

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

MINUTES OF
Regular Meeting of the Governing Board

October 24, 2007

CALL TO ORDER	Board President Monach called the Board of Education meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.
ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM	President June Monach, Vice President Cathie Geddeis, Board Members Ray Gadbois, Roy Tolles, Ward Lindenmayer
ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION	The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 6:05 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)
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 October 10, 2007 to order at 7:10 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	Riely White, Student Representative to the Board, reported that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This Friday is the last home football game of the season; the team is on a five game winning streak• Winter Sports are starting• Thursday was College Night at the High School• ACT tests are this Saturday; SAT tests are next Saturday• The quarter ends on Tuesday• Halloween is on October 31; students will be dressing up

PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA None

Superintendent Announcements

Superintendent Hubbard reiterated that the school quarter is ending at the secondary level and report cards are due to be mailed the beginning of November.

November 1-7 are the conference day schedules for the elementary and 6th grades.

The District is looking for substitute teachers; anyone qualified and would like to serve, contact Personnel Technician Sally Reddick at 594-2611.

Board President Announcements

President Monach made the following announcements:

- Elementary school book fairs are being held at the sites
- Flu shot clinics are being held at Piedmont schools. They are available to District staff, community members and parents. The clinics will be held on Thursday, October 25 from 8-10 a.m., 1-3 p.m. at the Wildwood auditorium; and Wednesday, November 14, 3:30-5 p.m. at the Piedmont High School Alan Harvey Theater lobby. The cost for a regular shot is \$20 and \$35 for a pneumonia shot. Alternate flu shots are available for those who are pregnant, nursing, or require thimerosal-free shots. Medicare can be billed. For any questions, contact Anne-Marie Lamarche at lamenke@aol.com or 654-3710.

REVIEW AND ACTION ITEMS

A. Measure E Bond Program:

1. Presentation of Hybrid Refinement of Conceptual Design and Cost Estimate of Havens Elementary School

Priscilla Meckley-Archuleta of Capital Program Management, Inc., the District's project management company, introduced John Nelson, President of *murakami*/Nelson Architects, Ron Gallagher of R.P. Gallagher Associates, Structural Engineers, and Mike Wasserman of Capital Program Management, Inc.

Ms. Meckley-Archuleta stated the first presentation is for the Havens "Hybrid" Concept Design 2 – a refinement of the previous concept. Back in June 2007, the team presented four options to the Board; two minimalistic approaches; a mid-range concept which was a hybrid option including some of the first two options, along with some changes in space; and then a fourth option which was the possibility of a full replacement. As a result of the presentation, the consulting team and program management group was asked to go back and refine the hybrid option. Tonight is that presentation. She asked that it be kept in mind that all of these options are still on the table for recommendations. No recommendations will be made tonight. The hybrid option is being presented in context to the request made by the Board back in June. A recommendation for project scope will be presented at a Special Board meeting on November 28, 2007. The hybrid development refinement work was presented to all staff and involved committees.

Mr. Nelson addressed the structural, accessibility and life-safety deficiencies at Havens Elementary School. This concept has selected specific structural solutions for each of the buildings: brace frames at Building A West, new construction at Building A

Central, minor strengthening at Building A East, a combination of roof diaphragm, exterior wall braces and corridor wall strengthening at Building B, and a combination of foundation, exterior wall and roof diaphragm work at Building C (Ellen Driscoll Theater). The replacement building (Building A Central) raises the floor elevation to the level of Oakland Avenue and the playground. This simplifies the circulation in the school allowing for one central hallway and a stair/lift combination to navigate the grade difference as well as allow for direct access to the restrooms at Building B from the exterior and direct exiting from those classrooms. The replacement building provides two classrooms that meet the OPSC size requirements, administrative space and new boys' and girls' toilet rooms. Modifications to Building C are guided by the use of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Buildings and preserve the existing interior finishes as much as possible. The entire school is planned to have fire sprinklers and an integrated fire alarm system. Various non-structural seismic hazards will be mitigated throughout the school.

Site Access Plan

- Accessibility and directional signage throughout
- Relocate existing accessible on-street parking space on Oakland Avenue
- Provide new at-grade entry to main doors
- Provide new concrete access ramp from sidewalk to yard at Bonita Avenue
- Provide new accessible gate hardware at all locations
- Provide new concrete access ramps to replace existing on-site non-compliant ramps

Building A East

- Reconfigure area around library for exiting and to improve usability
- New flooring and roofing in area of work
- New or retrofitted pendant light fixtures at library
- Protected openings at the side property line

New Infill / Reconfigured Building A-Central

- Administration suite, two classrooms, student toilets, raise grade to maximize efficiency of accessibility
- New central hallway with stair and platform lift
- All classrooms exit directly to exterior (no rated corridors required)

