

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

MINUTES OF
Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

May 23, 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. Conference with District Labor Negotiator Constance Hubbard Regarding Negotiations with the California School Employees Association (CSEA), Chapter 60 (Government Code Section 54956.6) B. Conference with District Labor Negotiator Constance Hubbard Regarding Negotiations with the Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) (Government Code Section 54956.6) C. Public Employee Performance Evaluation: Superintendent (Government Code Section 54957)
OTHERS PRESENT FOR CLOSED SESSION	Constance Hubbard, Superintendent Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services David Roth, Ph.D., Asst. Superintendent, Educational Services
RECONVENE TO REGULAR SESSION	Board President Ward Lindenmayer called the Regular Session of the Board of Education meeting of May 23, 2007 to order at 7:08 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	Not present (excused)

PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK ON
ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA None

Superintendent

Superintendent Hubbard reported that the WASC Accreditation Committee has given Millennium High School a six-year accreditation ending June 30, 2013, with a midterm review.

Board President

Board President Lindenmayer reported that:

- On May 24, there will be a retirement celebration for Nancy McHugh from 6:15-6:45 p.m.; the program will be from 6:45-7:15 p.m. and the Beach Open House will be from 7:15 to 8:15 p.m.
- May 24 is the Havens 5th grade spring concert at the Ellen Driscoll Theater, 7 p.m.
- May 24 is the MHS Drama Production, "Peter Pan", at 7:00 p.m. at the Veterans Hall
- May 25 is the PAINTS Annual Bird House Auction and Gala, from 5-7:30 p.m. at 55 Sea View
- Thursday, June 7 is the second MHS Drama Production of "Peter Pan" and the MHS Showcase. The showcase is at 6:30 p.m. and the drama begins at 7:00 p.m. at the Veterans Hall
- Thursday, June 7 is the Beach Science Fair from 6:30-7:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, June 13 is the Piedmont Middle School Ceremony of Completion at the PHS gym, 4:00 p.m.
- Thursday, June 14 is the PHS Graduation, 5 p.m., Witter Field
- June 18-July 16 is the APCP Summer School, Grades K-5
- June 18-July 13 is the APCP Summer School, Grades 9-12

REVIEW & ACTION ITEMS

A. Bond Program:

1. Havens Repair Options and Cost Estimates - Update

The Board was scheduled to hear a fourth presentation on the repair options and cost estimates for Havens School and provide direction as to next steps. However, additional clarification of the options and cost estimates from the consultants, and feedback/recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee were needed prior to the Board providing any direction. Therefore, more information will be forthcoming at the May 23 Board meeting. Additionally, a Havens community meeting has been scheduled for May 30 as an additional opportunity for parents/interested community members to listen to the options and give additional feedback.

Board Member Gadbois wanted to clarify that the Superintendent thinks it is not likely that the Board will be in a position at the next Board meeting to make a decision on Havens, and that she is thinking it may be better to wait until the fall until the Board hears about all the projects before it makes such a large decision on Havens. The Superintendent responded that she was basically saying that, but there may be a juncture at the next Board meeting where the Board may want

to have more information on a Havens option.

The Technical Advisory Committee will be meeting before the June 13th meeting and the structural subcommittee will be meeting before then, also. The TAC wants to develop some questions to ask the consultants.

Board Member Gadbois stated he would like to hear more precise information about the costs and more comparison figures on replacement because the numbers seemed really large to him. He would also like to know about the benefits of the various options.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this issue.

2. Presentation of Beach Elementary School Tier 2 Analysis – Structural, Accessibility and Fire/Life Safety Report

Ron Gallagher of RP Gallagher Engineers, and John Nelson, President of *murakami*/Nelson Architects, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the findings as follows:

Investigation & Analysis (Ron Gallagher)

Beach School was built in several sections. Their investigation involved the original buildings built in the 1930's and the modular building; they did not evaluate the structural aspects of the 1990's wing since it was a DSA-approved project but they did look at that building's relationship in terms of accessibility and life safety.

The school is on a steep hillside and in the back of the school there is a high retaining wall; there is also a steep dropoff by the portables down to the children's play area. This was the context for the project.

Seismic

3 structures at the site:

- . 1930s building, ASCE 32 Tier 2 evaluation conducted
- . 1990's addition – not studied
- . Portable P-1 – ASCE 31 Tier 1 conducted

There is an expansion (separation joint) between the 1990's building and the 1930's building.

