested the CCAB should have accurate information on the availability of district facilities for use by charter schools and the availability of local funds for charter schools for facilities related projects. Jessica noted some facts pertaining to charter schools. Currently, approximately 16% of charter schools are in district owned facilities or district owned land. The determination of whether a charter school can access vacant school district facilities is largely a decision made by the district. Moreover, not all vacant district facilities are in a condition suitable without significant repairs/renovations for a charter school, and the facility may not be adequate for the specific charter school needs. Local tax revenue proceeds for capital construction projects are not a viable option for the majority of charter schools for two main reasons. First, the amount of successful district bond elections/mill overrides has dramatically decreased due to the current economic reality. Second, many districts that are successful do not have charter schools and in cases where a district is successful the majority of district do not share these proceeds with their charter schools. Current law does not require districts to share locally raised mill levy override funds with charter schools. Also, the law requires school districts to invite charter schools to discuss their capital construction needs before the district submits a bond request for facilities funding but districts are not required to include charter schools as part of their bonds. Jessica said the CCAB should be well versed in the data on charter school access to local tax revenues and understands that accessing local tax revenues is not a realistic option for the majority of charter school applicants.

A CCAB member clarified charter schools need to clearly communicate with their districts and have proper documentation regarding vacant school facilities. The CCAB member said sometimes there are state charters in local districts, in which most cases the district will not let the charter school use district facilities. This puts charter schools in a difficult position. If a charter school goes to the state for a charter, then asks the district for money, issues can arise. The CCAB further discussed. Ted Hughes discussed section 3.2.3.1 in the rules. Ted said it is difficult for charters to budget their per pupil operating revenue. In section 3.2.3.2, Ted said this is not required anymore for charters. Ted noted these 2 sections need to be reviewed and may need legislative action.

Bryce Monosmith, the Akron School District's Superintendent, talked to the CCAB about Akron School District, and their previous bond elections. Bryce mentioned he had been working with the community to get their buy-in on the upcoming bond election. Bryce discussed issues and concerns of schools in the district. Bryce said a lot of effort had been put forth and is willing to do whatever it takes to get a bond passed. The CCAB discussed why they felt it was good to have back-up projects and may consider a policy for back-ups in the future. A CCAB member asked Bryce if supports back-up projects. Bryce said, yes they are good to have, but no it is not good to be the one. A CCAB member suggested simplifying the back-up process. A CCAB member recommended getting a list of potential back-ups and asking them if they want to be considered for an alternate.

The CCAB Vice-Chair called for break.

- Discussion pertaining to sorting of BEST Lease-Purchase projects. The CCAB Vice-Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. Vincent Badolato, with the Colorado League of Charter Schools, discussed several issues with the CCAB. Vincent completed roughly twenty-five on-on-one interview with schools to hear their concerns. First, Vincent said charter schools want more transparency and better guidance from the CCAB and Division staff on what factors would be highlighted during the selection process. Vincent acknowledged a charter school's relationship with its district is not a factor set forth in the statutory or CCAB guidelines. This is not a consideration outlined in statute or guidelines, and yet seems to have factored into the decision-making. Based on the criteria set forth by the CCAB, an applicant that demonstrates a needy project and also does not request a waiver should be given priority. For various reasons, this was not the outcome at the BEST hearings. Questions were raised regarding the effect of a charter revocation on the ownership of the facility. This is a question that should have been anticipated and the correct legal answer should have been provided to the CCAB in advance of the hearing.

A CCAB member rebutted and asked how can the CCAB know what questions they are ask? Vincent Badolato said questions should be laid out before the meetings. The CCAB member responded it is impossible to know. A CCAB member asked if Vincent could clarify some of the topics he discussed. Jessica Johnson, with the League of Charter Schools, responded to the earlier discussion of documentation for charters wanting to use district buildings. Jessica stated statute deals with the purchase of buildings, not leasing them. Jessica said some schools felt questions could have been anticipated, and wants to make sure the process is fair. Ted Hughes said statute says funding may be provided to an applicant who owns or has the right to own in the future under the terms of a Lease-Purchase agreement. Ted Hughes further discussed the statute and that the condition of the building needs to be addressed. The

CCAB Vice-Chair suggested training for charter applicants to help them clearly understand the process.

