

PIEDMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Council Chambers, City Hall  
120 Vista Avenue  
Piedmont, California 94611

MINUTES OF  
Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

April 25, 2007

CALL TO ORDER Board President Lindenmayer called the Board of Education meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM President Ward Lindenmayer, Vice President June Monach, Board Members Cathie Geddeis, Ray Gadbois, Roy Tolles

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 6:05 p.m. to discuss:

- A. Public Employee Performance Evaluation: Superintendent (Government Code Section 54957)
- B. Conference with District Labor Negotiator Constance Hubbard Regarding Negotiations with the Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) (Government Code Section 54956.6)

OTHERS PRESENT FOR CLOSED SESSION (After discussion of Item A.)  
Constance Hubbard, Superintendent  
Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services  
David Roth, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services

RECONVENE TO REGULAR SESSION Board President Ward Lindenmayer called the Regular Session of the Board of Education meeting of March 28, 2007 to order at 7:11 p.m. and led the Board and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

OTHERS PRESENT AT REGULAR SESSION Constance Hubbard, Superintendent  
Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services  
David Roth, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent, Educ. Services

Action Taken In Closed Session None

Agenda Adjustments None

COMMUNICATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS

Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) None

California School Employees Association (CSEA) None

Parent Clubs None

Student Representative to the Board Student Representative to the Board Sophie Coysh was presented with a certificate from the Alameda County School Boards Association honoring her service as a student representative.

She then reported that:

- This is Spring Fling Week
- Friday is “Day on the Green”
- Saturday is the Spring Fling Dance

PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA None

Superintendent

Superintendent Hubbard reported that:

- STAR testing has started and goes through May

Board President

Board President Lindenmayer reported that:

- On Monday, April 30 and Tuesday, May 10, there will be Joint City-School District Civic Center Master Planning meetings, both at 7:30 p.m. at the Piedmont Community Hall. They will not be broadcast live but will be televised shortly thereafter
- A Special Board Meeting will be held at the District Administration Office Board Room at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 2 to appoint the new principal of Beach Middle School (Closed Session: 3:30 p.m.; Open Session at approximately 3:45 p.m.)
- Saturday, May 19 is the Senior Prom
- Summer School for Grades K-8 will be held from June 18- July 16 at Beach and the Middle School and from June 18- July 13 for Grades 9-12 at the High School

## PRESENTATION

Actuarial Valuation Study (GASB 45)

School districts are required to report long-term fiscal obligations for other post-employment benefits as part of independent auditing requirements. The first step in this process is an actuarial study to determine a district’s liability. Ira Summer, an expert in the field and a community member, gave the presentation about this requirement and how it affects the Piedmont Unified School District

Mr. Summer’s PowerPoint presentation, “Review of Retiree Health Liability”, provided the overview of benefits, accounting rules and next steps.

A copy of the detailed presentation is available in the Superintendent’s office.

## REVIEW & ACTION ITEMS

A. Bond Program:

1. Presentation of Repair Options and Cost Estimates for Havens Elementary School

Superintendent Hubbard began by saying that this presentation is intended to be a broad overview and will return for discussion at two future Board meetings.

John Nelson, President of *murakami* / Nelson Architects and Engineers, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the repair options (concept design) and cost estimates for Havens Elementary School. Others participating in the project are: Mike Wasserman, Priscilla Meckley and Jennifer Walsh from Capital Program Management, Inc.; Ron Gallagher from RP Gallagher & Associates; Zach Goodman, *murakami*/Nelson project

architect; and Ariana Canova on the *murakami*/Nelson project team. Mr. Nelson advised that a model of Havens was provided and encouraged audience members to take a look at the model after the presentation.

#### ARCHITECTURAL ISSUES

The concept design is based on correcting any identified deficiencies relating to accessibility, life/safety, and structural issues. One needs to keep in mind that the defined project needs to be approved by the Division of the State Architect (DSA). There will be a negotiation process in dealing with them. Everything presented tonight is in draft form. There will be additional discussions and meetings to go over this information again.

#### ADA and Accessibility

The layout of Havens causes problems. The main entrance off Oakland Avenue is not wheelchair accessible. A better access from the perimeter of the site to the school buildings needs to be provided. To do that, a ramp is being proposed on Bonita Avenue and disabled parking in the area of the main entry. Nothing will need to be done on Highland Avenue.

#### Within the school: Building A (K-1<sup>st</sup> Grade Wing, Library & Administration Area:

##### Option 1:

Improve the ramps within that section of the building so they comply with the current requirements for access. This involves changing the slope and the orientation of the ramps.

