

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

MINUTES OF
Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

January 29, 2008

CALL TO ORDER	Board President Monach called the Board of Education meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.
ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM	President June Monach, Vice President Cathie Geddeis, Board Members Ray Gadbois, Ward Lindenmayer
Board Member Absent	Board Member Roy Tolles (excused)
ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION	The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 6:06 p.m. to discuss: A. Conference with District Representative Constance Hubbard Regarding Negotiations with the Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT) (Government Code Section 54956.6) B. Liability Claim Against Piedmont Unified School District Claim #PUSD02-07-08 (Government Code Section 54956.9(c) and 910
OTHERS PRESENT FOR CLOSED SESSION	Constance Hubbard, Superintendent Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services David Roth, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent, Educ. Services
RECONVENE TO REGULAR SESSION	Board President Monach called the Regular Session of the Board of Education meeting of January 29, 2008 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
Board Member Absent	Board Member Roy Tolles (excused)
Action Taken In Closed Session	In Closed Session tonight, it was moved by Vice President Geddeis, and seconded by Board Member Lindenmayer, to deny Claim #PUSD02-06-07. The motion passed as follows: AYES: Monach, Geddeis, Gadbois, Lindenmayer NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Tolles
Agenda Adjustments	None

COMMUNICATIONS /
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcement by City Clerk Regarding
Ballot/Election Process for March 2008

City Clerk Ann Swift stated that the next municipal election is on March 4, 2008. Some time-sensitive events will occur first. There is a write-in candidacy period which began on January 7, 2008 and extends to February 19, 2008. Any person not nominated during the official nominating period can pull a document from her office. The person would need to secure the proper amount of signatures in order to be eligible to be placed on the ballot. The Registrar of Voters will receive a list from the City Clerk's office and the Registrar will place the list at each polling place.

For candidates who file during the regular nominating period, their name appears on the voter pamphlet and ballot.

The last day for anyone wishing to register to vote is February 18, 2008 for the municipal election. The deadline for an absentee ballot is February 26, 2008 and is handled by the Registrar of Voters.

If a person did not request an absentee ballot by February 26 and needs one, they must go to the Registrar of Voters. They will give you an absentee ballot to be completed and handed back to them.

March 4, 2008 is election day. This year, the City will upload the map of Piedmont showing all of the precincts and one will be able to see the returns by precinct.

The Board had no questions for the City Clerk. President Monach thanked Ms. Swift for her presentation.

Association of Piedmont Teachers (APT)

None

California School Employees Association
(CSEA)

None

Parent Clubs

None

Student Representative to the Board

Riely White, Student Representative to the Board, reported that:

- This Saturday is the Winter Ball at Hs. Lordships
- First semester ended last week and grades will be mailed home
- Spring sports begin next week

Student Representative White excused himself from the meeting.

PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK ON
ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

Superintendent Announcements

None

Board President Announcements

President Monach announced that Board Member Tolles was absent due to personal family reasons.

She congratulated the Piedmont Asian American Club on their 20th anniversary and celebration, and thanked them for their \$2,000 donation to the school district.

She also thanked the League of Women Voters, the African American Association, the City of Piedmont, the City of Piedmont Diversity Committee, and the Piedmont Asian American Club for sponsoring the Martin Luther King, Jr. event. She especially thanked community member Lois Corrin who coordinates this annual gathering.

In regard to the State budget crisis, President Monach announced that community members Briony Bax and Ann Trutner will head the letter writing campaign effort being organized.

REVIEW AND ACTION ITEMS

Measure E Bond Program:

1. Presentation by Mark Kelley and Glenn Gould of Miller, Brown & Dannis Law Firm Regarding Delivery Methods for Measure E Projects

An overview was provided by attorney Glenn Gould of Miller, Brown & Dannis Law Firm of the various alternative project delivery methods that the Board may want to consider in the Measure E projects. His firm is celebrating its 30th anniversary, providing, almost exclusively, legal counsel and services to school districts and colleges throughout Northern California. This is their area of expertise.

