Board Work Session of the Board of Directors

BANKS SCHOOL DISTRICT 13

Banks, OR

Monday, May 11, 2026

Note: The District will endeavor to provide the following services if requested 48 hours prior to the meeting: qualified bilingual interpreters or qualified sign language interpreters. These services are provided at no cost to recipient. To obtain services, call 503-324-8591 at least 48 hours prior to this meeting.

1. Preliminaries
   - 1.1. Call to Order
   - 1.2. Roll Call
   - 1.3. Approval of Agenda
2. Discussion Items
   - 2.1. DO documentary
     BHS Students, Mrs. Tope
   - 2.2. Bond Update
     - 2.2.1. Scope, budget and timeline
3. Adjourn
4. Walkthrough Site Visit (Board Members only)

04-01a: Mutual Materials CMU 4x4x16 Veneer Castle White

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	8	20	8	20	8	20	8	20
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Risk	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**95**		**92.5**		**92.5**		**93.3333333**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Cost Effective. Less Labor	
Fewer units, faster installation, lower unit handling; potentially lower material cost for gross area	The overall campus would not be cohesive using Natural Gray, regardless of its size at 4x4x16, 4x8x16.
	This product is not used anywhere on the property.
	4x4x16 CMU better matches the brick coursing and scale. Switching to 8x8x16 CMU units conflict with the established 4x12 brick module and overall brick aesthetic.
	Natural Gray ground face CMU does not work with adjacent material selections including the following: aluminum storefront window system, exterior metal wall panels, sheet metal flashing, cornice, canopy system.....
	Land Use is complete and we would have to let the city know about this change

Comments

A

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

04-02: Casework - 80% reduction of locks

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	9	22.5	8	20	9	22.5	8.66666667	21.6666667
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Risk	25	10	25	8	20	9	22.5	9	22.5
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**97.5**		**90**		**95**		**94.1666667**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Cost Effective	
Keeps Teacher Locks in Scope Remove all other locks in General Classrooms and 1/2 the locks in Science Classrooms	
Allows for add back during future submittal review utilizing any potential contingency available.	
District Office - remove locks from Workroom	
Art Room - Remove half locks on west wall and all locks on casework on east wall.	

Staff Work Room remove locks.

Comments
Keep all locks in: Health Room, Graphics, Prep Room, Life Skills Room & DO Conference Room

A

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

07-05: Omit Mechanical Screen (District Office)

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	8	20	9	22.5	9	22.5	8.66666667	21.6666667
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	6	15	8	20	7	17.5	7	17.5
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
Risk	25	10	25	8	20	9	22.5	9	22.5
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**85**		**85**		**85**		**85**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Elimnates steel roof penetrations eliminating potential areas of system failure.	Different look to the front of the District Office building.
ease of access for maintenance.	
Cost effective.	Design Add Service from Structural for this change - ROM $2,500
Different look at the front of the District Office building. After studying, this is a positive direction.	We would have to let the city know about this change.

Comments
Can be less than 4 sides

B

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

07-06: Unit attached mechanical screen with ABS panels (High School Wing)

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
Maintenance/Durability	25	6	15	6	15	6	15	6	15
Risk	25	10	25	7	17.5	8	20	8.33333333	20.8333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**90**		**77.5**		**80**		**82.5**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Significat savings versus alumnium	Alumnium is a more of a durabale product than ABS.
No change to current design method	
Allows for add back during in construction period utilizing any potential contingency available.	

Comments
More risk data needed on long term issues.....Heat, discolor, function

B

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

22-14: Use combined storm/overflow system in lieu of separate piping systems

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	8	20	8	20	8.66666667	21.6666667
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	6	15	6	15	6	15	6	15
Maintenance/Durability	25	6	15	6	15	6	15	6	15
Risk	25	10	25	7	17.5	8	20	8.33333333	20.8333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**80**		**67.5**		**70**		**72.5**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Cost Savings.	Sazan Comment: Code compliant, but not recommended. The downstream of combination is much larger and will make coordination with architectural difficult. Downspout Nozzles that have water flowing out is an indicator that the roof drains must be cleaned.
Dale had noted a it is routine for the facilities to be on the roof and would notice an overflow.	Dale noted that Distirct had issues with vertical pipe and cows tounge and had to replace at other buildings.