1930's Building

- Does not meet Tier 2 Life/Safety Criteria
- Many shear walls are overstressed
- Roof diaphragms are okay
- Many footings are okay

In comparison with the Havens 2nd grade building, the demand capacity is very similar.

In the administration wing (west side), the walls have to support a lot of the roof and ceiling.

Expected Performance in a Large Earthquake (6.5 on the Hayward Fault):

- Unlikely to collapse
- Racking of walls
- Damage to walls and ceilings
- Possible residual lean

Portable P-1:

- Meets Tier 1 Life/Safety Criteria
- Unlikely to collapse
- Extensive water damage and rot

A non-structural survey was conducted for the 1930's building, 1990's building and P-1 Portable:

- Some hazards found, such as
 - unrestrained TV stands
 - pendant fluorescent light fixtures
 - file cabinets without drawer locks (could open and injure someone)
- Most items were rated low risks

If there is visible residual lean, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) would probably "yellow tag" the building, perhaps "red tag" it, and DSA would probably not allow the structure to be used.

ADA/Accessibility and Life Safety (John Murakami)

- Barriers along exterior path of travel to primary entrance
- Lack of code compliant directional signage and room identification signage
- No accessible route to some areas (i.e., P-1 building)
- Older areas of building non-compliant
- Parking and drop-off area not code-compliant

Within the school, there are issues as regards to stairs, handrails, inadequate landing size; and issues in some of the classrooms in regard to clearances for sinks. Many of the doors are too narrow and do not meet the requirements for access. Similar problems are at the other end of the building.

Administrative area:

- Several restrooms are inaccessible to the disabled
- Kitchen inaccessible to the disabled

Main Entrance to school:

- Main entrance inaccessible to the disabled – would have to travel 400 feet to get to entrance

Auditorium:

- No access to the stage
- Portable lifts no longer allowed; lifts are now required to be flush with the floor and would have to be a permanent installation

- Hallway in the back not wide enough
- Doors to auditorium all too narrow for accessibility
- Art room under stage area is accessible only by stairs and not a ramp so that would have to be modified

1990's section

- Temporary stairs built on the back of the building; landings and clearances not in compliance

Fire and Life Safety

- Main building does not have an automatic sprinkler system throughout or secondary exterior exits to code
- Main corridor does not meet requirements for 1-hour rating
- Number of exit door issues
- Doors not rated or corridor wall
- Many door widths not compliant for accessibility

In the 1990's section:

- Wall not rated so one would be exiting into a non-rated corridor
- Egress at the back of the building has non-compliance life safety issues

P-1 Portable:

- Potential issue where the portable is adjacent to a property line and windows to the portable are too close to the property line (still being confirmed)

Auditorium:

- Sprinklers only in auditorium and back stage; no fire sprinklers elsewhere
- Railings in various areas of the building are non-compliant
- Exits not to code

Walkway width in the back of the 1995 classroom addition is too narrow for means of egress.

Library:

- No egress

Next steps:

- Supplemental investigation
- Peer reviewer input
- Issue final report
- Concept design / cost estimate for correcting deficiencies
- Public engagement process on concept design
- School board decision on concept design
- Proceed with design and construction upon Board authorization

Board Member Gadbois asked about the retaining wall adjacent to the sidewalk on Linda Avenue. Mr. Nelson responded that the geotechnical engineer looked at the wall. It is moving

however, retaining walls don't fail catastrophically but the wall does need to be addressed in an overall program of repair. In an earthquake, it could be a risk. The wall is lightly reinforced and the reinforcement is rusted through in some areas.

Board Member Gadbois also asked why, for one of the buildings where the window is too close to the property line of an adjacent property, is that considered a life safety risk. Mr. Nelson said it is more of a technical issue. Because of the adjacent use, the Building Code says your adjacent neighbor could build up to the property line. They could have a wall there and a building right on the property line, so if you have an opening (window) and it's adjacent to a property line, there is a higher risk. The distance from the property line to the building if it has a window in it is ten feet, and the area being spoken of is less than 10 feet. The architect is still trying to confirm the property line title through title reports. The other property is City property.