Common Project Delivery Methods being used on schools throughout the State:

- Design-Bid-Build (traditional)
- Design / Build
- Lease / Lease-Back
- Construction Manager At-Risk

Design - Bid – Build (traditional)

California school districts must formally and publicly bid all contracts unless there is an exception.

- Public bidding seeks fairness and economy
- Open to all contractors
 - responsible bidders; experience, capacity – financial, personnel, equipment
 - responsive bidders; meets bid conditions, time, forms
- Contract awarded to lowest, responsible bidder
- Contract then builds from the construction documents
- Owner holds separate contracts with Architect and Contractor
- Architect advises Owner during bidding and construction
- Owner may add construction manager/firm as agent and advocate (assistance and oversight)

The basic process would be:

- District defines program and funding
- District selects architect
- Architect produces contract documents

- District bids contract documents
- District selects General Contractor – with advice from Architect and/or CM
- General Contractor builds according to contract documents

Pros

- Architect is Owner's advocate
- Tends to balance cost, time and quality
- Optimizes competitive bidding
- Done well, DBB is the method of choice for public work

Cons

- May increase overall time to completion
- Owner manages disputes between architect and contractor

The Design / Build has become more and more popular with construction in general because its greatest asset is that it allows the contractor and architect to work collaboratively together.

- Architect and General Contractor form single entity called Design/Build.
- Owner has one contract with Design/Build
- Two phases: design and construction
- Owner may add advocacy
- in-house team or agency construction manager

Process:

- District Board issues findings supporting use of design-build
- Expenditures for design and construction must exceed \$2,500,000
- Owner develops Request for Proposals, solicits Design/Builders
- Owner selects Design/Build entity
- Design/Build Architect designs project with cost and constructability input from General Contractor
- Design/Build secures subcontractor bids
- Design/Build General Contractor builds project
- Design/Build processes COs

Pros

- Single point responsibility
- Tends to be faster method
- Simplifies recovery of damages for design and construction errors
- Maximum transfer of risk for cost and schedule

Cons

- Requires increased owner capabilities
- No normal Architect advocacy
- Reduces design input by Owner
- Less Owner advocacy, Owners often retain Construction Manager

Lease / Lease-Back

- Contractor becomes “Developer”
- Developer leases land from Owner
- Developer leases back to Owner and builds facility to suit Owner
- Finance entity funds construction costs
- When project is delivered, Owner makes lease payments to Developer
- Lease payments pay for construction and financing
- Leases expire when Developer is paid in full
- Owner holds two contracts – Architect and Developer
- Owner may retain in-house advocacy or CM

Process

- Owner selects Architect to design project
- Owner develops solicitation documents for LLB contract
- Owner selects Developer through RFP process
- Owner leases land to Developer
- Developer bids to trades
- Owner authorizes construction
- Developer leases completed facility to Owner
- Leases expire when Developer is paid in full for improvements

Pros

- Public bidding for Developer is not necessary
- Facilitates cooperative partnering relationship with Developer
- Subs can be privately bid
- Owner may choose Developer based on qualifications
- Can ease funding issues
- GMP (Guaranteed Maximum Price)

Cons

- Increases Owner risk (land lease)
- Potential public policy issues

Construction Manager (CM) At Risk

- Owner holds two contracts
- Owner bids all trade contracts
- After bidding, CM role shifts from Owner’s advisor to a role similar to a General Contractor
- Provision of Guaranteed Maximum Price establishes risk
- Owner may add CM or in-house advocacy

Process

- Owner selects Architect
- Owner selects CM@R by qualifications, not low bid
- Architect designs project, CM@R provides expertise during design
- CM@R establishes GMP
- Owner bids out all trade contracts; CM@R manages bid process
- Trade contracts assigned to CM@R
- CM@R undertakes construction
- CM@R and Architect process Change Orders