##### Option 2:

Remove the middle section of the building where the Administration area is and construct a new Administrative area (middle portion of building). The grading of the elevation would also need to be raised.

##### Option 3:

A variation of Option 1. This would involve moving the science and special education building to the exterior wall and putting a new circulation element adjacent to the courtyard.

#### Fire and Life Safety

##### Option 1:

Because of the proximity of the building to the property line adjacent to the residential property, Havens is too close and there should be a fire-rated wall. The wall generally meets the requirements of the building code but the windows and doors do not so changes in that area are being proposed. A one-hour fire-rated corridor system is needed in a portion of the building for exiting purposes for fire safety and there are other firewalls that no longer meet requirements and need two-hour fire resistance. That would allow the architects to keep the buildings generally the way they are without making significant improvements to the construction of the buildings.

Option 2:

A new infill building achieves many of the same objectives but it would be a new construction.

Option 3:

The third option is a partial interior remodel which would have the similar issue of a two-hour fire wall and one-hour fire wall at the rear.

Accessibility to Main Administration Area:

A possible option is a new off-street disabled parking space, which would be van accessible and would allow one to pull off the street, get out of the vehicle, and navigate a ramp which would lead to the main entry door. The ramp would be extended alongside the nurse's room and administrative area, creating another ramp which would reduce the size of the science building somewhat but it would provide an accessible ramp which would meet requirements, and another ramp which would take some space out of the courtyard and special education room.

There is another option which would be to do a pullout and dropoff on Oakland Avenue that would allow cars to get out of the travel lane and do dropoffs entering the school at Oakland Avenue, which is not able to be done at this point in time.

A portion of the building would be new construction in order to raise the elevation of the site by three feet.

A main corridor going down to the K-1 grade wings would be opened and a lift and stairs would be put in because there would be a six-foot grade change at that point.

Another proposal could be to change the windows and put a door in the middle of the library, rather than at the corners. In raising the grade, the classrooms in Building B would be able to exit directly onto grade. Right now there are a series of sub-standard stairs and ramps and other issues that are co-deficient.

Another alternative would be to place a handicapped space farther up the hill in a more level spot and put a small ramp in for access for the front of the school.

In a different option, the special education and science building could be "slid" to the exterior wall which would allow students to exit directly to the outside, so a one-hour fire wall corridor in the middle of the building would not be required, and then there would be another corridor that would have the stairs associated with it.

He said it must be remembered that whenever you do structural work, there is related architectural, electrical and mechanical work that goes along with it so if you take a wall apart to put in some strengthening element, you also have to put back all the finishes – the ceiling, the floors – all those things that would be

affected. There are impacts to other building systems. In the K-1 Wing, there are two approaches:

Option 1: use the brace frame scheme where the braces in the corridor are strengthened, and introduce braces at the perimeter

Option 2: create shear walls in the corridor and do not strengthen the brace frames and create a plywood diaphragm. It would be proposed to close the skylights but introduce three relatively large skylights in the corridor system to introduce lighting to that area.

#### Building B:

- There are a significant number of deficiencies from the exterior
  - the ramp access is currently a paved pathway that takes you from Building A. The ramp is deficient. It would have to be lengthened and handrails added in order to be co-compliant
  - the ramp system on the back side of the school next to the theater is deficient and a new ramp is proposed along with a series of stairs, moving the stairs a little away from the door as you come out of the building to make a more gracious navigation transition
  - there would be also be some modifications to the exterior
  - the exit out of each classroom would have to be changed because they are all non-compliant

#### Ellen Driscoll Theater

The work needed is extensive. Restrooms are not accessible to those in wheelchairs so one proposal is to have two unisex toilets or in another option, take over the kitchen and make a men's and women's room on one side. The seismic work is related to the amount of architecture work. A significant amount of work is needed at the proscenium.

There are some alternatives in regard to access to the stage area and music room.

### **SEISMIC STRENGTHENING OPTIONS**

Ron Gallagher presented the various Seismic Strengthening Options at Havens: These options will bring the building up to life safety standards for existing buildings that are rehabilitated under FEMA 356.

Option 1: The walls in the administration/library area need to be strengthened.

Option 2: take out the center core of the building – no structural concept yet

For the two classroom wings that are closed right now:

Option 1: the existing steel bracing is very deficient in the corridors and unsafe. Take the existing bracing out and put in new, stronger high-strength steel bracing, and add bracing also along the window lines.