Comments

C

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

22-04 & 22-05: Use Floor Mount Toilets in Lieu of Wall Mount

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	8	20	8	20	8	20	8	20
Maintenance/Durability	25	6	15	6	15	6	15	6	15
Risk	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**85**		**82.5**		**82.5**		**83.3333333**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Cost Savings. *Decision is required soon due to schedule rough in work at the locker room.	Sazan Comment: Floor Mount, Wall Discharge, Back Spud. This would make daily cleaning more difficult, but would not otherwise interfere with the functionality. Wall mount is industry standard.
	BRIC Comment: We do not recommend this and Dale indicated NO at the OAC meeting 3/18/2026.
	Possible Design Add Service for this change - ROM $6,500

B

Comments
Provide cost info on floor mounted version Sazan provided as an option.

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

23-05: Point of Use Controls (Locker Room)

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	7	17.5	6	15	7	17.5	6.66666667	16.6666667
Maintenance/Durability	25	6	15	5	12.5	6	15	5.66666667	14.1666667
Risk	25	10	25	7	17.5	7	17.5	8	20
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**82.5**		**70**		**75**		**75.8333333**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Signficant Cost Savings.	District Will Not be able to integrate in Direct Digital Control System.
Considers materplan that Gym is intended to be a 20 year old building and will be demolished at that point.	
Venting can be setup to be timed and controlled but locally.	

C

Comments
Verify functionality with owner. Will this meet the districts needs for operation?

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

27-01: Reduce AV Scope at Library

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	9	22.5	8	20	8	20	8.33333333	20.8333333
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	8	20	8	20	8	20	8	20
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	9	22.5	8	20	9	22.5
Risk	25	10	25	7	17.5	8	20	8.33333333	20.8333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**92.5**		**80**		**80**		**84.1666667**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Saves money. There is further Savings that can be taken advantage of (aprrox 4K) if only moved to 1 vid conferening	Less flexible to add more equipment in the future due to it not beind AVoIP.
Sytem does not lose funtionality.	
Equipment can still be added in the Future.	

B

Comments
BRIC: Sent to Greenbusch for review 4/13/2026.

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

26-06: Reduce Site Lighting Pole Lights

		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	9	22.5	8	20	9	22.5	8.66666667	21.6666667
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	7	17.5	3	7.5	8	20	6	15
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9.33333333	23.3333333
Risk	25	10	25	5	12.5	7	17.5	7.33333333	18.3333333
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**90**		**62.5**		**82.5**		**78.3333333**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Saves money and has minimal impact to overal site lighting design. Interface to confirm suggested Pole light for omission are acceptable.	Possible Design Add Service for this change - ROM $---
	Need to understand what lighing will be omited for afterhours safty
	Removing the (2) proposed poles will reduce light levels below code requirements.

Comments
BRIC: 4/13/2026 - info sent to Sazan for their review. P&C to provide information & location on the (2) light poles that are being proposed to be removeNeed to run photometrics for alternate site lighting design. Layout provide noting to locations to be ommitted. Interface to review and confirm does not impact lighting model.

C

Intent is to go through the report cards and see if we're not all recommending the change as an "average".

Average scoring:
A = We strongly encourage and recommend the change. We don't think district would have any issues moving forward.
B = "recommend" but want district to make sure district understand small "cons" of the decision.
C = probably no-go, but worthy of carrying on the list.
D = we shouldn't have any.

Firm/Individual overall baseline intent on grading:
"B" 80-90 - it's not great, but overall considerations it would be recommended. If you're "neutral" , it's a B.
"C" 70-80- If anyone thinks the savings is probably not worth it, but still open for discussion.
"D" < 70 is "don't do it", overall budget doesn't matter. We shouldn't have any.

Banks SD – HVAV Refurbish Memo

P&C Construction

TO: Brian Sica, Banks School District
FROM: Parker Verhaeghe, P&C Construction
DATE: April 16, 2026
RE: Banks HS — AHU 2 & 5 Desing, Noise Mitigations, Update & Options

Purpose

This memo summarizes the work completed on Air Handling Units AHU-2 and AHU-5 at Banks High School under the bond program, the steps our team has taken in response to noise concerns, and the options available to the District for any further sound mitigation.