Pros

- Owner may select CM@R using RFP / RFQ
- Team-oriented approach, constructability input during design
- May allow better control over trade contractors
- May require less District oversight
- May result in faster, better project completion than low bid contracting

Cons

- Controversial – California case law indicates a CM cannot offer a Guaranteed Maximum Price without violating public bidding requirements
- If no GMP, key benefits are reduced
- CM no longer acts as advisor to District
- Design and quality may be compromised by CM's risk
- Cost savings not necessarily realized – District may add advocate

CM At-Risk Guidelines

- Be careful to keep the contract and procurement arrangements legal
- Pick an experienced CM
- Be able to monitor performance and cost
- Keep an eye out for recent legal developments

Measure E Bond Program:

2. Presentation by Community Members
Mark Becker and Jim Nybakken
Regarding Proposal for Rebuilding
Project, Havens Elementary School

Shortly after the December 8, 2007 community workshop, Messrs. Becker and Nybakken shared an alternative plan for rebuilding Havens Elementary School. This same plan will be presented at the Havens Parent Club meeting on February 5th. The purpose of tonight's presentation is to give the Board an understanding of the ideas being proposed. There are still a lot of details to be worked on. The Board may want to provide direction to the Superintendent to continue to explore this plan.

Mr. Becker is a sixteen-year resident, with children who have gone to and are presently in Havens. He is a designer and developer although not a licensed architect. He feels Havens is a severely deficient facility. It's about a 3-1/2 acre site and by current state standards should have 10 acres with the number of students it has. The play area is limited; children get hurt all the time. In following the Measure E process, he felt that any renovation was somewhat of a waste of time and any money should be spent toward a new facility. After attending the December 8 community workshop, which he felt was very well orchestrated, he realized that the general feeling in the room is that since a rebuild is off the table, let's concentrate on a hybrid. He wondered why it was costing so much money. He talked with others about soft costs, escalation costs, etc. If the process could be condensed and we can replace what we have at Havens in a better situation, could this project be done at a lesser cost? He thought if he could deliver a new school at the same cost as a hybrid, why not? He met with the present architect, murakami/Nelson and went over work to date. Mr. Becker came up with a schematic after speaking with different architects. He came up with a site diagram doubling the amount

of playground space, etc. He met with Superintendent and Board President Monach to discuss the costs and guarantees such as: What if he came up with a builder with significant financials to step up and underwrite the project with a guaranteed maximum fixed price of \$23-\$25 million?

Piedmont resident Andy Ball of Webcor, one of the largest contracting firms in the western United States, is interested in delivering a high quality product that he could drive by every day and be proud of.

Mr. Becker feels that Havens Elementary School is a terrible environment for teaching and learning. His goal was to replace what they have in order to bring it up to current standards, to create a broader sense of open space, and replace what is presently there in a better configuration.

He has met with various neighbors, City staff and parent groups.

He named several architects he has met with, all of whom support this project.

Co-coordinator Jim Nybakken has been a community member for 31 years and is a former Piedmont Board member. They are suggesting the Lease / Lease-Back approach. They feel it can deliver a high quality product with a maximum guaranteed price, expedited schedule and removal of administrative burden to the District. He is confident of this plan and urges the Board to proceed with the Request for Proposals process, placing the District in a position to make a final decision on this approach.

Besides the *murakami*/Nelson Architectural Firm, Mr. Becker wanted to thank John Malek and Associates Architects who did the artistry and renderings for this project *pro bono*, and Dick Hunt of Hunt, Hale and Jones who helped put together some renderings in the early stages. Then at the "eleventh hour" today, the firm provided the site plan and the rendering.

The plan is to eliminate everything except the Ellen Driscoll Theater in order to maximize space along Bonita Avenue and take advantage of areas where two-story massing can be placed.