Building A-West

- New glazing, flooring and roofing in area of work
- Modify doors, casework, etc. for accessibility
- New pendant light fixtures
- Skylight retrofit of replacement

Building B

- New glazing at south wall
- New flooring and roofing in area of work
- Modify doors, casework, etc. for accessibility
- Protected openings at the property line
- Bathrooms accessible from exterior

Building C (Ellen Driscoll Theater)

- Construction currently guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards
- New fire sprinklers integrated into the historic fabric of the ceiling
- Modify entries to provide accessibility throughout
- Restrooms are modified as two separate toilet rooms
- Stage access via platform lift behind the proscenium wall
- New exterior canopy over walkway

Building D

- Modify doors, casework, etc. for accessibility
- New glazing throughout
- New pendant light fixtures

Building E

- No work

Cost Estimate Summary:

Building A West:	\$2,834,000
Building C (Ellen Driscoll):	\$1,868,000
Building A East:	\$ 602,000
Building B:	\$1,428,000
Building D:	\$ 199,000
Building A Central:	\$4,061,000
Site Work:	\$ 868,000
Premium for Phasing:	<u>\$ 593,000</u>
Total:	\$12,453,000

Project Cost Summary:

(figures rounded to nearest \$100,000)
(24-month construction period with two phases)

Construction Cost Estimate:	\$12,500,000
Soft Costs: (AE, PM & CM fees, inspection, Agency, etc.)	\$ 3,400,000
Contingencies:	
Construction:	\$ 1,200,000
Project:	<u>\$ 500,000</u>
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<i>\$17,600,000</i>
Escalation: (start construction March 2009)	\$ 3,200,000
Interim Housing: (incl. previously committed expenses)	\$ 2,200,000
TOTAL Project Conceptual Cost Est.:	<u>\$23,000,000</u>

In response to a question asked by Vice President Geddeis, Mr. Nelson stated that the most basic concept for the administrative section is a little over \$1 million and the cost of the hybrid is about \$4 million. This includes getting the corridors consolidated, raising the grade, and reconfiguring that area.

Resident Anne Beeson, 1139 Oakland Avenue, a resident for 42 years, felt that the language in print and over the telethons prior to the Measure E election focused on life safety. She does not

remember classroom space and better teacher working facilities being part of the pro-arguments for Measure E.

Dana Serleth, parent, asked about room for the play structure. Mr. Nelson advised that in the hybrid scheme, the play structure would go away but there is discussion about relocating it to a different position on the playground. The structure on the side would stay. She asked to have the hallway in the stairs and lift area pointed out. She asked if the kitchen would remain in Ellen Driscoll. Mr. Nelson advised that there would still be room for a serving area there and it might be in another location within the reconfigured center section.

Carolyn Kenney, Havens parent, asked if, with the slight addition, the only real addition is moving out the wall on the administration side of Oakland area, does that qualify under Measure E? Superintendent Hubbard advised that the issue is a part of the guidelines needing to be discussed. State funding could come into this and Measure E could be used. It is a matter of debate. Ms. Kenney asked how the hybrid option would work programmatically in conjunction with any future curriculum needs. Do we know about future curriculum mandates that might require a different space configuration? Superintendent Hubbard stated that the hybrid design does not add a significant number of classrooms because it was felt that was not the purpose of Measure E. The "flex space" is a way to see what future needs would be, but it does not specifically address the discussion of having a longer kindergarten. Ms. Kenney also asked about the status of the long-range facilities plan for the District. Superintendent Hubbard stated long-range facilities planning is being presented at the Special Board Meeting of November 28 and that would be the time for community members to provide feedback as to whether or not to put certain things off, and to weigh the various options once we have all the information and the status of the buildings in terms of what needs to be done.

Detailed recommendations as to identifying by site some program function and educational priority needs would not be completed by the time of the November 28 Special Board meeting.

Rick Arney, Wyngard Avenue, a fairly new resident with a non-school age child, is concerned when he goes to the park and talks with others who have decided to place their children in private schools. He voted on the bond issue but it is clear to him that the use was confused. He agreed with Board Member Tolles that this is a fifty-year decision and if it is not done well and with the appropriate debate where we are already appearing to be constrained - whether it be by the estimates, the language of the code, or by the proposals put forth - why don't we put forth the unconstrained options, and if the voters say no, that's fine. Three people he has spoken with have already said they've attended Board meetings, listened to the discussions and read the information and they are moving their students to private schools. He feels it is possible to redraft a bond. People feel the redo option has been signed off for all the schools.

People feel the decision has already been made. We are looking at a constrained bond issue with constrained language that is not allowing us to get to the bold solution.