Background and Scope of Work

AHU-2 and AHU-5 are both part of the original building infrastructure and were over fifty years old at the time of the refurbishment. Both units had been tied to an aging, inefficient boiler plant. AHU-2, which serves the cafeteria and the adjacent seating area from a mezzanine location behind a wall, had in fact been abandoned and out of service for many years prior to this project. AHU-5 is located on the side of the stage.

Rather than replacing these units with new equipment, which would have carried a significantly higher price tag (and “additional” noise), our team, together with our design-build mechanical contractor Piper Mechanical, recommended a rebuild approach that preserved the existing cabinets while upgrading every component that affects performance and efficiency. This approach saved the District a substantial amount of bond money while delivering modern, code-compliant, high-efficiency equipment.

NO new insulated ductwork nor any changes downstream of the original unit was changed, and remains original.

Specifically, the project included:

- Disconnection from the old, inefficient boiler and conversion of both units to a new high-efficiency hot water boiler system.
- Installation of new fan walls in both units, increasing code required air flow
- Installation of new variable frequency drives (VFDs) for precise, efficient fan speed control.
- Installation of new controls to allow flexible scheduling and modulation of the units, add CO2 sensors for code.
- Bringing AHU-2 back online so the cafeteria and area receive proper conditioned air for the first time in years.
- Project design also qualified for considerable ETO and SB 1149 rebates and reimbursements, paying for substantial costs of the upgrades.

The Noise Concern

Once AHU-2 was returned to service and both units were balanced, noise concerns were reported that the units were audible in the stage and cafeteria/seating areas during drama performance. This feedback is understandable. AHU-2 had been silent for years because it was not operating at all, so any sound from that

unit is new to the space. AHU-5, located adjacent to the stage, became somewhat more audible after the rebuild.

Actions Already Taken

In direct response to the feedback, the following adjustments have already been made at no additional cost to the District:

1. **Fan speed reduction.** Ainsworth adjusted both units prior to the Thanksgiving holiday. AHU-2 is currently running at approximately 85% of the originally balanced fan speed, and AHU-5 is running at approximately 75%.
2. **Scheduling changes.** The units are now scheduled to turn off before drama practice begins so the fans are not running during rehearsals, around performances.
3. **Engineering review.** Piper Mechanical's engineer reviewed the design a second time against the building load. The review confirmed there is additional room to turn the fans down, potentially as low as approximately 67% of the original balance on AHU-2 and approximately 48% on AHU-5, while still fully meeting the heating load for the spaces served. This fan speed, or lower, can also be done at scheduled times only.

We share the District's view that the units should be able to run when needed and still support the drama program, and we are committed to continuing to tune the system until that standard is met in every condition, including cold-weather operation.

Options for Further Noise Reduction

Three options are available to the District for additional mitigation, and they can be pursued independently or in combination. They are presented below in order of cost, from no-cost programming changes to the more extensive duct modification.

Option	Description	Estimated Cost
Option A — Extended VFD Programming	Program the AHU-2 and AHU-5 VFDs to run at 50% or less during scheduled performances, in addition to the existing schedule that turns the units off during drama practice. Engineering review confirms the units can operate well below current settings and still satisfy the building's heating load.	**Programming Costs. $1,000 ROM**
Option B — AHU-5 Sound-Lined Return Elbow	Add an internal sound-lined elbow, facing up, installed on the AHU-5 return. Targeted at the stage-side unit where the drama teacher's complaint originated. Excludes electrical, a light fixture in the area will likely need to be relocated.	**$8,000 (+/- ROM)**
Option C — AHU-2 Supply Duct Replacement	Demo the existing AHU-2 supply duct run and replace it with internally sound-lined duct. Addresses the mezzanine unit serving the cafeteria and seating area.	**$20,000 (+/-ROM)**

Respectfully, Parker Verhaeghe

P&C Construction

6101 West Courtyard Drive
Building 3, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78730

04/15/2026

25-COC-000341 – Banks School District
Banks High School Addition & Remodel
12850 & 12050 Northwest Main Street, Banks OR 97106

Dear Melissa Stifel,

This letter is to inform you that a site loss prevention survey was conducted by an authorized service provider of Technical Risk Underwriters.

