

**Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
Board Committee
Measure BB Advisory Committee Meeting**

AGENDA

Monday July 9, 2007,

Time: 4-6:00 pm

Location: Board Room, District Office

1651 16th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90404

- I. Call to Order- Co Chair Gleam Davis**
- II. Approval of Minutes** – Approve minutes of June 25, 2007 Meeting
- III. Introductions: New and Continuing Members**
Introductions- New Members Appointed by Board on June 28
Brown Act Overview – to be provided to all new District Advisory Committee members
Facilities Master Plan Overview
- IV. Presentation on Educational Objectives in relation to Facilities** - Dianne Talarico and Sally Chou
- V. Discuss Phase 1 Priority Projects for Measure BB Funding**
Discuss rationale for preliminary recommendations from District Staff on potential BB projects
Discuss “option packages” for Phase 1 prioritization
Schedule for Board discussion and action on identifying priority projects for Measure BB
- VI. Program Manager Report** — Patrick Kennedy and Tom Tomeoni, Parsons 3di, Program Manager
Role and range of services for Program Management team – Patrick Kennedy
Discuss General Schedule for Program Management services in initial 3-6 months
- VII. Discuss PCR Scope of Services for Draft Program EIR – Jay Ziff, PCR**
Review attached staff report and PCR Proposal for EIR Preparation for July 12 Board action
Discuss preliminary schedule for Draft EIR Scoping, Preparation and Public Review
Discuss approach to CEQA compliance for exempt, minor and major projects
- VIII. Public Comment**

Measure BB Advisory Committee Members:

Craig Hamilton, Co-Chair (unable to attend)
Gleam Davis, Co-Chair
Dennis Crane
Ralph Mechur
David Resnick
Barbara Stinchfield, City of SM (Karen Ginsberg will attend)
Bob Stallings, City of Malibu (unable to attend)
Kathy Wisnicki, Board Liaison
Don Girard, SMC
Chris Harding
Laura Rosenthal
Laura Rosenbaum
Ted Bardacke
Elaine Rene-Weissman
Larry Gray
Judith Meister
William Jepson
David Kaplan

SMMUSD Staff:

Dianne Talarico, Superintendent
Steve Hodgson, Interim CFO and Asst. Superintendent
Sally Chou, Chief Academic Officer
Virginia Hyatt, Purchasing Director
Wally Berriman, Director of Facilities/ Director on Special Assignment
Sarah Wahrenbrock, Assistant to Superintendent

District Consultants:

Jay Ziff, CEQA Consultant, PCR
Tom Tomeoni, Program Manager, Parsons 3d/i
Alison Kendall, FMP Project Manager, Kendall Planning + Design
Patrick Kennedy, Program Management Consultant

NOTE: SEE ATTACHMENTS RELATED TO THE ABOVE DISCUSSION ITEMS.

SCHEDULE OF MEASURE BB RELATED ITEMS ON UPCOMING BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS :

- June 28, 2007: BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Board approved Interim Program Management Contract
Board endorsed Preliminary Draft Facilities Master Plan
Board approved Director on Special Assignment role for Wally Berriman
Board appointed remaining 7 members of Measure BB Committee
Board approved Boys + Girls Club Project at JAMS + OPSC Joint Use Funding Application
- July 9, 2007: MEASURE BB COMMITTEE**
Presentation on Educational Priorities for BB Projects
Recommendation to Board on Measure BB Project List
Review of PCR Contract for PEIR Preparation
Discuss Program Manager role and Schedule of Tasks
- July 12, 2007 BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Measure BB Recommendation to Board on BB List
Superintendent Recommendation to Board on BB List
Board discussion of BB Project List
- August 9, 2007 BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Board action on Program Management Contract

**SANTA MONICA MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
MEASURE BB ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE 2007-08**

Draft Schedule for Committee, Staff Review 6/21/07

All meetings 4-6pm in District Office-Board Testing Room unless noted.

District Office is located at 1651 16th Street, Santa Monica, near Olympic Blvd.

Meetings are generally third Monday of month unless school vacation day.