Wynne Kokka, residing at 1909 Oakland Avenue, about a block above Havens, said she had considered taking her children out of Piedmont schools because of what seems to be a lack of community support for the schools. She comes from Montgomery County, Maryland where they have a capital improvement program that replaces every single school in the district that needs replacement. She helped on the Piedmont Measure E bond measure. This is an opportunity for Piedmont citizens to look at our District as a whole. We have facility issues that need to be addressed. It would be a travesty to put \$12 million toward a school that needs to be rebuilt and ignore any of the problems such as opening up a wall and putting faulty electrical wiring back in. We need to have the opportunity to make this more than just patching up because of earthquake concerns. The District as a whole is important. There is only so much teachers can do without facilities that are modernized and expanded for full kindergarten classes, etc.

Resident Anne Beeson responded that it would be nice to rebuild every school in the District and to have the best of everything like they do in Maryland - their State financing must be much different than California. Ms. Beeson's point is that this is not what Measure E was touted as. If we want to revamp our entire school structures, let's be honest and present some kind of measure to the public that says that's what we want. She doesn't feel this process has been very honest.

George Childs, resident, agreed that we must stay within the confines of what was voted on in Measure E offered to the voters. He recalled that when a former bond was approved to build a new Middle School, it turned out there was not enough money to finish the project and the District went out to the electorate again, which didn't go over very well. Now to come in and decide to rebuild one or more schools would be asking for a great deal from the electorate than we could come up with. The great majority of our tax base in Piedmont is out of property taxes of the residential community. We don't have sales tax revenue to speak of or other kinds of revenues as other communities may have. He asked the Board to exercise restraint. He feels the hybrid solution looks like a reasonable compromise.

Resident Dana Serleth said that the Measure E campaign did emphasize seismic safety yet also believed that some other things would be corrected that were felt could not be left alone any longer. Those who worked hard on the Measure E Committee did not think the schools would end up worse than originally thought. The committee also believed that, although the District didn't have money to plan, it would begin by planning this and telling us what the options are and we are beginning to see some clear pathways outlined. It appears that we can make some very minor fixes which will leave us with schools that are less than we started with by simply correcting the deficiencies,

or we can spend a lot of money to rebuild, or we can do something in between. She is not advocating for any one of these. She said when Board Member Tolles said we are looking at a fifty-year time frame, he is on target. We have to look at the long-term and need to know we are doing something in the context of a plan - that we are not putting a lot of money into a school project that is not going to last for the long term.

Vice President Geddeis stated that life safety is the objective in this endeavor and the key question is: is life safety the objective at all costs, i.e., non-functional classrooms, or do you need to take that into consideration?

Board President Monach stated that some of the comments made this meeting in terms of how the Measure E funds are spent can be brought up later on the agenda under the Review of Discussion Guidelines for Measure E Project Decisions. These over-arching guidelines are going to be discussed.

Resident Greg Toto of Mesa Avenue asked if there is a date available on the expected growth or decline of the student population over time, matched against the capacity of the school system.

Superintendent Hubbard explained that the District has past demographic information and current for the past 5 years because Piedmont is considered built out. The fluctuation isn't expected to vary significantly from our high of about 400 more students than we have now, to our low which we will be hitting next year or the year after. The range is still between 2,400 and 3,000 because of the constraints on the number of houses Piedmont has.

She stated that the District did not look at that factor because it was not part of Measure E; Measure E was to look at the current structures and make them safe. However, she said his was an important comment and it may well be beneficial to have the demographics updated.

2. Presentation of Conceptual Design and Cost Estimates of Beach Elementary School

The concept designs contained in the report have been developed to address the structural, accessibility and life safety deficiencies at Beach. The solutions presented are designed to mitigate the deficiencies, while preserving the basic functional and architectural character of the school.

Project Manager Priscilla Meckley-Archuleta stated that at the May 10, 2007 Board meeting, the Investigative and Analysis report on Beach was presented. Tonight's presentation is a recommended solution to the seismic, life safety and accessibility issues at Beach. Unlike at Havens, this is the only one option recommended as a solution. Various options were looked at but did not rise to the top as being recommended. The team will touch upon some of the things recommended and dropped. Tonight is only a presentation of the information. In November, a project scope and final proposed budget in the context of an entire program will be brought forth.

John Nelson stated Beach Elementary School was constructed in the 1930's with an addition made of the library and some classrooms in the 1990's.