The entrance to the school would be off of Highland Avenue. The Ellen Driscoll Theater would be the architectural hub of Havens. The school would have a grand courtyard entrance, with the library at the front of the building. A 45' wide pathway from Highland Avenue down to Bonita Avenue is planned, spilling out onto a children's play area, a grassy children's play area, and a field turf area. The amount of outdoor space would be doubled and will provide a grassy area for the children to play on which is equivalent to the Linda Beach field. The two-story component of the school will be behind Ellen Driscoll and Mulberry's, incorporating a School Mates building at the end of the facilities opposite City Hall. There is also provision for a kindergarten playground.

His goal is to have a developer selected by this April, have the plans worked out and out of the Division of the State Architect (DSA) one year later. The project must be completed by 2010. Webcor is stating that they will guarantee this goal date. The goal is to build a temporary school in one school year where the portables will stay where they are; when one wing gets torn down, additional portables will be installed along with a construction fence and there would be a temporary school.

President Monach asked each Board member to give a preview of their support of this plan in order to be able to direct staff to continue exploring this alternative plan. She added that, in order to proceed if a lease/lease-back method is taken, there are many steps to be completed in order to assess viability, one of which is a Request for Proposal (RFP). In the last two-three weeks, the Board has received approximately 90 emails in support of the plan, asking the Board not to delay in addressing the seismic safety needs and accessibility needs of the District; to earmark a portion of the funds for work at Havens, and to continue to pursue Mr. Becker's alternative plan which ensures earthquake proof schools in the long run and getting the most value for every dollar spent.

Vice President Geddeis said it is an exciting concept.

Board Member Gadbois said he is in favor of moving forward; it is extremely exciting.

Board Member Lindenmayer stated he was originally skeptical about the financial feasibility of this project, but now it seems all nuances have been thought out.

President Monach stated that in terms of outcomes, building a community asset is a key desired outcome, along with reducing financial risk via the guaranteed maximum price. Expediting the time period is imperative; this sort of contractual delivery model helps to reduce the burden on the administration, given what the District faces in the next several months in terms of the budget crisis.

Before the public discussion began, President Monach asked each person to limit their comments to two minutes, and added that she appreciates their support and feedback of this project.

Resident Pat Pendergast asked the Board what they see as the biggest hurdles going forward. Superintendent Hubbard responded: getting a commitment from a design-build team willing to work within the cost parameters; the timeframe is formidable; and the "hoops" the District would be expected to go through for the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC), and Division of the State Architect (DSA). There are still many details to work out, and the District would have to have the willingness to give up on continual input that a Design-Build sequence would prevent.

Mr. Becker felt that the biggest hurdle is getting a developer, which we already have. He is asking the Board to set aside \$24

million. Number 2 under Item VII involves time [allow citizens' group to explore possible replacement of school]. He added that the goal is also to have a LEED-certified school ["green school"] on an energy-efficient standpoint as far as we can.

Resident David Oppenheimer and neighbor to Havens School, felt this is a terrific project. There may be some problems related to light and air and mass and views that Mr. Becker is clearly sensitive to. He hopes that as the District goes forward, everyone involved will continue to work with the neighbors to minimize the problems.

Architect Grier Graff and former Board member said one of the points brought up during the bond campaign was about getting real value for the money. With this plan, the school would be under current code, and there would be a grassy playfield which would be a great community asset. He encouraged the Board to support the plan.

Resident Drew Bendon supports the project. He likes the idea of a community asset. He said the value added by this project cannot be measured purely in the dollars we are going to spend. The challenge to the Board is to make it happen.

Resident David Hollander, spoke on behalf of the Havens Dads' Club and as a Board member of the Soccer League. In the winter, most of the kids don't get to play due to the dark, but now, two under-eight fields could be gained. He supports the lease/lease-back method and the GMP. The Havens Dads' Club recommends proceeding with the Request for Proposal provisions, with a deadline set of April 10, and setting aside \$24 million to make this project happen.