Board Member Gadbois asked about the tile roof at Beach - why is it less of a risk than the high school roof? Mr. Nelson said it is a different kind of risk. Wood frame buildings are more of a redundant structure versus the high school quad building which is a very heavy massive building with a weak diaphragm. The wood frame buildings perform differently. They are greatly overstressed because of the weight of the tile, but if we take the tile off at Beach, it will still be greatly overstressed.

Mr. Gallagher said that quad building at the high school has a very weak diaphragm. The diaphragms at Beach are basically okay and have diagonal sheathing.

At the high school quad building, the diaphragms span a great distance – much greater than allowed by rule – as well as the stresses are very high. In some cases, there isn't even a shear wall at the end of the diaphragm.

The tile does not have to be taken off Beach.

Board Member Gadbois asked how might the 30's building perform in an earthquake, to which Mr. Gallagher replied the 30's building at Beach would likely be yellow tagged but if there was a lot of wall racking, it might possibly be red tagged.

Vice President Monach asked if you spend over a certain amount of State modernization funds, it triggers a certain level of ADA or accessibility requirements: is the trigger the program or project-specific? Mr. Nelson responded that if you have a project larger than \$120,000, you have a whole series of modernization projects that you would have to do. DSA does not allow you to do a little each year. If you are doing work, they want to make sure you are doing the ADA/accessibility requirement, also. They may also ask for accessibility within the classrooms, for example, the classroom sinks. The portable building is non-accessible. Right now it is not being used as a classroom – only 2 hours a week for music. In the past, it has been used as a classroom. Mr. Nelson felt DSA would look at that as not meeting the requirements as a classroom.

Board Member Tolles asked, on the portable building, where the window is, what is the issue? Mr. Nelson explained that if the pathway is your means of egress, you would not want to be walking along the pathway where the window is. You would have a mitigation of a "protected" opening which would prevent the glass from breaking.

Sloughing would not occur at Beach, as it would at the high school.

The proscenium wall at Beach has a concrete wall for the art and mechanical storage room below, so it is equivalent to a giant footing so there is no problem.

The Ellen Driscoll Theater has small footings under the proscenium wall.

Resident and Citizens' Oversight Committee member George Childs asked: it strikes him that quite a lot of the Beach school issues are similar to Havens. One significant issue was the photo showing the rather narrow egress from behind the 90's building up against the retaining wall. It is a significant issue for developing a life safety for that structure.

Resident and Technical Advisory Committee member Bill Drum suggested that a set of questions be developed that the Board might ask to help in deciding which of all the alternatives are going to be approved. He added that addressing seismic issues involves safety and continuity of education and that it is obvious that you would fix a building that has a real risk to the occupants. The other questions involve: how well is the building going to function after an earthquake? How are we going to continue continuity of education for the students of Piedmont, and how many of the buildings do we need to retain that DSA is going to allow to be used after minimal correction? This is the basic set of questions to ask the consultants for which they will give probabilities.

3. Approve Proposal by Fidelity Roof Company for Removal of Existing Roof and Installation of Temporary Roof, 30's Building/Library (Quad), Piedmont High School

Superintendent Hubbard advised that the District is still proceeding on removing the roof tiles at the high school. Vila Construction Company, the consulting construction management firm hired by the District, has recommended the services of Fidelity Roof Company at a cost of \$37,793, which includes removal of the tile, saving and storing the tile, and placing a composition single roof with a five-year guarantee. The Board authorized the process of obtaining a roofing company to do this at a previous Board meeting through a futility resolution.

The Board asked how the bidding process was handled. Assistant Superintendent Michael Brady explained that there were four companies who did walk-throughs with District staff and Vila Construction Company and then provided their estimates. The scope of work was defined by John Nelson of *murakami*/Nelson so a full set of plans was not needed.

The work will be completed prior to the start of the 2007-08 school year.

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois, seconded by Board Member Tolles, and approved unanimously to approve the proposal by Fidelity Roof Company for the removal of the existing roof and installation of the temporary roof, 30's Building/Library (Quad) at Piedmont High School, at a total cost not to exceed \$37,793 (Vila Construction Company fee: \$8,000 plus contingency).