Building A: Theater and administration area

Building B: Section of classroom wing

Building C: Library and classrooms at rear of site

Building D: Kindergarten area

Building E: Portable

Options Considered :

- Repair or replace portable (determined not cost-effective to repair)
- Interior or Exterior strengthening (Exterior determined not cost-effective and much more disruptive)
- Access to stage (looked at Lift/exterior ramp vs. elevator (lift created some disadvantages for disabled people and also was fairly costly so opted for elevator solution which created equal opportunities to get to that space and provided more compact approach to the solution)

Upgrade Criteria:

(per Ron Gallagher, Structural Engineer)

- Only Original 1930's building to be strengthened
- ASCE 41 criteria to be used (update of FEMA 356)
- Life safety performance level

Overview of Strengthening Options: Recommend:

(per Ron Gallagher, Structural Engineer)

- Add plywood sheathing to interior side of exterior walls
- Strengthen many interior walls
- Add plywood to auditorium roof
- Add hardware, including hold-downs

Site Access Plan – Corrective Measures:

- New accessible parking
- New ramp at Lake Avenue
- Replace damaged retaining walls
- ADA upgrades at exterior stairs and handrails
- Replace portable building

Auditorium / Administration / Classrooms / Classrooms

Addition – Corrective Measures:

- Fire-rated corridor
- Upgrades at doors, stairs and landings
- Upgrades at kitchen and toilet rooms
- Replace non-compliant classroom sinks
- Automatic fire sprinklers throughout
- Upgrade fire alarm

Auditorium – Corrective Measures:

- New elevator for stage and art room access
- Upgrades at doors, stairs, and landings
- Fire-rated corridor

Construction Cost Estimate Summary:

Building: \$5,227,000
New Portable: \$ 172,000
Site Work: \$1,107,000
Total Construction/Site Work w/o phasing: \$6,506,000

Phasing (allow 5%) \$ 325,000
Total Construction Cost with phasing: \$6,831,000

Project Cost Summary:

(Phased Construction – 18-24 month construction, 3-phase project) (rounded to nearest \$100,000)

Construction Cost Estimate: \$ 6,800,000
Soft Costs: \$ 1,800,000
(AE, PM & CM fees, Inspection,
Agency, etc.)
Contingencies:
Construction: \$ 700,000
Project: \$ 300,000
Subtotal: \$ 9,600,000

Escalation Costs (assume 2009 start): \$ 2,000,000

Interim Housing Project: \$ 600,000

Total Project Conceptual Cost Est.: \$12,200,000

All of the information is available on the Measure E web site.

The Board asked if, including the portable (currently used for a classroom), there is a programmatic impact. There would be no programmatic impact.

The primary reason for phasing is so as not to empty the school and divert students elsewhere.

There was no one from the public requesting to speak.

3. Presentation of Investigation & Analysis, Conceptual Design, and Probable Costs for Maintenance Buildings

Ms. Meckley-Archuleta advised that this particular presentation is slightly different because it includes both the investigation work and concept work combined.

The four buildings of the Maintenance facility were evaluated for seismic safety and related accessibility and fire and life safety deficiencies and to design corrections of any deficiencies.

The probable costs presented are not a validated cost estimate. This is not a recommendation of how to move forward with a solution at this site; this is part of the plan that will be brought forward in November.

Building A: Workshop
Building B: Storage
Building C: large trailer office/break room/ toilet room
Building D: small trailer office

Structural:

- Structures do not meet ASCE 31 standards
- Wood building and trailers will likely fall off supports
- Prefab unlikely to collapse, but may be damaged
- Mezzanines do not meet code
- Many non-structural hazards
- Continued operations severely impaired or prevented after an earthquake
- Maintenance is essential in preparedness and recovery operation (first responders)

ADA / Accessibility

- Path of travel non-compliant
- No accessible route
- Lack of code-compliant directional signage
- Stairs are non-compliant
- No ramp for wheelchair access
- No accessible parking

Fire and Life Safety

- Exterior sides of exit doors do not have handrails or landings
- Lack of proper exhaust systems
- Lack of OSHA compliance
- No fire alarm
- Unsafe storage

Various Options:

- Repair existing buildings
- Remove wood frame buildings and trailers, replace with new buildings
- Replace all buildings

Cost Probabilities:

New workshop / upgraded metal building: \$1 – 1.8 million
(outcomes: more functional, five
standard parking spaces, meets ASCE 41)

New workshop / storage offices: \$2.7 million
(outcomes: 4,000 sf new building,
code compliant, 5-truck parking spaces
plus 3 standard parking spaces,
efficient layout)

President Monach commented that with respect to our Maintenance Department workers, the level of competence and responsiveness for addressing ongoing maintenance needs - even when Superintendent Hubbard has talked about some of the non-structural items that are lower costs but would reduce risks significantly if they were addressed sooner than later - the Maintenance crew has been incredibly responsive and she wants to credit them for their work.

Resident George Childs asked if the Maintenance facilities are required to be repaired. Ms. Meckley-Archuleta stated that facilities that are not student-focused do need to meet the ADA requirements because the issue is that when you are in a

building that houses a shop, a warehouse, a restroom, or potential locker facilities, you could have a partially or fully disabled person who needs access to those facilities, so the facilities need to comply. DSA is not necessarily required to do any review of this particular project.