Resident and TAC member George Childs is quite excited about the prospect. It would make a valuable addition to the community. Regarding the idea of setting aside \$24 million out of the Measure E bonds, he wants to make sure that during deliberations, if the Board decides to go ahead and earmark \$24 million for the project, that it not short-change any of the remaining seismic projects that have to take place on the other schools. He asked if work on the Ellen Driscoll Playhouse would be included in the \$24 million for Havens. This is one of the details being worked out.

Mr. Becker advised that plumbing, ADA standards and doing the bathrooms have been incorporated into the proposed structure across the way. So the goal is to include the seismic retrofit of the Ellen Driscoll Playhouse, but if not, the plan is to raise separate funds and make it a lower priority behind the other schools but still make it a component. Another possibility is that because it is not known what it will cost to retrofit Ellen Driscoll, we know we can satisfy the ADA portion, and a number of community members have asked what they can do to help, so he felt private funds could be raised.

Rick Raushenbush, Board of Education candidate, wanted to convey that he is very happy to hear that there is a clear understanding on the part of the Board that they have the discretion to spend money on Measure E to replace the school. There is a seismic issue at the school and replacing it is the best option. He is concerned that the Board may take too long to accept the proposal. He thinks the action that needs to be taken tonight is for the Board to set aside \$24 million for Measure E funds. He feels the Board, at their next meeting, should issue an RFP for the builder to do this project at a fixed price of \$24 million. This would allow enough time to set a time limit to get back responses and negotiate a contract for a fixed price.

President Monach called for a five-minute recess to allow those who wished to leave after hearing the presentation.

Review and Approve Recommendations
by Superintendent on Measure E Bond
Program Plan Development Phase

The investigative phase of the Measure E Bond Program is essentially completed and was presented as part of the beginning of the Program Plan Development Phase at a Special Board Meeting on November 28, 2007. A bond program community workshop was held on December 8, 2007 which provided the decision-making process, Board guidelines, investigative reports and possible approaches for the overall program planning. Feedback and information were reviewed at the regular Board meeting of December 12, 2007.

A review of the structural presentation at the December 8, 2007 community workshop was given by structural engineer Ron Gallagher of R.P. Gallagher. The report covered which District buildings were evaluated (all) and the national standard used (ASCE 31); and seismic vulnerability rankings (3 groups: Group 1 – Partial Collapse or Severe Damage; Group 2 – Major Structural Damage, and Group 3 – Minor Damage). This was based on the magnitude of a 6.5 or larger earthquake at the Northern Hayward Fault.

Group 1 buildings are categorized as:

- Don't meet life safety requirements
- Expected red-tagged
- Replacement or major repairs needed
- Risk of injury or death
- Likely unusable for multiple years

Group 2 buildings are categorized as:

- Don't meet life safety requirements
- Heavily damaged
- Unlikely to collapse
- Expected yellow-tagged
- Major repairs
- Likely unusable for a year or more

Group 3 buildings are categorized as:

- Meet life safety standards
- Some have non-structural hazards

- Most green-tagged
- Low risk to occupants
- Short unusable
- Don't require strengthening

A major issue is whether or not to strengthen the Group 2 buildings, which are:

- Wildwood 1930's building
- Beach 1930's building
- Havens 2nd grade building
- Ellen Driscoll Theater

He was asked to provide his recommendations, which are:

- Strengthen or replace all Group 1 buildings
- Strengthen Group 2 buildings
- Fix non-structural hazards
- Upgrade to life safety requirements

Janiele Maffei is Chair of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), a volunteer group of citizens with professional expertise in the areas of architectural engineering and construction management and development. The TAC also includes two liaisons from the Bond Measure E Citizens' Oversight Committee and two liaisons from the Board. She provided responses on behalf of the TAC, to questions presented by the Board and provided the TAC's Recommendation Consensus as follows:

TAC Response to Board Questions:

- Life Span of Wood Frame Buildings?
 - Key to longevity is appropriate maintenance
 - buildings can last over 100 years if properly maintained
- Preliminary Cost Estimates?
 - TAC does not take exception to costs as presented in conceptual phase of project
 - many think contingencies are conservative and should be refined during schematic phase

TAC Recommendations Consensus:

- Proceed with PHS schematic design on Quad and Student Center
- Proceed with integrated PHS/PMS fire alarm systems
- Proceed with District-wide non-structural bracing program
- Proceed with Maintenance project not to exceed \$2 million
- Proceed with schematic design for both Beach and Wildwood Elementary Schools
- Postpone decisions on Havens for a limited period of time
- Allow for development of study by citizens' group for Havens replacement
- Proceed with schematic design for seismic strengthening of Ellen Driscoll Auditorium

Mr. Gallagher was asked if the District should also do the repairs on the Group 2 buildings now or after an earthquake? He and others in his firm felt the Group 2 buildings should be upgraded

now to life-safety requirements.

Mr. Nelson inserted that new building code mandates that if you lose 10% of the value of the strength of the building after an earthquake, you must bring it up to current code. The chance of that happening if you do not do any retrofit is almost certain. You will be looking at a different set of questions under current code.

Superintendent Hubbard presented her draft recommendations for the Program Plan for discussion and public input at the January 15, 2008 Board meeting and at tonight's meeting, she presented her final recommendations as follows: [this is all part of the original cost estimates that is in the contingency that was talked about and in the original program plan costs].

Recommendations by Site – Cost Estimate – Timeline

- I. Piedmont High School and Piedmont Middle School
\$350,000
5-6 months
 1. Building A (Quad / Library): Authorize schematic design and design development
 2. Building B (Student Center): Authorize programming exercise (deadline for completion April 2008) and go into schematic design and design development
 3. Address non-structural seismic deficiencies per District-wide plan for entire campus
 4. Include integrated fire alarm system for PHS/MHS/PMS contiguous campuses

- II. Maintenance Facility
\$2,000,000
ASAP (method of delivery – Design / Build)
 1. Set budget cap of \$2 million for renovation/replacement of facilities
 2. Begin programming exercise
 3. Explore alternate locations on District property
 4. Explore interface possibilities with City of Piedmont
 5. Bring plan and budget to Board for approval as soon as possible

- III. Beach Elementary School
\$270,000
5-6 months
 1. Authorize schematic design for structural retrofit project
 2. Address non-structural seismic deficiencies per District-wide plan

- IV. Wildwood Elementary School
\$290,000
6-8 months
 1. Complete investigation of area with no drawings to verify conditions

2. Authorize schematic design for structural retrofit project
 3. Address non-structural seismic deficiencies per District-wide plan
- V. Ellen Driscoll Auditorium
\$65,000 (3-4 months)
1. Authorize schematic design for structural retrofit project
- VI. District-wise Plan/Protocol/Non-structural Seismic Issues
\$100,000
4-5 months
1. Complete District plan to address all non-structural seismic deficiencies
 2. Develop protocol that includes responsibilities, tracking and follow-up annually
 3. Develop budget using Measure E, Deferred Maintenance and General Fund budget as part of overall maintenance operations
- VII. Havens Elementary
April 2008 Deadline
1. Designate \$18.4 million from Measure E for Havens Elementary School
 2. Allow citizens group to explore possible replacement of school
 3. Follow up on proposal from Mark Becker on January 29, 2008
 4. Explore delivery methods appropriate to support the proposal
 5. Consider allocating all State modernization funds received from Measure E projects to augment Havens project up to a total of \$24 million
- VIII. Elementary Schools "Master Planning"
\$7,000
1-2 months
1. Summarize inventory of current classrooms and programs in tri-school
 2. Develop "mini Master Plan" for tri-school classroom/program needs
- IX. Piedmont Middle School and Alan Harvey Theater
Year 2010
1. Delay all decisions until mid-way through Program Plan Implementation

All but one member of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) agreed with the recommendations as presented. The TAC also added qualifiers, such as pursuing a joint maintenance facility with the City of Piedmont and relocating the facility to a flat site; making "green design" a key consideration; acceleration of projects to reduce disruption; maximize the potential for

capturing State funds; and reduce the impact of escalation on projects.