Option 2: take out the bracing in the corridors and put in new plywood wood shear walls so that whole corridor would be very strong but to do this, a portion of the roof would have to be filled in to make a strong roof diaphragm of wood framing and plywood. Under this design concept, there would not be any bracing introduced on the exterior of the building.

Bldg B (2<sup>nd</sup> grade):

Option 1: the big weakness is that there are too many doors and windows on one side of the building (east side). The transverse walls are fairly strong so all the walls on the exterior wall on the east side of the building and along the inside and corridor could be strengthened. On the outside, brace steel frames could be installed. They would be hidden in the walls. However, the frames would require some foundation work.

Option 2: don't do any work along the west wall (problem wall) and solve the problem by strengthening the corridor walls the same as Option 1. Additionally, take the lower floor (ceiling level) [Explanation: above each room there is a ceiling and on top of the ceiling is diagonal wood sheeting and on top of the ceiling diaphragm is a roof so there are "two floors" above each classroom]. Each "lower floor" would be sheeted the whole length of the building and plywood added, making a structural diaphragm which would make the area above the rooms very strong so no bracing would have to be added on the outside. In both options, the roof would have to be taken off because there is other work to do.

Ellen Driscoll Theater – Building C:

Option 1: the heavy Spanish tile roof causes problems. This option would fix the building but still keep the tile on the roof as it is. There are basically two choices: the walls between the proscenium are very weak so they could be strengthened but the foundation would be rebuilt because they are somewhat narrow. This is a lot of work and in addition, some of the diagonal sheeting on the walls would have to be taken off and new plywood installed around the building to resolve the deficiencies and bring it up to FEMA 356 life/safety standards.

Option 2: don't do any work at the proscenium wall; there is mostly the same strengthening around the building. Two other walls would have to be strengthened. The tile roof would have to be taken off, then overlay the existing roofing material with diagonal sheeting with plywood, and then put the tile roof back on.

Mr. Nelson noted that the buildings have historic character and although the Theater is not a designated historic landmark, the architects are approaching the renovations according to the Secretary of the Interior Historic Standards. When the project is all finished, none of the strengthening work will be visible. The exact height and shape of the roof still needs to be ironed out.

### **COSTS:**

The components that drive the costs are:

- Structural upgrades
- Fire and Life Safety
- ADA and Accessibility
- Non-structural seismic hazards (items that could fall and cause harm; breaking glass, bracing of gas lines, etc.)
- Hazardous Materials abatement
- Cost Escalation factor (up to year 2010)

The replacement building cost is approximately \$2.8 million. Then there is an allowance for additional work.

The low-end estimate for work at Havens is: \$7.5 million

The high-end estimate for work at Havens, including replacing the Administrative area is \$15.9 million in construction costs.

Adding in the “soft costs” (permits, fees, design services, inspections, contingencies), the low-end cost estimate is a little over \$10 million, and the total approximate cost at the high end would be \$22.7 million.

The consultants were asked: how would these costs compare with replacing the entire school?

Mr. Nelson answered: for replacing the entire school, the low-end would be approximately \$21.6 million and the high end would be approximately \$32.4 million.

Mr. Nelson reiterated that this is only the *concept* design phase and there are still many issues to be resolved. The initial estimates are a starting point to show the magnitude of the project and the amount of work that is included.

President Lindenmayer advised the public that Board members heard this information earlier at a Steering Committee meeting.

Public Comment:

Billy Allen: he hopes the District will take a good look at significant cost options.

Dana Serleth: Building A West – replacing interior bracing and adding exterior bracing – what will the building look like? Mr. Nelson said the general answer is that those buildings already have rod bracing in them so the architect would do something somewhat compatible, such as rods being bigger to take the

higher loads on the exterior, and they would work with the pipe columns that are there now to keep it appealing.

Drew Bendon: He encouraged the District to have as many props and brochures as possible so people can have access to take a look at the information. He also encouraged the Board not to just sit and listen but to offer feedback. In terms of deciding whether to refurbish the buildings or build a new structure, he feels it is comparing apples to oranges and encourages the Board to flush out more information to get a better understanding of how the District might make those decisions. In the cost projections, there's a high and a low cost in terms of refurbished construction. The high and low reflect different levels of work that might be accomplished, but it's not clear to him what the high and low mean and whether the \$21 million might be functionally equivalent to the \$22 million that's the highest estimate for refurbishing, and what would we be getting for the money? In terms of the buildings themselves, there is a life expectancy of buildings and keeping them maintained. If we build new, the life expectancy would be longer than if we did a refurbishment. He would be interested in knowing what the long-term costs are in terms of maintaining the structures so that the numbers can be compared. For instance, if we are looking at comparing \$32 million versus \$22 million, but over the course of the next fifty years, it will cost the District five times as much to maintain the building and it is going to overtake the initial cost of construction, perhaps we would be getting more for our money by building a new building.