Lilis Stern, Havens parent, 9 Craig Avenue, is wondering if it would be possible or has it been considered to ask the company who is renting us the portables at Havens, if they would sell them to us at a discount, using some of them to solve the Maintenance buildings problem. Ms. Meckley-Archuleta stated that the type of facilities being looked at for Maintenance would be taller structures and have other requirements that are not necessarily part of the current portables. There also may be some concern in terms of how quickly these facilities can be done so if the Havens project, in terms of construction, cannot be done relatively quickly and it is decided to begin the Maintenance facilities first, that may, in fact, be able to be done quicker, and the portables may not be available. There also may be need for other interim housing in which the portables would be used. CPM has not considered this issue.

Superintendent Hubbard added that the cost of moving the portables to another space could be more expensive than building something that meets the Maintenance Department's needs.

4. Review of Discussion Guidelines for Measure E Project Decisions

President Monach advised that the detailed recommendations were presented at the Board meetings of September 26 and October 10, 2007 and that a one-page summary by the Superintendent is presented tonight and was distributed for comments at Board meetings and through the bond web site. Also presented tonight is a summary developed by President Monach, with Board feedback, as to the areas of Board consensus to date and areas identified that need further clarification. It is anticipated that the final guidelines, based on the Superintendent's recommendations, will be presented at the Board meeting of November 14, 2007.

The Project Investigation and Concept Development phase is also due to be completed by November 14, 2007 and the Program Plan Development phase is scheduled to begin at a Special Board meeting on November 28, 2007. It is expected to go through January/February 2008.

The Board Guidelines for Developing the Measure E Program Plan is shown below:

Piedmont Unified School District
Summary of Board of Education Guidelines for
Developing Measure E Program Plan

Policy Area
Safety

Guidelines

Budget Measure E funds to each site to address all earthquake safety and earthquake preparedness issues as a first priority including:

- Non-structural seismic hazards
- Address fire alarm systems at all sites
- Structural seismic
- Accessibility as required by Division of the State Architect (DSA)
- Fire and Life safety as required by DSA

Long-term Investment in Facilities

Guidelines

Budget Measure E, Deferred Maintenance, and State Modernization funds to improve and extend the useful life of the district's facilities

- Address the Maintenance Facility project early in the Program Plan to boost capacity of the district to prepare and to be able to recover from an earthquake
- Assess pre and post earthquake building performance and usability to aid in prioritization of projects, design, and implementation of program plan

Building Modernization

Guidelines

Budget State Modernization funds to improve building infrastructure and to leverage (supplement) Measure E and Deferred Maintenance funding of projects

- Develop a prioritized list of program function improvement needs at each site to apply as the schedule for receipt of State funds is confirmed
- Use Modernization funds remaining to improve programmatic functions at each school.

Accessibility

Guidelines

1. Ensure that accessibility as required by DSA respectfully addresses the needs of all who use the district's facilities
2. Given the topography of Piedmont and layout of existing facilities, it is assumed that not all accessibility needs can be addressed
 - Develop a long term plan to address accessibility deficiencies at each site
 - Guided by the plan, address accessibility issues not required by DSA from available Measure E, State Modernization and Deferred Maintenance funds

Building Design

Guidelines

1. Recommended design must not reduce program function of the building
2. Consider usability after an earthquake in the structural criteria, design, and program plan development
3. Address all buildings 50 years or older as if designated as historic sites in the development of the design options
4. Require all designs and materials to consider the requirements for Leadership in 'Energy and Environmental Design' (LEED™) rating system, and 'California High Performing Schools' (CHPS). Incorporate sustainability and ecological impact for now and the future for use and selection of materials.
5. Address infrastructure issues at same time facility is disrupted by required Measure E work
6. Consider long-term impact for maintenance of facilities
7. Consider current and emerging program function improvement needs whenever possible and practical
8. Ensure parity of educational program offerings among all schools (elementary, middle, and high)
9. Apply approved facilities standards in selection and use of materials
10. Apply Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) and District program standards in design of spaces

Board comments were as follows:

Vice President Geddeis wrestled in the beginning with the prioritization of the objectives which she now feels is premature. What we should really be looking at now are constraints – the boundaries over which we are going to evaluate whether something is or is not “in our pot” to look for in spending funds. We would have to look at: a) what improves safety; and b) what addresses the accessibility as required by DSA.

The issue she has with respect to the long-term investment is that we are not looking at spending Measure E building funds just for the sake of improving; we are saying we are going to make a smart decision and not spend an enormous amount of money on a structure that has a very limited useful life or very little possibility for improvement, as opposed to an inefficient use of funds. She likes taking modernization off into its own category and looking at State monies where available. In terms of accessibility, she feels like the Board should be realistic and say that based on the numbers we are seeing coming through, is it even feasible that we would be able to address access outside of DSA requirements? The long term plan is what we have to do; we have to be cognizant of what resources we have available and their prioritization.