A CCAB member talked about the rubric which was drafted for an earlier CCAB meeting and wanted to review it with the CCAB. A CCAB member recommended taking off number of students. Another member said if number of students is used, it should not be ranked high. A CCAB member said cost per square foot is an important factor. Another CCAB member said square foot cost per pupil is more reasonable. The CCAB further discussed the rubric. A CCAB member said there are two categories that need to be looked at; is it needy, and is the response appropriate? Ted Hughes mention the Division does not always receive good information from the schools. A CCAB member talked about the importance of master plans and stated every district should have a master plan, regardless of they are going out for a grant. The CCAB member said everyone thinks they need a master plan to receive a BEST grant, but that is not the case. The CCAB member said importance should include FCI & CFI, and health and safety should be taken off. A few CCAB members said the sorting should be based off need. The CCAB further discussed the sorting list. Ted Hughes told the CCAB he would take the FCI off and use the CFI and create a new sort list for the November meeting.

A CCAB member asked if there was anyone on the public who had any comments. Dan O'Connell, with RBC, asked the CCAB if they could go through the entire list of applicants before and award is made. Dan asked if applicants could be given a chance to present. A CCAB member said the process needs to be changed. Another CCAB member said the process needs to be better defined. Scott Newell with the Division staff commented, he likes the rubric, because it is more transparent and likes assigning different weights to the criteria. The CCAB continued their discussion on the rubric; one CCAB member mentioned giving time for applicants to speak would lead to "sales pitches" from the applicants.

Ted Hughes suggested having an early meeting in June to review the list. The CCAB Chair (via conference call) said she would like to see a process less focused on scores and look at elements not conducive to scores. The CCAB discussed the option of giving applicants a set time frame to speak. Vincent Badolato stated in regard to charter schools, there would be fewer applications if they knew first how they would be sorted. Pat Bershinsky with Edison School District, asked if ability to bond should be incorporated? Ted Hughes discussed the statute and how schools maximize their boning indebtedness. A CCAB member said schools should be rewarded for providing their full match. Archie Neil, with the Pikes Peak BOCES, commented saying they applied for a grant and did not receive it. Archie said he is glad they did not get the grant, because there was more planning that needed to take place. The CCAB concluded their discussion on the sorting of Lease-Purchase grants by stating if time is allotted for applicants to speak, the CCAB needs to stick to a strict time schedule.

- Discussion pertaining to match percentage calculations. Jessica Johnson, with the League of Charter Schools, told the CCAB some facts she gathered regarding charter schools. Jessica stated on average, charter schools have a higher match requirement than districts. In FY 2010-2011, 36% of district applications had greater than a 50% match requirement. This is compared to 51.4% of charter school applicants that had a greater than 50% match requirement. 27.6% of charter school applicants in the FY 2010-2011 BEST cycle were given match requirements of 80% or more, while only 2.8% of districts had match

requirements of 80% or more. District to charter comparison shows that charter schools often times have a higher match percentage than the district within which they are located or authorized.

Ted Hughes spoke to Jessica's concerns saying there are a higher number of charter schools with a higher match percentage. Ted Hughes told Jessica he is taking a hard look at different data and criteria, but the matching calculations are based on statute requirements. Ted Hughes said the percentages are re-calculated every year, this year it will be done in November. The CCAB Vice-Chair discussed his findings on charter school matches and how the percentages seemed skewed. He said he would email his findings to the Board to review. Paula Stephenson, with the Colorado Rural Caucus, stated the statute guidelines have worked out well and encouraged the CCAB to look at the rubric with weighted points. Vody Herrmann, with the CDE, told the CCAB her and Ted Hughes had conversations about changing the statute. Vody said the statute is misleading, and a charter school's match should not exceed a school district's match. Vody suggested revising the statute guidelines. A CCAB asked Vody if the match for criteria should be where the school is located, or where the students are coming from. Vody said, from the location of the district.