He heard in a meeting with Principal Susman that there are some functionality problems with the way the Havens campus is structured now and he would like to have some quantification of the value of improving the functionality of the building if the entire school were to be rebuilt.

He would like to know what the relative lengths of time would be in building a new building versus refurbishing the buildings we have now.

He also said that one of the assumptions with the Ellen Driscoll Theater is that the roof is going to be maintained and that because of that, there is a huge seismic requirement to upgrade it seismically. If the roof is not maintained - if there are other options - what would be required to maintain that building to make it safe and have some discussion about what the value of the tile roof is to the community?

President Lindenmayer advised that these are comments for which the Board is seeking public comment.

Michelle Eldridge: she would like to hear from the Board what the long-term plan is for the schools in general. One of the issues coming up is that for kindergarten, right now it is for three hours and we double up in the classrooms. However, eventually the State and federal government will be mandating a four or five-hour kindergarten, in which case we will need additional classrooms. She would like to know how that will be addressed and how that interplays with the seismic work. The same is true

with art and other things that are “wanting” and part of it is private involvement. There are other things that might need to be addressed. It might mean private funding or an additional bond. When will that discussion be held?

She also echoed Mr. Bendon’s concern about the Ellen Driscoll Theater. If it is historic in nature, perhaps there is another source of funding that can be used; she doesn’t think school dollars should be used for historic funding.

Lastly, if the Havens project is done in phased parts, she would like to request that the kindergarten or wings where students go to school are done first, rather than the Ellen Driscoll Theater.

George Childs: Looking at the dollars and cents of the project is where his focus is. In looking at the numbers, we need to keep in mind that this is only one of the schools that is going to require significant investment from the bond fund, which is limited to \$56 million. The highest end cost estimate for Havens will be eating up a lot of the bond measure funds. He hopes the deliberations that take place from now on will ensure that the District gets the “biggest bang for the buck”.

Lillis Stern: Several parents discussed that with the administrative wing option of rebuilding the center core area, it potentially would give the school the opportunity to add more classrooms or maybe make it two stories or maybe make the additional amount part of a private fundraising effort to make that part meet the greater needs of the continuing growth of the student population in kindergarten, etc. It gives more flexibility.

Mr. Nelson stated that the rehabilitation work has a degree of uncertainty; you’ll find things you didn’t expect when you open up the building. In terms of how the rehabilitation meets overall objectives versus a new building, that’s part of the dialogue to go through.

President Lindenmayer stated again that this information will be presented at future Board meetings.

2. Adopt Resolution 19-2006-07, “Resolution of Futility Regarding the Need to Formally Bid the Roof Replacement Work at Piedmont High School During the Piedmont Unified School District (PUSD) Bond Program as Authorized by Measure E (2006)”

Superintendent Hubbard advised that the Quad/Library building is really five separate buildings and the consultants are working on a design to figure out how best to retrofit the buildings. One of the mitigations that would make the buildings significantly safer in the short-term is to remove the heavy clay tiles from the building to allow more time for the building to be occupied and safer while planning is going on. It would be likening removing the students from the glass hallways in Havens. In order to do this, the tiles would have to be removed this summer. This resolution would permit the District to go ahead and remove the tiles without going through a traditional competitive bid process which would not give the District enough time to have all the specifications drawn up, all the bids received, and all work completed so that school is not interrupted for 2007-08. *murakami*/Nelson would do all of the specifications for the new roof. The old tiles would be taken off, wrapped and stored. Vila Construction would do the construction management portion

and get bids. The total cost for the development of the documents, specifications, construction management, removal and storage of the tile and new roof is not to exceed \$150,000.