On the issue of ensuring parity among the schools. she feels there has to be a way to filter that in terms of Measure E spending vs not. We can't just say we are increasing the lab space at Havens, therefore we are going to spend the same amount of money at Beach. The funding is a different issue.

Superintendent Hubbard inserted that there is also parity in the level of safety. Is parity of program and/or parity in the safety level guidelines you want the design team to consider?

Board Member Tolles: it would be really nice if the elementary schools could be working as a group – different people at the schools seem misinformed about who has what and who doesn't. It would be very useful to understand how the elementary schools compare now as relates to parity.

One example of parity would be that all elementary schools would have the same number of computers and computer classrooms.

Superintendent Hubbard added that parity is not always in a dollar amount; not everything is going to come out of Measure E funds. It is the intent to get all three elementary schools together to discuss parity.

President Monach recapped the discussion to propose a statement about ensuring parity of educational program offerings across the three elementary school sites as a design goal, and then presume that, at the safety level, if we are suggesting each site receives attention with respect to safety as defined in the following areas, that we achieve parity with respect to safety across the school sites in that way.

Board Member Gadbois wanted to respond to a couple of comments from tonight about long-term vision. We are somewhat constrained within the current discussion, by Measure E and Measure 1-D, in terms of what we can accomplish and what was the intent of the two measures. If we want to have a big vision discussion and go back to the voters about that, we need to talk about whether or not to do that. But for him, the set of guidelines is what we have in front of us today which is Measure E and State Measure 1-D. So we are constrained by the measure that was voted on and what the intent of the voters was. And there are constraints in terms of total amount of money and how it is supposed to be used. If we want to revisit that whole question, which he is not necessarily proposing, let's have that discussion at the appropriate time. If we are talking about within this context, he likes President Monach's summary. Regarding the long-term investment of facilities, he interprets that as more a question related to what Board Member Tolles brought up about the wood frame structures. If the engineers think that in reality the buildings are relatively safe structures today but don't meet the specifics of the life-safety requirements, his question then becomes: is it better to spend the money on those structures before an earthquake or after an earthquake? He is looking forward to

that discussion, which will come at the Special Board meeting on November 28.

Superintendent Hubbard added that Piedmont is unique because of its location to the Hayward Fault. If you look at the Hayward Fault as being the next big event, Piedmont is the only school district where all of our facilities are within the fault area.

For instance, if the judgment of the engineers is that Beach would cost \$10-\$12 million to retrofit and the structure will be reusable after an earthquake with perhaps some minor repair, versus the building will have to be torn down after an earthquake and replaced at a cost of \$50 million, it might be a prudent decision for the Board to say we should spend the \$10 million before an earthquake. To him, he feels Measure E would authorize the Board to do the prudent thing, which is to make sure the buildings are usable after the quake and make sure that the life-safety needs are taken care of. That's what we need to hear from the community.

On the accessibility issue, he agrees with Vice President Geddeis that if the Board is being realistic, he does not think the District will be able to afford to do any of the optional accessibility work. He knows there will be a lot of debate about this but he is not sure that the voters who voted for Measure E intended for that to be a priority, even though, as Vice President Geddeis pointed out, it was included in the bond language. Board Member Gadbois said it is just his interpretation of the intent. He thinks the intent of the voters is that, for instance, if the Middle School does not need any seismic work but needs \$5 million in accessibility work, are we going to say we are going to do this work or not?

His last point is on the issue of supplant vs. supplement. For instance at Havens, if \$23,000,000 (just an example) has imbedded in it programmatic improvements and modernization and if we can't separate it out, he would argue that the State fund should supplant Measure E; in other words, it's already "baked in" and we are planning on using Measure E money to do that, then he thinks that State money should be used to replace that. If we can separate them out, in other words, use \$20 million hypothetically for safety and accessibility work required, and \$3,000,000 is for modernization and program improvement along the way, he would say Measure E funds should be used for the \$20,000,000, and State funds should be used for the \$3,000,000. We can't have our cake and eat it, too. We can't use Measure E funds to do modernization and then turn around and use State modernization funds to do additional modernization.

Board Member Lindenmayer felt the following things need to be addressed with the monies:

His "A List":

- Seismic and usability of buildings after an earthquake is a bare minimum must
- Fire and life safety is an absolute given, to include integrated

- fire alarms at all the facilities
- DSA-required accessibility
- Include District-wide repair of all key/lock problems
- Maintenance facilities: Replace one structure and repair the other

His "B List":

- Replace wiring, etc, when walls are open
- Parity between the schools, especially elementary schools – he is thinking programmatic parity
- Programmatic improvements to the extent they are cost-effective (above and beyond any parity issues)

His "C List":

- Non-DSA required ADA
- Green construction techniques only if makes economic sense
- Historic preservation only if makes economic sense
- Replace Maintenance facility
- Demographic / full-time kindergarten; this issue was not incorporated into Measure E but is something to think about; for instance at Havens, there are two rooms in the hybrid design concept which presently do not look like they would qualify as classrooms; if they could be redesigned in a way where they could qualify as classrooms at a nominal cost

Board Member Lindenmayer stated it is not the Board's position to be thinking about demographics twenty-five years down the road; as Superintendent Hubbard stated, our town is limited and there will not be a massive change in population.