All Meetings of the Measure BB Advisory Committee are public meetings

July through December 2007					
Month	1st Mon	2nd Mon	3rd Mon	Note:	Reg Board Mtgs:*
July		7/9/2007		7/9:Board Room	7/12 DO
August			8/20/2007		8/9 DO, 8/23 DO
September			9/17/2007		9/6 DO, 9/27 DO
October			10/15/2007		10/4 M, 10/18 SM
November			11/19/2007	Thanks 11/22-23	11/1 M, 11/15 SM
December	12/3/2007				12/13 DO
December 24-31: Winter Break					
January through June 2008					
January 1-4: Winter Break					
January		1/14/2007		MLK Day 1/21	1/17 DO
February	2/4/2007		2/18/2008		2/7 M, 2/21 SM
March	3/3/2007			Stairway 3/6-7	3/13 DO
March 17-28: Spring Break					
April			4/21/2008		4/3 DO, 4/17 SM
May			5/19/2008		5/1 M, 5/15 SM
June			6/16/2008	Last day 6/20	6/5 DO, 6/26 DO

Board Meeting Locations:

District Office (DO): 1651 16th Street, Santa Monica.

Malibu City Council Chambers (M): 23815 Stuart Ranch Road, Malibu, CA

Santa Monica City Council Chambers (SM): 1651 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA

*Board Meeting Schedule as of 6/21/07

**Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
Board Committee
Measure BB Advisory Committee Meeting**

DRAFT MINUTES

Monday June 25, 2007, 4-6 pm
District Office, Board Room

Participants:

SMMUSD:

Dianne Talarico, Superintendent (present for item V)
Steve Hodgson, Interim CFO and Asst. Superintendent (present for items V and III)
Virginia Hyatt, Purchasing Director
Wally Berriman, Director of Facilities
Alison Kendall, FMP Project Manager, Kendall Planning + Design
Sarah Wahrenbrock, Assistant to Superintendent (not present)

Measure BB Advisory Committee Members:

Craig Hamilton, Co-Chair (unable to attend)
Gleam Davis, Co-Chair
Dennis Crane
Ralph Mechur
David Resnick
Barbara Stinchfield, City of SM
Bob Stallings, City of Malibu (unable to attend)
Don Girard, SMC
Chris Harding (not present)
Laura Rosenthal
Kathy Wisnicki, Board Liaison

I. Call to Order

Chair Gleam Davis called the meeting to order at about 4:10 pm, noting Co-Chair Craig Hamilton was out of town. Items were taken out of order to allow Superintendent and CFO to address committee on items V and III.

II. Discuss Phase 1 Priority Projects for Measure BB Funding (Agenda Items V and III.)

Superintendent Dianne Talarico described her recommended priorities for Phase 1:

- **Focus on High Schools** – Because high schools serve as focal points for the community, hosting cultural and athletic events and extensive joint use, upgrading facilities at high schools is priority
- **Health, Safety, Security and Access** – As promised in campaign and in bond language, health and safety related projects should be top priority
- **Technology Upgrades** – Integration of new technology for 21st century teaching and learning is high priority, as included in campaign
- **Equity in “Curbside Appeal”** – All schools in district would have similar curb appeal to foster school and neighborhood pride
- **Student and Joint Use Athletics** – Given high use levels by students and community, upgrades to athletic facilities to minimize injuries are a top priority.

Dave Reznick asked about **overall cost of “Initial Outline” list** provided at meeting relative to \$268 million Measure BB amount. He suggested only about 2/3 of the \$268m be allocated, and cautioned against over promising, given likelihood of costs to escalate. He also suggested ranked priorities be established, such as high schools, health and safety and technology in case full initial list is not affordable. Superintendent Talarico noted that Tech Department audit will be available in mid July to identify needs.

Gleam Davis noted importance of orienting new members to **District wide perspective** to avoid competition between schools. She suggested Superintendent Dianne Talarico and CAO Sally Chou describe educational goals at July 9 meeting to provide broad overview. She also suggested that “**option packages**” be identified which represent various priorities, such as upgrading high schools or health+safety, and that costs be assigned with Program Manager assistance to these packages.