The question was raised as to the difference between a traditional competitive bidding process and the bidders Vila Construction will pursue. Superintendent Hubbard explained that the traditional competitive bidding process has certain advertising and timing requirements and when the bids are opened, the District must accept the lowest bidder. It does not take into account availability, timeframe, etc. Someone could be the lowest bidder and even though they may say they will have the work completed within a certain timeframe, they may not. Vila Construction will look at three different companies, asking how much they will charge, can they meet the timeframe, and how will the company guarantee that the work will be done in a specific timeframe. It may not be the lowest bid in the technical term of bidding but it would be a firm who meets our needs in terms of timing which is more valuable to us than money can buy versus having students disrupted beyond the timeframe. This type of bidding process will match the District's immediate needs, plus ensure that the District is looking at competitive costs.

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois and seconded by Vice President Monach to adopt Resolution 19-2006-07, "Resolution of Futility Regarding the Need to Formally Bid the Roof Replacement Work at Piedmont High School During the Piedmont Unified School District (PUSD) Bond Program as Authorized by Measure E (2006)".

Resident George Childs questioned what the approximate cost would be for a temporary roof. Superintendent Hubbard responded approximately \$64,000.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Update by Board Subcommittee on Public Engagement Process

Vice President Monach advised the public to go to the Piedmont Unified School District bond web site ([www.pusdbond.org](http://www.pusdbond.org)) for the KCOM schedule of previous meetings discussing bond program issues. A main meeting yet to be determined will be held for Havens community, staff and parents regarding design concepts is being planned and a press release will go out along with an announcement in the weekly school newsletters. She encouraged everyone to attend the April 30 joint community meeting between the City and School District at 7:30 p.m. in the Piedmont Community Hall regarding civic center master planning.

Board Member Gadbois added that at least three more opportunities to discuss and receive input regarding Havens will take place at the Board Workshop on Monday, May 7, from 8-10 a.m.; and the regular Board meetings of May 9 and May 23, at 7:00 p.m. All of the meetings will be held at the City Council Chambers. There may be an additional evening meeting, also.

Change in Order of Agenda

Item C. Conduct Review of Proposed Textbooks for Adoption, Grades K-12

Dr. Roth introduced Jamie Adams, Director of Curriculum, and announced her newly-conferred title of “Dr.” Jamie Adams.

The proposed textbooks for adoption are:

- “California Science”, Grades 4-5
- “Full Option Science System”, Grades K-5
- “Focus on Earth Science”, Grade 6
- “Focus on Physical Science”, Grade 8
- “Physical Science with Earth Science, Grade 9
- “Chemistry”, Grades 10, 11, 12
- “Physics: Principles and Applications”, Grades 11, 12
- “Biotechnology: Science for the Millennium”, Grades 11-12

Jamie Adams, Director of Curriculum, advised that teachers recommended the above textbooks following the feedback received during Curriculum Council meetings. The Curriculum Council was not involved in selecting the textbooks; the teachers made the recommendations, along with the support of District administrative staff.

Ms. Adams reviewed some of the reasons why the above textbooks were preferred by staff over other textbooks.

Grade 7 has not yet made a decision because teachers felt the one main area of need was in the health curriculum of their science program so they diverted from looking at solely health books. Instead of getting a new textbook at the grade level, they will get a new health textbook.

The Biotechnology textbooks will be at no charge to the District because it is an ROP (Regional Occupation Program) and paid for by ROP funds.

Ms. Adams announced that on Thursday, May 3, a K-12 science curriculum program for next year will be presented at the Piedmont Middle School multipurpose room from 7:00-8:30 p.m. Also, after that event, a group email will be put together for those interested in math adoption for next year. Parents who want to participate should email Ms. Adams at [jadams@piedmont.k12.ca.us](mailto:jadams@piedmont.k12.ca.us) so they can be added to the group email list.

The textbooks proposed will be on display at the District Office and it is anticipated they will be adopted at the Board meeting of June 13, 2007.

Item B. Adopt Resolution 20-2006-07, “Resolution of Futility Regarding the Need to Formally Bid the Work for the Replacement of the Witter Field Complex Field Turf Playing Field and Track”

At a previous Board meeting, the Board authorized the Superintendent to enter into negotiations for a contract with the company “FieldTurf” in order to move forward to obtain more information on the renovation of the Witter Complex football field and track. The company “FieldTurf” has agreed to replace the existing football field by tearing out the existing turf and disposing of same; upgrading the turf to monofilament fiber (newest material on the market); and adding permanent (stitched) soccer lines, hash marks, numbers, and a simple logo (“P”) in the middle for a total cost of \$219,000.