President Monach clarified that there was not an expectation in developing these guidelines that the Board come out with a prioritization; rather as the program plan is being developed and Board members are weighing what the project sequence is going to be, that is how these guidelines would be used to help develop prioritization of the projects.

Board Member Tolles asked, as far as the guidelines go, our numbers are going to go over the \$56 million bond limit. Are there some guidelines that the Board can give to help cut costs somewhere, especially if we include the "yellow tag" group? It should be offered as part of the public debate. He added that there doesn't seem to be anything profound about cost or savings with a historic fabric. He feels the safest way is to go with the historic fabric if the cost is not exorbitant. There can be significant project and delivery consequences.

John Nelson said, specifically on the roof issue and the clay tile, at Beach they performed an analysis of if they took the tile off and put a shingle roof on and picked the lightest weight on, what would the impact be on the structure? They determined that the outcome was that actually you would do just as much work throughout the building so the reduction in the weight would not change the disruption; you might have a little less nailing or a little bit thinner plywood but the work would be just about the

same, so to go buy a new roof material and install it would not really have any advantage, so you would want to consider that carefully. If you have the clay tile roof and it's properly installed, it will last 75 years on those buildings. If you do another kind of roof material, such as asphalt shingles, that might last only 25-30 years. Additionally, the District already owns the clay tiles. It might make good sense just to use the existing tiles.

Havens Parent Lilis Stern wanted to repeat the request that has come up a couple of times which is to look at the long range plan for these buildings. The Beach plans looks like half of the school needs every single wall replaced. Does it make sense to put those walls back in the same place before we have thought about the demographics? At one time there was discussion of making two of the grade schools K-2 level, and one grades 3-5 - when do you think about that? Another thing to think about concerning demographics that hasn't been discussed is that the District may have a population that remains relatively stable, but one thing that has come up is that it is possible that the number of students who need various types of resources has increased and maybe those spaces need to be increased. She would like the Board to have a better idea of where to spend the \$56 million.

Carolyn Kenney, Havens Parent, stated she understands that what was voted on was to fix the schools from a safety standpoint and address ADA issues and the bond was not written nor intended to replace schools. When you look at Beach, there are not programmatic issues in order to solve the safety problems. It is very straightforward. The problem at Havens is a more complicated fix, and if you are going to solve a safety problem by moving a wall, then you have to look at program since one of the guidelines is not to take program away. Yet, if there is not a long-range plan for Havens, how do you know what you are designing for? It would seem that because there is no long-range plan, it would be difficult to evaluate how you would fix safety problems and address programmatic fixes.

Resident George Childs talked about "supplant" versus "supplement". The District won't know whether the State is actually going to provide money in a timely manner to do any of these projects. So if we are fortunate enough to get some monies from the State, there will probably be no useful way to use that money except to supplant what we have spent. We will be trimming off something in this program. We'll probably get to the point where we will have to defer some of the non-DSA mandated issues. If the money then comes in from the State, it seems decisions will have to be based on \$56 million – not monies from the State.

Katherine O'Connor, Havens Parent Club President, 1870 Trestle Glen, commented that it is important to fine-tune the list because in looking at the life safety risks, Havens is the only site where children were pulled out and put into portables. That should really come up clearly what is the current impact, what is truly a life safety risk, and once it is laid out, make sure you are

not reducing programmatic delivery. Having this delineated will make it much simpler as to what projects can be done.

Ken Jensen, resident and member of the Citizens' Oversight Committee, said it seems to him we give lip service to parity and the emphasis always comes back to Havens. There is a default solution and it is not the hybrid. We keep emphasizing programmatic needs at Havens, but at Beach, for instance, was there a lot of work done with the faculty and principals to determine what was needed?

Bill Drum, resident and members of the Citizens' Oversight Committee, stated there is a huge earthquake on the Hayward Fault every 140 years and it has been 139 years since the last one. We need to get going on these projects and historically, construction costs go up by 10% each year and our consultant costs are being projecting at a 7% increase per year. The increments of costs for added items may be very small. The first priority, of course, is having classrooms after the earthquake. There may be some buildings that don't get worked on at this time and deferred until the District has the money to do it.

President Monach advised this discussion will continue at the next Board meeting. Also at the next Board meeting, the guidelines will be finalized.