We are pleased to report that this survey recorded no deficiencies - physical or human element - which are identified in *NFPA 241 - Standard for Safeguarding Construction, Alteration, and Demolition Operations*.

Please confirm with the insured and/or general contractor if any modifications to the pre-agreed security regime will occur within the next 100 days. If so, please provide the details so that we may proactively work together to ensure security is in accordance with the Underwriting Conditions of the policy.

We appreciate the efforts of your team and the client in their commitment to loss prevention. We thank you for your business. As always, if you have any questions, please contact us.

Sincerely,
Technical Risk Underwriters

TRU Loss Control Contacts:

Joseph Amodeo
Senior Risk Engineer
joseph.amodeo@truins.com
M: 862-485-9221

Trey Sulak
Senior Risk Engineer
trey.sulak@truins.com
M: 254-722-5902

Tyler Retzloff
Risk Engineer
tyler.retzloff@truins.com
M: 210-459-8008

Technical Risk Underwriters is a series of RSG Underwriting Managers, LLC. RSG Underwriting Managers, LLC is a Delaware series limited liability company and a subsidiary of Ryan Specialty Group, LLC, specializing in underwriting management and other services for insurance products distributed through agents and brokers. Some products may only be available in certain states, and some products may only be available from surplus lines insurers. In California: RSG Insurance Services, LLC License # 0E50879 © 2022 Ryan Specialty Group, LLC

BANKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

BID TABULATION FORM

Banks ES Shingle Roof Replacement Project								
OPEN: April 30, 2026 @ 1:00pm								
BID PROVIDER	Signed	Add -1 Ack.	Base Bid:	Unit Price: Plywood	Unit Price: Fascia Board Replacement	Unit Price: Tie Off Anchor	Total	1st Tier Discl.
Vitan Construction	X	X	248,000	$5	$18	$125	248,000	n/a
ABC Roofing	X	X	374,470	$7.50	$22.50	$33,042	374,470	n/a
Frontier Roofing	X	*	356,396	$4	$7		356,396	n/a
Carlson Roofing	X	X	221,672	$3.75	$20/LF	$25/anchor	221,672	n/a
Griffith Roofing	X	X	271,943	$4.25	$5/LF	$98	271,943	n/a
Safe Cover Roofing	X	X	189,500	$5.00	$20/LF	$100	189,500	n/a
								n/a

OWNER Representative:

WITNESS: Dale Virden, Banks SD

BID FORM
DIVISION 0 * SECTION 00300

Bid TO: **Brian Sica, Superintendent**

Bids DUE: April 30, 2026 @ 1:00 PM

PROJECT: **Banks ES Shingle Roof Replacement Project**

Start of Project: June 15, 2026 (unless changed by Addenda)

Substantial Completion: August 14, 2026 (unless changed by Addenda)

Final Completion: September 18, 2026 (unless changed by Addenda)

1. The undersigned,

NAME of FIRM: SafeCover Roofing

after having carefully examined the bidding documents and **addenda numbered** 0 **through** 1 inclusive, as well as the work site and conditions affecting the work, hereby proposes and agrees to furnish all labor, materials, and all other work, required by and in strict conformance with the above documents, necessary to complete the project for the stipulated sum of:

Base Bid – Shingle Roof Replacement:

TOTAL (Figures) $ #189,500.00 Dollars

TOTAL (Words) One hundred and Eighty-Nine Thousand Five hundred 00/100 Dollars

Unit Cost: Plywood Decking (provide a cost/SF):

TOTAL (Figures) $ 5.00 Dollars

TOTAL (Words) Five Dollars

Unit Cost: Fascia Board Replacement (provide a cost/LF)

TOTAL (Figures) $ 20.00 Dollars

TOTAL (Words) Twenty Dollars

Unit Cost: Roof Tie Off Anchor (provide a cost)

TOTAL (Figures) $ 100 Dollars

TOTAL (Words) One-hundred Dollars

2. The undersigned agrees to maintain the proposal price for a period of 30 calendar days after bid opening.

3. The undersigned agrees, if awarded a contract, to complete all work as shown in the Contract Documents by the substantial completion date listed above.