- Steve Hodgson noted that the schedule to finalize Phase 1 priorities included a **July 12 Board presentation** of the “distilled list” of Phase 1 projects provided for discussion, with comments from the Superintendent, Comments from the Measure BB Committee and Input from Program Management firm.
- Virginia Hyatt noted that **PCR Contract for the Program EIR** is also slated for the July 12 Board meeting, and the project list will impact the EIR. Alison Kendall noted that if there are some projects on which there is not complete consensus, the potential environmental impacts of those projects can be studied as alternatives within the EIR. Alternatively, the project level CEQA compliance can occur at a later date, Virginia noted.
- Wally Berriman reviewed the Initial **Outline of Potential Measure BB Projects**. He noted they were based on bond language, the FMP and considerations of Phasing and Sequencing. Enrollment pressures, programmatic goals, technology upgrades and elimination of relocatables were key goals.
- **Samohi Applied Instruction Building** is an example of a project which achieves multiple goals at once, Wally explained. It addresses fire and life safety problems with the existing Business Building, provides state of art classrooms, provides a technologically integrated Library/Media Center for after school research and homework, will integrate an interior commons/meeting room with food service, and will provide a model for modernization of other Houses at Samohi, support Smaller Learning Communities, and help to reconfigure and redefine the campus. Related improvements to the Promenade and University Plaza will improve pedestrian safety and make the school more welcoming to students and community members.
- Wally Berriman said he will complete preliminary costing by July 9 and will email a revised list with associated costs by Wed or Thursday of next week. The projects will be displayed in a matrix showing fire-life safety, other priority projects, with cost estimates for planning purposes, derived from prevailing costs per SF. These preliminary costs will not include escalation, as precise timing and sequencing will be determined with input from PM firm. Parsons 3di will also take an independent look at these costs, based on FMP description of projects and Opinions of Preliminary Costs by HED.
- Steve Hodgson noted that the value of the bond will decline over time. Current estimates are an eight year construction program finishing 2015. There is risk of too much talk and not making timely decisions eroding the value of the bond. The thoughtful process to arrive at the Preliminary Draft FMP needs to be followed up with timely programming, design and construction.
- Ralph Mechur noted every school site will have to buy off on the projects on their site or it may affect their support of future bonds or parcel taxes. Gleam noted that there may be a need for a Town Hall meeting or review by each site in the Fall.
- Barbara Stinchfield cautioned that it is important to prevent dilution of the District-wide consensus represented by the FMP. She noted we need to avoid a dollar to dollar comparison and competition at each school site. Board needs to make tough decisions and Committee can help. Need to stay on message with Big Picture on District-wide needs. Barbara wrote some proposed **Implementation Principles** for the Committee. They include:
- The basis for prioritizing projects should be the SMMUSD Facilities Master Plan- developed with community and school-based input and endorsed by the Board of Trustees on _____.
- BB Funds should be used to positively impact all schools and all students district-wide; however Phase 1 projects should recognize that specific schools have critical, immediate needs that should be addressed as priorities in order to achieve educational equity district-wide.

- Approved projects should be implemented in an efficient and timely manner in order to avoid excessive cost escalation that would erode the District's ability to achieve the goals of the Facilities Master Plan.
- Phasing of projects on each campus should minimize impacts on students and teachers and avoid significant relocation costs during construction.

III. Contract with PCR for Draft Program EIR Preparation (Agenda Item IV)– Continued to July 9 MMBAC, with Board Action scheduled for July 12. Virginia will provide copy of PCR Proposal for Measure BB Advisory Committee review

IV. Recommendations to Board on Measure BB Committee Membership (Agenda item I)

The Measure BB Committee reviewed the list of potential new members for the Committee. While they were impressed with the qualifications of all candidates, they felt that adding all 13 interested candidates to the current 10 member Committee would produce an unworkable overall number of members. Given the many issues the group will need to advise upon during Measure BB design and construction, the difficulty of obtaining a quorum and of reaching consensus with a large group was a significant concern.

As a result, the Committee members selected seven members from the overall list, based upon the Board charges to consider relevant expertise, geographic diversity, sensitivity to equity issues, past experience with the District and proven ability to consider District-wide issues and forge consensus.

The list below was recommended by Dennis Crane and seconded by Dave Reznick, with an amendment by Laura Rosenthal and accepted by Dennis Crane to add Elaine Rene-Weissman as a second Malibu parent representative in addition to Larry Gray and herself. The list of seven members was unanimously approved (9-0) by the Committee, with all members but Chris Harding in attendance.

The recommended list of seven new members includes:

1. Laura Rosenbaum, Past PTSA Council President with Financial Services Experience
2. Ted Bardacke, Environmental Designer with Green Schools expertise and experience
3. Elaine Rene-Weissman, Architect and Malibu Middle School Parent
4. Larry Gray, Malibu High School Parent, General Contractor, Project Manager on Prop X projects
5. Judith Meister, Current Samohi PTSA President, Former JAMS PTSA President, former Project manager on major capital projects
6. William Jepson, Chief Information Officer for UCLA Dept of Architecture and Will Rogers parent
7. David Kaplan, Historic Preservation Architect with school projects, SM Conservancy member, Samohi Parent

V. Quick Start Project List (Agenda Item VI) was included in agenda for Committee review, as were staff reports for CEQA and Interim Project Management contract.