5. Update from the Public Engagement Subcommittee

The meeting and public engagement schedule is available on the bond web site www.pusdbond.org and click on public engagement and then community meetings. The Superintendent's recommendations on the Measure E guidelines can also be seen on the same web site. Input on the guidelines can also be placed at the same web site.

On Saturday, December 8, 2007, from 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in the Piedmont Middle School multipurpose room, there will be an interactive Community Workshop in order to provide input on the Draft Program Implementation Plan. The District would like to have at least three representatives from all community groups, support groups and parent clubs to participate. Individual community members are also invited. RSVP's should be sent to Beverly Feusier, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, at bfeusier@piedmont.k12.ca.us or 510-594-2614. Please give your name, email address and the organization you are representing. A detailed flyer will be distributed in November. It is hoped at least 150 people will participate.

Conduct Annual Review of Specific Board Policies:

- . Board Policy 5116.1, "Assignment of Students to Schools / Open Enrollment"
- . Board Policy 6145, "Extra and Co-Curricular Activities"

Education Code mandates that these two Board Policies be reviewed annually. It was acknowledged that these policies were reviewed by Board members. Administrative Regulation 5116.1 is being revised and will be brought to the Board as an informational item at a later date.

CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence was received regarding the Curriculum / Curriculum Council; the Board President received a letter regarding a middle and high school parent concern, which is being handled by the Superintendent; and the Board was copied

on a letter from a Middle School parent regarding the collaboration schedule, which response is also being handled by the Superintendent.

BOARD REPORTS

Vice President Geddeis announced that the High School Boosters Club is making aprons which will be for sale at the football game on Friday. The Parent Calendar Committee presentation was fantastic; it was good to have parents and teachers and members of the negotiating team to hear others' perspectives.

Board Member Lindenmayer was invited to a committee meeting regarding the Arts/PE programs grant. An update on how the money is being spent would be appreciated.

President Monach shared an anticipated change to the month in which the City Municipal Election may be held. It is being discussed by the City Council to approve a Resolution asking voters in March 2008 to support moving the Municipal Elections normally held in March, to November.

There would be ramifications to the timing of the City's Municipal Tax Election and the School Parcel Tax Election if voters do approve moving that election month from March to November. This issue was held over to the Council's next meeting on November 5, 2007.

Board Member Gadbois attended the District Technology Committee meeting regarding revamping the District web site.

Board Member Tolles feels the implementation of the Curriculum Council meetings has been great, and the dialogue, although at times passionate, is healthy. He thanked Jamie Adams, in her role as Director of Curriculum, for running the meetings and to the parents for attending.

CONSENT CALENDAR: ACTION ITEMS

It was moved by Vice President Geddeis, seconded by Board Member Gadbois, and passed unanimously to approve the Consent Calendar as follows:

1. Adopt Regular Board Meeting Minutes of October 10, 2007
2. *Approve Personnel Action Report
3. *Approve Contract Between District and CoVision, to provide equipment for a Measure E Bond Program interactive Community Workshop to be held on December 8, 2007. The effective date of the contract will be from October 25, 2007 through December 14, 2007, at a total cost not to exceed \$6,615.00 (150 participants anticipated). Funding Source: Measure E Bond Fund
4. *Adopt Resolution 08-2007-08, "Authorizing Closure of Revolving Cash Account 010-0241736" (Michael Brady, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services)

It was discovered that this revolving cash account had not been established as a non-profit account and needed to be closed. The independent auditor is requesting a Resolution for any account opened or closed. Therefore, the Board is

being requested to adopt the Resolution closing the account.

FUTURE REGULAR BOARD MEETING
AGENDA ITEMS

(Subject to change)

- Review of Board Bylaws (Section 9000) (Board Workshop-TBD)
- PHS Design Concepts/Cost Estimates-all buildings (Nov 14)
- Wildwood Preliminary Concepts/Preliminary Cost Estimates (Nov 14)
- PMS Design Concepts/Cost Estimates (Nov 14)
- Program Plan Development guidelines finalized (Nov 14)
- Emergency Plan: All Sites (Nov 14)
- Special Board Meeting, City Hall, 7:00 p.m.: Initiate Program Plan Development Phase (Nov 28)
- Review First Interim Financial Report and Approve a Positive Certification of the District's Ability to Meet Financial Obligations for Current and Subsequent Two Fiscal Years; Authorize Appropriate Budget Transfers (Nov)
- Appoint Parent Rep to SELPA Community Advisory Comm (Nov)
- Election Resolution (Nov)
- Quarterly Report on Measure E Bond Expenditures (Dec)
- Community Meeting: Saturday, December 8, 9:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m., PMS multipurpose room: Community to Provide Input on Draft Program Plan

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, and with no objections by the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

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

CONSTANCE HUBBARD
Secretary, Piedmont Unified School District
Board of Education