4. Approve Agreement Between District and *murakami/Nelson* Architects & Engineers for:
 - Piedmont High School Priority Buildings (30's Building/Library [Quad]), Student Center and Alan Harvey Theater Conceptual Design
 - Additional Materials and Geotechnical Investigation of Piedmont High School 30's Building/Library (Quad)
 - Evaluation of Piedmont High School Non-Priority Buildings

Superintendent Hubbard explained that the agreement is in three parts: the first part is for the architectural and engineering services for the next development of plans for the high school 30's building/library (quad) for concept designs, not to exceed \$380,000; additional materials testing and geotechnical investigation not to exceed \$184,000; and evaluation of non-structural seismic hazards, access, and fire and life safety at the high school in terms of seismic deficiencies not to exceed \$103,000, for a grand total amount not to exceed \$668, 100.

This is a standard comprehensive contract approved by all attorneys involved on both sides.

Mike Wasserman of CPM explained that the next step is that now the evaluations have been completed on the three priority building at the high school, conceptual solutions can be developed. The cost of \$380,000 will be split between *murakami/Nelson*, RP Gallagher, the cost estimator and reimbursable allowances.

The \$184,300 is for additional materials and geotechnical investigations. Some of the foundations will have to be unearthed as a result of not having the drawings of the building. It will be necessary to find out exactly how the reinforcing is installed and how the footings were constructed so it can be properly analyzed to provide best solutions to correct the deficiencies. Two-thirds of the costs go to the materials testing company itself.

The \$103,800 is for the non-structural seismic hazards access and life safety evaluations on the non-priority buildings not yet examined at the high school. The costs will be paid to a combination of *murakami/Nelson* and their consultants in order to produce a report. Mike Wasserman of CPM stated this is a comprehensive agreement.

Mr. Wasserman also indicated that this proposal does not include non-priority buildings for Havens. All of the buildings at Havens have now been looked at.

Board Member Gadbois asked what the average rate is being charged for working on these projects; he was trying to understand the number of hours for the different projects.

Mr. Wasserman explained that CPM takes a look at a detailed breakdown that identifies all the different scopes – the different people and their rates and other things like reimbursable allowances that aren't directly translated into hours. They look at the breakdown information to see if it is a reasonable amount of time. It is not a lump-sum agreement; it is the hours worked for which the District pays.

CPM reviews the hourly billings and performs due diligence on all invoices. Invoices are submitted with detailed backup and then CPM reviews the recaps to make sure everything is within budget.

No concepts for replacement will be presented for the High School; it will be repair options, only.

Mr. Wasserman said October 24th is the timeline anticipated for bringing forth the conceptual design on the High School. There will also be some possible solutions presented for use of the Student Center.

George Childs asked for clarification of the buildings covered in the \$103,800 – what structures are they? Are they structures identified as in need of upgrade or not?

Superintendent Hubbard explained these are buildings that are in the third group of buildings (non-priority) to be looked at that passed the Tier 1 evaluation and did not require a Tier 2 evaluation, but because the language in the bond measure was to reduce damage and improve safety of all structures in the District, we are also committed to looking at non-structural seismic hazards, accessibility and fire and life safety. Those buildings are the science building, 10's building, 40's building and the gymnasiums.

Mr. Nelson said the fire alarm system campus-wide is deficient at the high school and will have to be addressed. Regarding falling hazards at the high school, even though the building itself may perform adequately, the potential danger from falling hazards can cause as much damage and/or injury as the damage to the building, such as pendant-mounted light fixtures.

Ken Jensen, Technical Advisory Committee member, advised to be sure to remove the referral to the Havens Elementary School on page 20 of the *murakami*/Nelson contract.

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis, seconded by Vice President Monach, and passed unanimously to approve the agreement between the District and *murakami*/Nelson for the work on the high school buildings, with the correction that the Havens non-priority buildings have already been evaluated and not part of the contract, in an amount not to exceed \$668,100.

5. Update by Board Subcommittee on Public Engagement Process

Vice President Monach said the subcommittee met this week to identify ways of bringing the web site more up to date and provide a listing of the various meetings that involve bond measure issues. The "Frequently Asked Questions" is being

updated and the subcommittee is trying to work out the mechanics for posting executive summaries and links to reports that are logistically large files. The third newsletter is being worked on. Over the summer, the subcommittee will be working with the Center for Collaborative Policy to revamp the District's public engagement strategy and communications plan.

Discussion ensued about framing questions for the upcoming May 30 Havens community meeting.

Resident and Technical Advisory Committee member Ken Jensen said that one of the areas of the public engagement process that could be improved on is the information dissemination. There needs to be a more effective way of providing the press and public of more documentation that they can look at. There is a perception that there is not open availability of information and perhaps there could be some structured way of accessing consultants.