4. The undersigned agrees that, prior to commencement of the Work, and within 7 calendar days of Notice of Intent to Award, to:

   A. Enter into and execute a contract for the work in the form of Banks School District, "Construction Contract".

   B. Deliver to the Owner duly executed AIA Document G705, "Certificate of Insurance," or ACORD form 25S.

   C. Deliver to the Owner duly executed AIA Document A312, "Performance Bond and Payment Bond."

5. The undersigned certifies that this Bid has been prepared independently and is not made in the interests of any undisclosed party. It is submitted without collusion or intent to limit independent, competitive bidding. The Bidder has in no way induced or solicited other Bidders to submit false bids, or to refrain from bidding.

6. The Undersigned agrees to be bound by and will comply with the provisions of ORS 279C.838 and 279C.840 pertaining to the payment of the prevailing rates of wage.

7. The undersigned agrees to comply with Oregon tax laws in accordance with ORS 305.385.

8. Indicate below whether Bidder is Resident or Non-Resident bidder.

   Oregon Reciprocal Preference Law (ORS 279.029): In compliance with ORS 279.029, each Bidder must state in its proposal whether it is a resident or non-resident bidder. Bids that fail to provide this information will be considered nonresponsive and will be rejected.

   DEFINITION - RESIDENT BIDDER: A bidder that has paid unemployment taxes or income taxes in this state during the 12 calendar months immediately preceding submission of the bid, has a business address in this state and has stated in the bid whether the bidder is a "resident bidder."

   DEFINITION – NON-RESIDENT BIDDER: A bidder who is not a resident bidder as defined above.

   Indicate by an "X" in the appropriate space whether you are an Oregon resident bidder or non-resident bidder:
   Oregon Resident Bidder _____ Non-Resident Bidder X

9. The undersigned certifies that you visited the site and thoroughly investigated all existing conditions. It is understood that the Bidder, before signing his/her proposal, has made a careful examination of the plans, specifications, and character of work required; that he/she has made a careful examination of the location and condition of the work, verified all measurements at the job site, and sources of supply of materials.

10. Security Deposit is NOT required:

11. The Undersigned certifies that it has not discriminated against minority, women, or emerging small businesses in obtaining any subcontracts for this project as required by ORS 279A.110(4).

12. If applicable the first-tier subcontractor disclosure form is due 2 hours after bid are due.

13. Submittals are due promptly after Letter of Intent. A Pre-Construction Meeting will be held prior to commencement, Weekly Construction meetings are required but may be held with less frequency.

14. As a condition to submitting a bid, a Contractor must be registered with the Oregon Construction Contractors Board in accordance with ORS 701.035 to 701.055 and/or the State Landscape Contractors Board licensed number, and disclose the appropriate numbers. Failure to register and disclose the numbers, as applicable, will make the bid unresponsive and it will be rejected. The Undersigned hereby certifies that all subcontractors who will perform construction work as described in ORS 701.005 are or will be registered with the Construction Contractors Board in accordance with ORS 701.035 to 701.055 or State Landscape Contractors Board, as applicable, at the time the subcontractor(s) made a bid to work under the contract.

15. Oregon Business Registration: To transact business in the State of Oregon, a Bidder must be registered with the State of Oregon Corporations Division. Please indicate your business' current registration type with an "X" in the appropriate space:

X Corporate Registration 0247604618

X Assumed Business Name Registration Safe Cover Roofing LLC.

16. Any Bid of a contractor or subcontract listed on BOLI's list of Ineligible Contractors will be rejected.

SIGNATURES

Oregon Construction Contractor's Board No. 236354

State Landscape Contractors Board No. N/A (if applicable for the project)

NAME OF FIRM Safe Cover Roofing

ADDRESS 1696 Bishop Rd Chehalis, WA

FEDERAL TAX ID _____

TELEPHONE NO. 360-304-8055

Cell NO. Same

SIGNATURE

1) _____
Sole Individual – Signature

2) _____
Sole Individual – Printed Name

or 2) _____
Partner

or 3) _____
Authorized Officer of Corporation – Signature

Brady Collins
Authorized Officer of Corporation – Printed Name

(SEAL)

Kaitlin M. Bailey
Attested: Secretary of Corporation

Notary Public
State of Washington
KAITLIN M. BAILEY
COMM. # 23033348
MY COMM. EXP. 10/29/2027

SAFECOVER
ROOFING LLC

961 INDUSTRIAL WAY
LONGVIEW, WA 98632
(360) 916-1430
LONGVIEWOFFICE@SAFECOVERROOFING.COM
LIC# SAFECRL820KZ

REFRENCES SUBMITTED TO: Cornerstone Management Group, Inc.