- Discussion pertaining to waiver policies. Jessica Johnson, with the League of Charter Schools, said the CCAB commented that the majority of the waiver letters were insufficient as to the particular reason for hardship. Jessica suggested waiver letters should cite specific reasons of financial hardship and should not be a "standard" letter. Charter school applicants should include in waiver letters evidence that it communicated with districts regarding use of existing facilities and communications regarding inclusion in bond election and sharing of local tax dollars controlled by the district. The CCAB discussed waivers and what is wanted. A CCAB member said the free and reduced lunch numbers for rural districts are not accurate. Another CCAB member said districts should not be rewarded for not taking care of their buildings.

Mary Wickersham entered the meeting.

Division staff member Kristin Lortie discussed her opinion on waiver letters with the CCAB and said she does not recommend school districts to use them if possible. Paula Stephenson, with the Colorado Rural Caucus wanted to clarify, is the staff telling districts not to submit letters and the CCAB is? Scott Newell with the Division staff clarified, if a school needs to submit a waiver, the staff does not discourage waiver requests. Ted Hughes said all waivers need to be customized to show that districts reasons why they cannot meet their required match percentage. Kevyn Brown with the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind discussed his point of view on waivers and the process. The CCAB Chair said it is ultimately up to the Board, and the BEST program values the applicant's match.

The CCAB took a break for lunch.

- Discussion pertaining to Master Plans. Ted Hughes discussed the importance of districts having a master plan, with the CCAB. Ted Hughes said he does not think a master plan should be required to obtain a BEST grant. Ted Hughes emphasized how important it is to have a master plan and not a project plan. Ted said he and the staff had made it very clear, but it still seems to be an issue. A CCAB member said he thought the University of Colorado

was completing master plans at a lower cost. Ted Hughes said he was not aware of anyone doing master plans at a discount, and discouraged contractors from completing them for free. A CCAB member said it is hard for rural districts to fund a master plan. The CCAB Chair agreed and said she understands how important a master plan is, but there is a lot of school doing master plans just for BEST grants. The CCAB discussed possible options of funding master plans. A CCAB member noted there is potentially two more years to apply for Lease-Purchase projects, so master plans need to be completed very soon.

The CCAB Chair asked if there were any public comments. Vincent Badolato, with the Colorado League of Charter Schools said charter schools would appreciate the help. The CCAB Vice-Chair said master plans need to do a better job of incorporating technology. A CCAB member discussed the option of having a set pool of money for master plans. Ted Hughes said he does not want to see a roof put on a school that will be torn down in the near future. Ted said a master plan will provide good objective data to prevent this scenario from happening. The CCAB Vice-Chair mentioned the how the statewide facility assessment is a good tool to get an idea of some of the needs. Jessica Johnson, with the League of Charter Schools suggested having master plan fund and having schools pay it back over time. The CCAB discussed this option and if it would be possible to do. A CCAB member said he is concerned with hearing districts need a master plan to receive a BEST grant. The CCAB member said the master plan needs to be a guideline tool, more of a stepping stone, not the solution. A CCAB member asked if funding master plans was an appropriate use of Assistance funds. The CCAB member noted master plans should have been funded at the beginning of the BEST program. The CCAB discussed other options. The CCAB Chair said she would like to see it play out like the grant process where match percent is on an ad hoc basis.