For the track, alternatives looked at were to:

- repaint and respray the existing track, including some general “cleanup” work: \$107,000 or
- remove the present track and replace it with a BSS-300 embedded track system which is the best of the track surfaces: \$299,000 (8-year warranty)

The alternative being looked at by the District is to leave the old track, clean it up, and have the new BSS-300 surface substance “sandwiched” onto the old track. There would be a five-year warranty. D-zones were looked at where the pits are and with Wildwood Elementary School using that play field so much and with the constant rental of the field and because much of that area is used for little kids’ soccer, it would be a significant loss of green playing surface so that will not be done and the District will instead look at pit covers.

Assistant Superintendent Michael Brady added that to put in a permanent track at the south end d-zone would involve grading and concrete work and then replacing it with turf which would elongate the process and go beyond summer.

In the north d-zone, there is an area for shotput and the bid also includes removing that and replacing it with turf for more green space.

There was also concern about water being able to infiltrate the new “sandwich” surface of the track. However, because a four-inch strip on the inside perimeter of the existing track will be cut, the new top will overlay the existing top and will be sealed and become impermeable.

The funding sources will be from the Capital Facilities Fund, bond proceeds originally issued in 1996 for the installation of Witter Field and other construction projects in the District (use of funds verified by legal counsel), and from financing not to exceed \$200,000 which will release current lease obligations already designated for Witter Field. It may be possible that the District may not have to renew a lease. If not, then the District would make a proposal to set aside the equivalent lease amount for future replacement. More will be known about that in June when the 2007-08 budget is discussed. It will be shown as a lease or set-aside.

Additional work included in the price of \$500,000 is:

- covers over the sandpits
- installation of new box for pole vault
- flashing around the goal posts
- on the north end: no mechanism for discus cage so removable sleeves and a portable cage will be used
- Removable shotput curbs

Superintendent Hubbard added that there is some dissatisfaction at not having Lacrosse lines sewn in. This is a case where you cannot make everyone happy.

“FieldTurf” will begin work on June 18, 2007.

Vila Construction will oversee the work.

Board Member Gadbois commended District staff for being prudent but effective within the timeframe allotted.

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois and seconded by Board Member Tolles to adopt Resolution 20-2006-07, “Resolution of Futility Regarding the Need to Formally Bid the Work for the Replacement of the Witter Field Complex Field Turf Playing Field and Track”, not to exceed \$500,000.

Resident George Childs thanked the Board and staff for their diligence in following through on this matter that will save the District and taxpayers a substantial amount of money.

President Lindenmayer added that the company “FieldTurf” held to their prices of two years ago.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

Item D. Conduct Public Hearing on the Proposed Levy of the Current 2006-07 Parcel Tax, To Be Assessed in 2007-08; and Adopt Resolution 21-2006-07 (Measure B) and Resolution 22-2006-07 (Measure C)

Parcel Tax Measures B and C were approved by the voters in 2005, to start with 2006 and this is the end of the first year of Measures B and C. It is required that a public hearing be conducted on the levy of a tax prior to the levy. This is the third time this item has been on the agenda. A parcel tax calendar was provided in the Board agenda packet.

The Board Finance Subcommittee, Board Members Ray Gadbois and Board Member Cathie Geddeis, reviewed the parcel tax from a different viewpoint.

The recommendation by the Superintendent is to levy the 5% increase for 2007-08 because it is fiscally prudent. She realizes it was hoped the tax could be maintained but it is not a responsible choice fiscally, especially in looking at multi-year projections.

Three variations were presented: maintain the current parcel tax rate; raise the levy by 3%; or raise the levy by 5%.

If the District does not raise the tax at all, it will suffer negative revenue in 2007-08, which increases in 2008-09 and 2009-10.

A 3% levy would cost the average taxpayer \$53/year (for both measures). Although the increase helps with the revenue in 2007-08, costs could very possibly not be met in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The projections are without collective bargaining being completed or any program improvements.

A 5% levy would cost the average taxpayer \$89/year (for both measures). With a 5% increase, the District will be in the positive for 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10.

The Board Finance Subcommittee (Board Members Ray Gadbois and Cathie Geddeis) conducted an analysis of

Revenue Growth from 2007-08 to 2010-2011. Their purpose was to take a longer view of a model that the District could have as a strategy that is more predictable and sustainable.

Funding resources are not unlimited. State and Federal funding are 68% of the resources; the parcel tax revenues are 26%, and community donations and fund raising are 6%. The community cannot be asked to continually bear the costs.