ADDRESS: 42350 NW Trellis Way, Banks, OR

PHONE: 251-554-9822

EMAIL: mdolan@cornerstonemgi.com

DATE: 4-28-26

REFERENCES

Tenino Stadium
- Tear off and install Polyglass roof
- Tenino, Wa
- Tenino School
- 120k
- Start and finish April 2026
- Ian 360-280-7390
Tenino Highschool
- Tear off and install Polyglass roof
- Tenino, Wa
- Tenino School
- 206k
- Start and finish November 2025
- Same as above
St Joseph Vancouver
- Tear off and install of Pabco Prestige
- Vancouver, Wa
- Catholic Archbishop Seattle
- 394k
- Start and finish July 2025
- Jessicaav@stjoevan.org
Winlock School
- Tear off and install GAF TPO
- Winlock, Wa
- Winlock School district

- 110k
- Start and finish July 2022
- fterry@winlock.wednet.edu
Centralia city pool
- Tear off and install steep slope and low slop roof system
- Centralia, Wa
- City of Centralia
- 494k
- Start and finish March 2026
- Contact Matt at Thorbeckes
Lewis County Community Development
- Install GAF TPO
- Chehalis, Wa
- Lewis County
- 114k
- Start and finish August 2024
- TJ.Snodderly@lewiscountywa.gov
Lewis County Senior Center Projects
- Completed 5 senior centers
- Lewis County
- Lewis County Wa
- 300k
- Completed from 2022-2026
- Same as above

BANKS SCHOOL DISTRICT – BOARD MEETING

MAY 11TH, 2026

BOND PROJECT UPDATES

1. PROJECT UPDATES
   - Schedule, Budget, Other

2. BUDGET UPDATES
   - Executive Summary, Grand Summary Budgets

3. QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

4. SITE TOUR WITH P&C (if time allows)

BANKS HIGH SCHOOL UPDATES

SCHEDULE

- Grading Permit received! Pre-Con mtg held w/ CWS and Wash County
- Erosion Control measures installed, Tree Protection being installed
- Grading Commenced this week, Concrete crusher to be delivered next week
- BHS Substantial Completion is 8/12/27
- Locker Room Renovations have begun
- Locker Room Substantial Completion is 8/14/26



BUDGET

- Addition VE items have been reviewed and approved
- VE report card system used to evaluate and recommend items
- Guaranteed Max Price agreed upon with P&C for the BHS project
- Carrying items for potential “add back” during construction

If contingency becomes available

OTHER

- Groundbreaking for the BHS Addition held, good turnout

and spirits were high even in the rain!

BANKS HIGH SCHOOL UPDATES

VE Report Card Example

04-02: Casework - 80% reduction of locks									
		P&C		BRIC		Cornerstone		Average	
SUBJECT	MAX POINTS	Score* (1 to 10)	POINTS SCORED	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score	Score* (1 to 10)	Weighted Score
Cost Efficiency	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Design/Assembly/System Impact	25	9	22.5	8	20	9	22.5	8.66666667	21.6666667
Maintenance/Durability	25	10	25	10	25	10	25	10	25
Risk	25	10	25	8	20	9	22.5	9	22.5
TOTAL POINTS	**100**		**97.5**		**90**		**95**		**94.1666667**

***Scoring Rating: 1 (Poor) to 10 (Excellent)**

Pros	Cons
Cost Effective	
Keeps Teacher Locks in Scope Remove all other locks in General Classrooms and 1/2 the locks in Science Classrooms	
Allows for add back during future submittal review utilizing any potential contingency available.	
District Office - remove locks from Workroom	
Art Room - Remove half locks on west wall and all locks on casework on east wall.	

Staff Work Room remove locks.