Discussion on the Maintenance facility was held. Assistant Superintendent Brady asked Architect John Nelson to explain to the Board how the figures were arrived at for the Maintenance facility. The number range arrived at before was \$1.8-\$2.7 million. The \$1.8 million was based on building a new 2,000 square foot building in the same location that would replace the two trailers and the wood frame building, and retrofitting the metal building. The \$2.8 million was for a new 4,000 square foot building in the same location. Part of the uncertainty is that the programming exercise has not yet been done to know if 4,000 square feet is the footage to use, and there are site costs for staying where the Maintenance facility is now in terms of creating enough flat area to adequately park the Maintenance vehicles and store materials, which would require a rather extensive retaining wall. These issues still need to be reviewed.

It was moved by Vice President Geddeis and seconded by Board Member Lindenmayer to approve Items I, III, IV, V, VI, VIII and IX. The motion passed as follows:

AYES: Monach, Geddeis, Gadbois, Lindenmayer
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Tolles

It was moved by Board Member Lindenmayer and seconded by Vice President Geddeis to approve Item II., Numbers 2-5. The motion passed as follows:

AYES: Monach, Geddeis, Gadbois, Lindenmayer
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Tolles

It was moved by Board Member Gadbois and seconded by Board Member Lindenmayer to approve Item VII, changing the Superintendent's recommended amount of \$18.4 million to \$23 million, and deleting Number 5 under that Section. The motion passed as follows:

AYES: Monach, Geddeis, Gadbois, Lindenmayer
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Tolles

Contracts for the recommendations approved will be brought before the Board for confirmation at the February 13, 2008 Board meeting.

Mr. Raushenbush expressed concern about the overall scheduling organization.

Update from the Public Engagement Subcommittee

President Monach advised there was nothing new to report.

Adopt 2008-09 District Budget
Development Calendar

The 2008-09 Budget Development Calendar was reviewed by the Board on January 15, 2008 and a two-week public comment period was provided.

Superintendent Hubbard advised the Budget Development Calendar indicated that the date of March 12 for the Board meeting to take action on certificated layoffs, if necessary, should be March 13.

It was moved by Vice President Geddeis, and seconded by Board Member Gadbois to adopt the 2008-09 District Budget Development Calendar, including the corrected Board meeting date.

The motion passed as follows:

AYES: Monach, Geddeis, Gadbois, Lindenmayer
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Tolles

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEM

Review of California Physical Fitness Test,
2006-07

The California Physical Fitness Test (PFT) is administered annually to all students in grades five, seven and nine. The results can be used by students to assess and plan personal fitness programs; by teachers to design the curriculum of physical education programs; and by parents and guardians to understand their students' fitness levels. Results were provided in the Board packet.

The students are performing at a level quite a bit higher than the State average.

INFORMATION

2007-08 Budget Update

The pocket budget was provided in the Board packet. Assistant Superintendent Brady stated there is a high likelihood that a 07-08 mid-year cut in the estimated amount of \$75,000 will occur. There is also a possibility of a projected revenue limit reduction in the amount of \$1.3 million for 2008-09. Parent Clubs, the Budget Advisory Committee, APT and CSEA representatives, and other stakeholders will be advised.

A letter writing campaign opposing budget cuts will be implemented.

Application Opening of Arthur Hecht
Volunteer of the Year Award

Superintendent Hubbard notified the Board that applications for the 2008 Arthur Hecht Volunteer of the Year Award have been disseminated. The application is also available on the District web site. The deadline for receipt of the nominations is 4:30 p.m. on March 3 to the Superintendent's office.