Board Member Gadbois stated that when we come to available revenue growth, what that really means is, that is all that is left to pay for every single cost increase that may occur for that school year, such as negotiated raises, increase in health insurance costs, books, supplies, energy costs, etc.). Basically what the chart presented indicates is that the District has less than 1% to pay for any of those things (for 2007-08) which is unrealistic, and the District would have to cut staff or programs in order to balance the budget.

Board Member Geddeis added that their figures are assuming that the District's base funding level stays the same in terms of enrollment. If there is a decline in enrollment, the net revenue growth would be even lower.

For 2008-09 and forward, the District is more in the 2.3-2.8% range of available revenue growth.

Both Board members concurred with the Superintendent's recommendation to increase the parcel tax by 5%.

Superintendent Hubbard added that neither model (hers or the Board Finance Subcommittee's) included postemployment benefit costs.

Resident George Childs asked why Piedmont taxpayers would have to fund more than what the State funds. He is also concerned about declining enrollment. At some point, consideration will have to be given to what potential declining enrollment might have on the need for the parcel tax or some element of it. He is also concerned about GASB 45: how will the District struggle with how it is going to be funded?

Vice President Monach acknowledged that the school board has received and reviewed emails regarding the parcel tax from the public in response to a *Piedmonter* article.

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis and seconded by Vice President Monach to adopt Resolution 21-2006-07, "Resolution Establishing the Amount of Measure B Tax To Be Raised and the Levy Rate Per Parcel for Fiscal Year 2007-08, to be Assessed as of July 1, 2007", increasing the Measure B tax by 5%.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois and seconded by Board Member Tolles to adopt Resolution 22-2006-07,

“Resolution Establishing the Amount of Measure C Tax To Be Raised and the Levy Rate Per Parcel for Fiscal Year 2007-08, to be Assessed as of July 1, 2007”, increasing the Measure C tax by 5%.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

Adopt Resolution 23-2006-07, “Day of the Teacher – May 9, 2007”

Superintendent Hubbard advised that one day has been set aside by the District to honor both teachers and classified employees [breakfast rolls at each site], which is May 16. Individual parent clubs also honor the employees at sites.

It was moved by Vice President Monach and seconded by Board Member Geddeis to adopt Resolution 23-2006-07.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

Adopt Resolution 24-2006-07, “Classified School Employee Week – May 20-26, 2007”

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois and seconded by Board Member Tolles to adopt Resolution 24-2006-07.

The Board was polled and the motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEM  
Discuss District Goals for 2007-08

The Board agreed last school year to place the discussion of District goals on an agenda earlier in the school year to coincide with the budget development and parcel tax process. In addition, this year, the Board solicited feedback from Piedmont citizens, parents, and school staff on the job the Board is doing to meet the goals and any comments for future goals. The survey can be accessed at the District web site or <http://www.usrveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=620723596546>. The deadline for submitting survey responses is May 8.

Assistant Superintendent David Roth liked the wording and idea of “continuous improvement” on the present goals. He talked about topics of assessment, research-based methodologies, instruction and programs. District-wide professional development ideas has been a largely-discussed topic at both administrator meetings and faculty staff meetings. He mentioned the concept of starting a Wellness Center at the secondary level.

Vice President Monach stated that objectives should be short, middle and long term to help everyone in setting priorities.

Board Member Gadbois put forth his suggestions and had “to do” lists for each but due to the late hour, did not go into detail:

- Assessment of educational program; math review
- Bond program
- Closely monitor District finances
- Technology improvements

Vice President Monach thought a calendar of Board items routinely discussed each school year would help the public to provide feedback.

District Goals will be discussed again at the May 9 and May 23 Board meetings.

#### INFORMATION / ANNOUNCEMENT

2006 Base Academic Performance Index (API) Index (API) Report

Assistant Superintendent David Roth said that at the beginning of the school year, the growth API District-wide was discussed. Our District has the second highest API score of Unified School Districts in the State (917). The growth API comes out in March as the Base API; in August we will get our new growth rate based on the STAR testing presently occurring.

Notification of Grants Awarded Through the 2007 Piedmont Educational Foundation Spring Grant Program

The Piedmont Educational Foundation was extremely generous in awarding a total of \$172,400 for grants for this spring. \$95,000 has been set aside from the PEF funds, along with \$35,000 donated by the Lois Blair Rawlings Educational Foundation, for District-wide staff development opportunities. This will allow the District to do planning for extensive K-12 staff development. Dr. Roth will provide an update at a future Board meeting.