Review and Adopt Regular Board Meeting Schedule for 2007-08

Superintendent Hubbard advised that the regular Board meeting schedule presented has since changed since publication in the Board agenda. Therefore, the calendar will return for adoption on the Consent Calendar at the next Board meeting.

She added that for the 2007-08 school year, the Board may have to look at not having Board Workshops in the Council Chambers, having the workshops at different times, and/or having them at the District Office. She felt that since the Board is interested in having more programmatic workshops that aren't Measure E-related, they could be easily held at the District Office but not taped during work hours because of the disruption to employees. These would still be open meetings.

Approve Awarding of the 2007 Spring Noda Grants

The purpose of the Hideo Benjamin Noda Memorial Fund is to provide annual grants for the support of the visual arts in Grades 6-12. Criteria for grant proposals may include field trips, purchase of equipment and supplies, interns and assistantships, guest artists and lecturers, juror's stipends, display space, gallery, art department facility improvement, funding to support adequate visual art class offerings, and reference collections.

The interest earned from the sale of the Noda artwork (has ranged between \$2,800-\$3,500) is used every year for this purpose. When the interest rates went down, part of the corpus was disturbed so instead, money was taken out of the General Fund for the grants. This year, \$3,500 was set aside from the General Fund. A committee was convened to review the grants and a list of those recommended was presented. The Superintendent is recommending that the grants be funded in the amount of \$3,688.

It was moved by Board Member Geddeis, seconded by Board Member Gadbois, and passed unanimously to approve the Spring 2007 Noda Grants in the amount of \$3,688.

REVIEW & DISCUSSION ITEM
Discuss District Goals for 2007-08

Each year the Board of Education and the Superintendent set goals to advance the mission of the school district. Draft 2007-08 general goals were provided as follows:

- Educational Program
- Communications Practices
- Technology Plan
- Bond Program
- Financial Management

Superintendent Hubbard read the mission statement of the District.

The draft goals were developed from looking at last year's goals, the *Single Plan for Student Achievement* of all school sites, and the three-year Technology Education Plan. Ideas and feedback obtained from Board members, staff, and the District Goals online survey were also integrated into the 2007-08 goals.

Vice President Monach summarized the responses from the online survey and synthesized comments as follows:

- Respondents care very much about the educational program their students are receiving.
- Respondents felt the curriculum review was excellent
- Respondents wish instruction could be refined or modified more to spark intellectual curiosity in their student.
- Respondents commented about working harder to cultivate independent learners
- Respondents wanted to see more respect, collaboration and compassion in actions and conversations taking place in and around the schools

She felt the information can be used to help the Board set better priorities; develop good, reasonable and achievable objectives; and assist in terms of resource allocation for program budgeting. She anticipated that the next steps will be to enter into a dialogue with the administrative team and staff to agree upon objectives.

The Board thanked and commended Vice President Monach for her thoroughness in the District Goals process and felt the survey gives the Board a base guideline on how to improve and proceed in the future. An educational experience for every student is the Board's goal and objective.

In reviewing the comments from the survey, Board Member Gadbois said the Board needs to do a better job of communicating and explaining, especially in the areas of the bond and financial areas. He said it will be difficult to balance comments such as "make the curriculum more challenging", versus "there's too much stress" and "too much competitiveness".

Board Member Tolles thought it was interesting that the ratio of respondents goes up as the students move up in grade levels.

Vice President Monach thanked the Superintendent for putting the Board on an earlier track to align the goals with budget development.

Superintendent Hubbard advised that the goals should be adopted no later than the last Board meeting in June. She reiterated that the goals must balance with the resources we have. Strategies can be presented to the administrators and then reviewed to see that the objectives are being met. A mid-year check was suggested by the Superintendent. An assessment on progress can be made mid-year.

There was no one from the public requesting to speak.

David Roth, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services, added that the administrators can help in providing with refining the emphases on different focuses. The Board was requested to review the goals to provide some specifics in different categories and give the comments to the Vice President prior to the next Board meeting.

Short-term, mid-term, and long-term goals and objectives were also discussed. Assistant Superintendent David Roth commented that, in developing a multi-year plan, it is important to get input from the administrative team involved so the implications can be reviewed.