Comments
Keep all locks in: Health Room, Graphics, Prep Room, Life Skills Room & DO Conference Room

A

BANKS HIGH SCHOOL UPDATES

KELLY FIELD UPDATES

- Fundraising updates

- Land Use & Permitting in process

- Word Scheduled to be completed this summer (permit dependent)
    - Turf Field replacement
    - ½ Field Lighting replacements

OTHER

- All work is being coordinated with other summer projects

at the BES, BMS and BHS sites

BANKS SCHOOL BOARD MEETING

AUXILIARY GYM UPDATES

SCHEDULE

- Foundations have been poured for the Gym
- Steel has been delivered for the building structure
- Steel delivery for siding system coming soon
- Underground Utilities install (5/5 – 5/19)
- Slab on Grade final prep (5/22)
- Pouring of building Slab On Grade, then steel erection
- Substantial Completion for Aux Gym is 12/23/26



BUDGET

- LOA’s signed for all phases of the work
- GMP Amount agreed upon and under current budget



OTHER

- Had to work through a temporary egress plan for MS Gym Occupancy with Wa County. This has been resolved with a reduced occupancy until construction is completed.

Bond Program Executive Budget Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY of Project Budgets

Banks School District **DRAFT**

Date: 5/11/26

A Budget Original budget #		B Description	C Original Budget	D Current Budget	E Committed to Date	F Paid to Date	G Uncommitted Budget (D-E)	H Remaining to be Paid (E-F)	K Notes
1	BHS		$ 47,059,269	$ 47,618,919	$ 45,067,884	$ 8,280,892	$ 2,551,035	$ 36,786,992	
2	AUX GYM		$ 6,375,033	$ 7,405,033	$ 7,046,156	$ 1,589,846	$ 358,877	$ 5,456,310	
3	Banks ES Maintenance		$ 153,750	$ 935,209	$ 780,711	$ 58,287	$ 154,498	$ 722,424	
4	ROOF ES		$ 785,109	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
5	PARKING		$ 559,650	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	
6	SAFETY		$ 372,383	$ 428,538	$ 412,585	$ 377,489	$ 15,953	$ 35,096	
		Subtotal	$ 55,305,194	$ 56,387,699	$ 53,307,336	$ 10,306,514	$ 3,080,363	$ 43,000,822	
A	District Costs		$ 2,919,018	$ 1,056,513	$ 770,236	$ 763,810	$ 286,276	$ 6,426	
B	Program Contingency		$ -	$ 882,000					
C	Other Additional Funds		$ -	$919,177					
D	BSD Program Totals		$ 58,224,211	$ 59,245,388	$ 54,077,572	$ 11,070,324	$ 3,366,639	$ 43,007,248	

Approved by: 6/4/2024

Brian Sica Superintendent Date:

Bond Program Grand Summary Budget

Grand Summary

PROJECT BUDGET

Date 5/11/2026

Banks School District

Location Code

Bond 4xx Summer 20xx Architect:

Description	Original Budget	Current Budget	Committed to Date	Paid to Date	Uncommitted Budget	Remaining to be Paid	Current % Paid
1.0 Architect/Engineer (383)	$5,182,553	$5,636,874	$5,574,374	$4,045,685	$62,500	$1,528,689	72%
2.0 Professional Services (390)	$1,578,500	$1,982,822	$1,778,052	$1,191,138	$204,770	$586,913	60%
3.0 Building Construction (520)	$40,597,800	$45,824,467	$45,626,521	$4,777,790	$197,946	$40,848,730	10%
4.0 Site / Off-Site Construction (530)	$3,780,800	$7,975	$7,975	$5,270	$0	$2,705	66%
5.0 Hazardous Material Abatement (322)	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	0%
6.0 Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment (480, 481)	$800,000	$745,905	$34,943	$6,171	$710,962	$28,772	1%
7.0 Permits / PIP/PUP Fees / SDCs / TDCs (	$1,248,000	$1,289,086	$285,472	$280,459	$1,003,614	$5,013	22%
8.0 Owner's Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	0%
9.0 Owner Contingency	$1,867,541	$900,570	$0	$0	$900,570	$0	0%
10.0 Land Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	0%
11.0 TOTAL BUDGET	$55,305,194	$56,387,699	$53,307,336	$10,306,514	$3,080,363	$43,000,822	18%
Total Budget +/-		$1,082,505					

Rev 2022-01

Grand Summary

Approved by: 6/4/2024

Brian Sica Superintendent Date:

Questions and Discussion

Site Tour (if time allows)