CORRESPONDENCE

President Monach advised that approximately 50 parent and 4 staff emails regarding Mark Becker's plan for Havens have been received, along with several emails from the California School Boards Association keeping the Board updated about the State budget.

BOARD REPORTS

None

CONSENT CALENDAR:
ACTION ITEMS

It was moved by Vice President Geddeis, and seconded by Board Member Lindenmayer to approve the Consent Calendar with amendments to the January 15, 2008 Board meeting minutes. The Consent Calendar included the following:

- A. Adopt Regular Board Meeting Minutes of January 15, 2008
- B. Approve Personnel Action Report
- C. Approve Grant Application for "Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse", Fiscal Year 2008 Through the U.S. Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools
These grants provide funds to local educational agencies to develop and implement innovative and effective alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools. Grantees will have a significant amount of technical assistance available to them through an agreement between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services. The project period for these grants is three years. An estimated 70 new awards will be made for amounts ranging from \$250,000 to \$450,000 depending on the scope of work. The award period is expected to be June 30, 2008 but may be made as late as September 30, 2008. The official documents can be viewed online at: www.ed.gov/programs/wedvpalcoholabuse/index.html
- D. Approve Application for State Grant Application for "Tobacco-Use Prevention: Grades Nine Through Twelve, Fiscal Year 2008-09"
This grant provides for tobacco-use prevention education (TUPE) funds to support health education efforts aimed at the prevention and reduction of tobacco use. TUPE in grades 9-12 is funded through a competitive application process. Funds are awarded to local agencies that propose to replicate scientifically research-proven, effective programs. This is a three-year grant. If awarded, the recipient's amount is up to \$37.50 per ADA.
- E. Adopt Resolution 10-2007-08, "Declaration of Surplus Property" (outdated computers at Beach)
- F. Second Reading and Adopt Proposed New Board Policy 5030, "Comprehensive School Wellness Policy"
School districts are required to have a Board Policy in place designed to promote the health and well-being of students and staff, and to promote a lifelong health lifestyle with a focus on health, physical education, and nutrition. The Administrative Regulations are still being prepared and will come to the Board at a future meeting for informational purposes.
- G. Approve Out-of-State "Field Trip" (tour of Colorado Colleges for 15 PHS juniors), February 18-21, 2008
Because this trip is being sponsored by the High School and College Career Center, the trip must be approved by the Board

FUTURE REGULAR BOARD MEETING
AGENDA ITEMS
(subject to change)

Future Regular Board Meeting Agenda Items are as follows:

- Budget Update (Feb)
- Mid-year Assessment on 2007-08 Goals and Objectives

(Feb)

- Appoint Board of Education Members: Reorganization: Adopt Resolution Regarding Designated Signatures (Mar)
- Hearing for Certificated Layoffs (**if necessary**) (Mar)
- Review and Approval of Facilities Use Fees (Mar)
- Report on Model Arts Program – 5 Year Grant Program (Mar)
- Certification of Athletic Coaches (Mar)
- Public Hearing and Recommendation to determine the parcel tax levy and amount for Measures B and C for the 2008-09 fiscal year (Mar & Apr)
- Announcement of Availability of Noda Memorial Grants (Mar)
- Discussion of District Goals for 2008-09 (Mar)
- Approve Single Plan for Student Achievement / SIP Plans (Mar)
- Approve School Safety Plans (Mar)
- Approve Emergency Plan Portion of Comprehensive School Safety Plan (Mar)
- 2008 PEF Spring Grant Applications (Apr)
- Notification of 2008 Arthur Hecht Volunteer of the Year Awardee (Apr)
- Recognition of 2008 Arthur Hecht Volunteer of the Year (May)
- Review of Board Bylaws (Section 9000) (TBD)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 11:22 p.m.

JUNE MONACH, Board President
Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education

CONSTANCE HUBBARD
Secretary, Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education