- Discussion pertaining to roofs. A CCAB member said the guidelines staff has provided is great and he would not change them at all. The CCAB Chair asked if there was anyone who would like to speak from the public, there were none. Ted Hughes talked about roofs and how the staff is requesting warranty information, as well as inspections throughout. The CCAB talked about roofs and how districts should be proactive in planning ahead. A CCAB member asked about putting some types of R-values in the document. Ted Hughes talked about the CSPMA meeting and how they are trying to get larger districts to help the smaller districts by providing the tools to help save time and money. Kristin Lortie, with the Division staff said she has been asking for roofing maintenance plans with grant application, and it seems to help.
- Discussion pertaining to Colorado Historical Society. The CCAB discussed what defines a building to be historic. The CCAB legal advisor stated statute says historic buildings are fifty-years and older. A CCAB member said the Historic society needs to be taken out of the BEST program. The CCAB Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. Brian Calhoun, with RTA Architects, described a situation where their firm cannot meet the expectations of the CHS, dealing with the replacement of windows in a historic building for the Colorado School for the Deaf and blind. Brian said it would be nice to have clear rules or guidelines from the CHS. Ted Hughes said the Division staff has defined a three-step process with the CHS and both sides are in accord with the process. Brian said RTA has tried to resolve the window replacement issue, but cannot come to an agreement with the CHS. Ted Hughes recommended RTA take the steps the BEST program uses to

resolve their issue. Vody Herrmann noted another issue with the CHS is additional funding. Vody said the CHS should help provide the extra costs they demand, because it is affecting schools in the long run. A CCAB member said the CHS involvement is a big problem for rural districts and he is in the process of working on a bill to have them removed from the BEST program. The CCAB Chair noted how it is important to maintain a good relationship with the CHS. The CCAB Chair coincided with Vody's statement saying it is difficult for schools to incur the higher costs.

The CCAB Chair call for a short break

Steve Turner and Cynthia Nieb addressed the CCAB. Steve Turner talked about the CHS's goals and why they have been put in place: to preserve historic buildings. Steve noted a study done in Center School District, in Colorado, showed it to be more cost effective to keep the building in one scenario. Steve said all implications need to be looked at before a building is demolished, because historic buildings cannot be re-built. Ted Hughes and Steve discussed other projects where the CHS held up construction on BEST awarded grants. The CCAB Chair said a major frustration is BEST is providing all the funding and the CHS is delaying the process. The CCAB Chair said the number one goal of BEST is to provide safe 21st century buildings. This is a competitive grant process, in which schools and district put a lot of time and effort. Then a project is awarded and the CHS comes in and says grantees cannot proceed. Steve said that is because the CHS is sometimes brought in at the end of the project and wants the CHS to be considered as top priority.

A CCAB member said he was concerned of the extra costs incurred on behalf of the CHS could be used to pay teachers salaries. The CCAB Chair noted the project in Sargent; the CHS required the small district, with little money to upkeep an old building they wanted to tear down. The CCAB further discussed the issues and concerns. Steve Turner said he would like to help improve the process, and thinks the CHS can communicate their expectations a little better.

- Discussion pertaining to procurement. The CCAB Chair asked if there was anyone from the public who would like to speak. Stuart Coppedge, with RTA Architects mentioned to the CCAB, he believes a lot of people working on BEST projects, are working below market value. Stuart is afraid because he thinks a precedent will be set down the road where contractors will not want to do work for any BEST projects. Stuart claims he sees a lot of inconstancy with the expectations of the selection process. Ted Hughes said the goal for the selection process is to pick the best consultant and get a reasonable fee. Ted said there are mixed perceptions, but this process is put in place to protect the schools, while maintaining a fair, transparent process. Brian Calhoun, with RTA, stated he likes the RFQ process and having fees be negotiated after the consultant has been selected.

V. Future Meetings

The CCAB Chair briefly talked about the upcoming November 10, 2010 meeting. Mary noted the election results would be in and the Division staff will inform the CCAB of which projects passed their bond elections and will be eligible for Lease-Purchase financing.

VI. Public Comment

The CCAB Chair asked if there was anyone who had questions or would like to speak. Mae Ann Saas, with Eidos Architects, needed a few clarifications from the CCAB on topics discussed.

VII. Adjournment

The CCAB Chair asked for a motion to adjourn:

- So moved by Norwood Robb;
- Tom Stone 2nd the motion;
- No discussion;
- Motion carried;
- Meeting Adjourned.