Vice President Monach was excited to hear the recommenders and the grants committee speak of how these dollars can be leveraged to benefit all students.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Emails from citizens regarding the parcel tax were already mentioned.

#### BOARD REPORTS

Vice President Monach served as a Board liaison during the elementary principal search; she attended the PEF reception and their regular meeting; the Alameda County School Boards Association Student Recognition get-together; a Board Workshop, PRAISE reception and a City-School District Liaison meeting.

Board Member Geddeis acknowledged the PEF reception and the wonderful way they thanked their donors; also, the speakers were "truly inspirational".

Board Member Gadbois: Commented that the Middle School Parents Club is very interested in the school's technology vision. They are looking for ways to fund additional technology. Parents are also interested in learning more about the District Technology Plan and seeing demonstrations of *Smartboard*.

Board Member Tolles attended the PEF reception, also and agreed that the speakers were inspirational. He also sat on the Beach principal interview process.

President Lindenmayer thanked Deidre and Michael Coen for opening their home for the PRAISE reception.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR: ACTION ITEMS

President Lindenmayer acknowledged donations by parent Bijan Zahedi in the amount of \$1,000 to the District, and a matching fund donation in the amount of \$1,000 by AnneMarie O'Brien and the Pfizer Foundation Volunteer Program, for the Piedmont High School Program.

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis, seconded by Vice President Monach, and passed unanimously to approve all of the items presented on the Consent Calendar as follows:

1. Accept Donations (as noted above)
2. Adopt Regular Board meeting minutes of March 28, 2007
3. Approve Personnel Action Report
4. Approve Monthly Financial Report of the District for March 2007
5. Approve District Warrant List dated April 20, 2007 for Goods and Services Rendered
6. Approve 2006-07 *Single Plan for Student Achievement*, School Safety Plans, and Site Block Discretionary Grant for:
  - Piedmont Middle School (SPFSA)
  - Piedmont High School (SPFSA)
  - Millennium High School (SPFSA & Safety Plan)
  - Adult Education (Site Block Discretionary Grant)(Elementary school plans were approved at the Board meeting of March 28, 2007)
7. Approve District's Five Year Deferred Maintenance Plan for the Following Facilities: Beach Elementary School, Havens Elementary School, Wildwood Elementary School, Piedmont Middle School, Piedmont High School, Millennium High School
8. Approve Quarterly Report (January 1, 2007-March 31, 2007) of Complaints Received Under the Williams Settlement Agreement
9. Approve California Instructional School Garden Program: *Flourishing and Nourishing Grant Application*
10. Approve North Region Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Assurances
11. Approve Overnight Field Trip for Millennium High School as a community building event as recommended by WASC, to be held at Tilden Park on May 3-4, 2007
12. Approve Student Teaching Fieldwork and Student Teaching Agreement Between District and Chapman University, effective July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2010
13. Ratify Agreement Between District and Office of Kern County Superintendent as Administrative Agent for the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) Which in Turn Administers the California School Information Services (CSIS), Effective April 5, 2007 through June 30, 2009
14. Approve Management Plan for Financing Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) In Accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 45

President Lindenmayer advised that a Special Board Meeting (Open Session) has been called for Wednesday, May 2 at 3:30 p.m. in the District Administration Office for the purpose of appointing the new Principal for Beach Elementary School.

FUTURE REGULAR BOARD MEETING  
AGENDA ITEMS

Future Regular Board Meeting Agenda Items:  
(subject to change)

- District Goals for 2007-08 (Apr 25/May 9/May 23)

- Continued Discussion on Repair Options, Cost Estimates, Havens Elementary School (May 9/May 23)
- Appoint Principal, Beach Elementary School (May 9)
- Recognition of 2007 Arthur Hecht Volunteer of the Year (May 9)
- Review of Board Bylaws (Section 9000) (June)

Tentative Board Workshops (subject to change/cancellation):

- Monday, April 23, 2007, 8-10 a.m., City Council Chambers  
Subject: PUSD Bond Program: Capital Program Management, Inc. / Decision-Making Models – Effects on Time
- Monday, May 7, 2007, 8-10 a.m., City Council Chambers  
Subject: Havens School Design Options
- Monday, June 11, 2007, 8-10 a.m., City Council Chambers  
Subject: TBA

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:53 p.m.

---

WARD LINDENMAYER, Board President  
Piedmont Unified School District  
Board of Education

---

CONSTANCE HUBBARD, Superintendent  
Secretary, Piedmont Unified School District  
Board of Education