Vice President Monach would like to follow a collaborative process.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Announcement of Joint City-School District Community Meeting Monday, June 11, 2007, 7:30 p.m., City Council Chambers

The Board is invited to meet with the City Council to hear feedback from the last two meetings as synthesized by the consultants. The Board will be seated with the Council, and the public can ask questions. Following a brief break, the Board will then be seated in the audience and the Council will continue with their meeting. The Council will take action later that night on providing direction to their consultant team.

CORRESPONDENCE

Two emails were received by the Board expressing appreciation and thanks for the reporting out of the Curriculum Council reporting out. The second email expressed concern about the Board's vision for the goals and not wanting the vision to be limited to the four options shown in the goals. Vice President Monach received an email regarding bringing service learning into the schools.

BOARD REPORTS

Board Member Geddeis mentioned the efforts of both the High School Boosters and a subcommittee that was formed to discuss upgrading coaching stipends.

Board Member Gadbois attended the Middle School Parents Club meeting, a Budget Advisory Committee meeting, a public engagement meeting, a CHIME meeting, the Wildwood fifth grade concert, and the Spring Fling.

Board Member Tolles attended several committee meetings on the Measure E Bond projects. He met with the Superintendent

on bond program issues which was very beneficial to him. He attended the Spring Fling.

Vice President Monach reported that at the Associated Parents' Club of Piedmont (APCP) meeting this morning, there was discussion of the success of training offered to the treasurers of the various parent club boards. The training centered on the sharing of best practices for accounting procedures. Close to thirty persons attended.

President Lindenmayer and Havens Vice Principal Valerie Jew attended the Recreation Commission meeting where the continued use of the tennis courts by Havens for next school year was discussed and approved. He attended the changeover meeting and dinner of the Piedmont Educational Foundation.

CONSENT CALENDAR:
ACTION ITEMS

President Lindenmayer acknowledged the donations to the District: matching donations (\$2,000 each) by Goldman Sachs and Steve Hollis to the District's Special Education program and a donation of \$2,300 by Sandra Nguyen to the Special Education program.

Vice President Monach brought the edited minutes to the attention of the Board, copies of which had been provided to each member.

It was moved by Vice President Monach and seconded by Board Member Geddeis to approve all of the items presented on the Consent Calendar, including the Board minutes with the minor revisions.

Board Member Tolles took a moment to mention the Beach solar panel project on the Consent Calendar and expressed his pleasure because the solar panels are movable if the need arises in the future; there's a terminal included that can be used as an educational tool in the classes to track solar power usage, so the project is three-fold (solar power, student learning, incorporation of staff training in solar energy).

The President called for the vote to approve the Consent Calendar, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Consent Calendar items approved were as follows:

1. *Accept Donations
2. Adopt Regular Board Minutes of May 9, 2007
3. *Adopt Joint City-School District Community Meeting Minutes of April 30, 2007
4. *Approve Personnel Action Report
5. *Approve 2006-07 Safety Plans for:
 - Piedmont Middle School
 - Piedmont High School
6. *Approve Community-Based English Tutoring (CBET) Program, Application, Fiscal Year 2007-08
7. *Approve *Certification of Unused Sites*
All school districts are required to report all unused sites to the State Allocation Board, pursuant to Education Code

Sections 17219-17224. An unused site is deemed to be any site owned by the District that is not being used for school purposes. The District has no unused sites.

8. *Approve Contract Between District and REgrid Power, Inc. to Install a Sun Power Grid Tied Roof-Mount Solar Electric System at Beach Elementary School

The contract with 'reGrid' is for the purchase and installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof of the portable building at Beach Elementary School. The cost for the 3.3 kilowatt system (comprised of 16 panels) is \$23,650. Funding Sources: State Site Block Discretionary funds via the Beach Site Council, the Piedmont Educational Foundation, the Beach Parents Organization, and a private donor. Effective date: July 3, 2007 through September 30, 2007

FUTURE REGULAR BOARD MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

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

- District Goals for 2007-08 (June)
- Continued Discussion on Repair Options, Cost Estimates, Havens Elementary School (June 13)
- Review of Board Bylaws (Section 9000) (June/July)

BOARD WORKSHOP

President Lindenmayer announced that the June 11 Board workshop had been cancelled and replaced by the joint City-School District community meeting to be held on Monday, June 11, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers to discuss Civic Center Master Planning.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

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

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