VI. Agenda Planning for Next Meeting: July 9, 2007 4-6pm. Items include:

- Measure BB Recommendations on Priority Project List
- Recommendations on PCR Contract for EIR Preparation
- Report from Program Manager on Costs, Phasing and Priority Project List

VII. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at about 6:30pm.

**FOR REVIEW BY MEASURE BB ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON JULY 9, 2007,
AGENDA ITEM V.**

Measure BB Projects Matrix to be inserted here.

following certification of the Final Program EIR at the conclusion of the environmental review process. Overall, the environmental review process leading to adoption of the Final Master Plan is expected to extend over an approximate 12 month period.

The Facility Master Plan addresses 17 capital improvement projects. These projects include: 8 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, 3 high schools (including a continuation high school), a child care facility, a language academy, and District administrative offices. Overall, the Facility Master Plan provides for a net increase of 40 new classrooms to be constructed over time to accommodate district-wide enrollment growth forecasted through the 2015-2016 school year. In addition to new classrooms at a number of schools, the Facility Master Plan proposes a broad array of other necessary capital improvements that vary from campus to campus. Some of the more common improvements relate to circulation, pick-up and drop-off areas, surface parking lots, playfields and courts, and a variety of physical plant upgrades for technology, buildings, and aging infrastructure.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that public agencies assess the potential effects of development projects on environmental resources. In enacting this statute, the California Legislature intended that long-term protection of the environment be considered in public decisions, that governmental decision makers and the public be informed about the potential environmental effects of a proposed project, and that ways be identified to avoid or significantly reduce environmental damage. CEQA generally applies to projects that require discretionary decisions by government entities. As implementation of the proposed Master Plan has a limited potential to impact the environment and will require a discretionary approval by the Board of Education, the District needs to address the proposed projects pursuant to the requirements of CEQA.

Program Environmental Impact Report

It has been determined that the proposed Master Plan be addressed through preparation of a Program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. According to the Guidelines, a Program EIR is appropriate for actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either geographically, as logical parts in the chain of contemplated

actions, in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways. Program EIRs contain less detail than typical development project EIRs because the level of detail in the environmental analysis is reflective of the level of detail in the program description itself. As a Program EIR, it should be understood that the level of analysis and specificity of certain impacts and mitigation measures will be inherently limited in specificity, particularly where the campus improvements presented in the Master Plan are more long-term in nature and subject to change and refinement over time. As such, a subsequent and more focused environmental review may take place based on evaluation of individual campus proposals if the individual projects are not exempt under CEQA or if they have the potential to result in impacts that are not adequately addressed or mitigated in the Program EIR. In instances where subsequent CEQA review is required, the Program EIR will provide the basis for Initial Study determinations of the potential for significant environmental effects while helping focus subsequent review on only those effects not adequately considered in the Program EIR. Accordingly, reliance on the Program EIR will help the District avoid future environmental review, or streamline future review through preparation of Mitigated Negative Declarations or Focused EIRs where more comprehensive documentation would otherwise be required.

Project-Level EIR Analysis

In addition to addressing the overall environmental implications of the Master Plan at a programmatic-level, certain campus improvement recommendations presented in the Master Plan are well defined and are being considered by the District for implementation in the near-term, therefore, the Program EIR will also include project-level analysis for certain schools.

Goal of Program EIR

The goal of the Program EIR will be to provide project-level approval for near-term projects, and to only provide the level of analysis warranted for other projects, understanding they will be subject to change and refinement overtime and will be implemented at a point in time when environmental conditions are likely to have changed. An additional goal of

the Program EIR will be to assist the District in the development of project commitments or design practices, which if adopted as part of the Master Plan, will serve to avoid or reduce impacts on the environment that might otherwise occur as a result of school construction and operation. Having such commitments or practices in place as part of the Master Plan will provide the District with another tool to help streamline future environmental review.

While it is important for the District to assess the overall Master Plan program under CEQA, it is also important to note that CEQA Guidelines, Section 15314, Minor Additions to Schools, provides a categorical exemption for "minor additions to existing schools within existing school grounds where the addition does not increase original student capacity by more than 25 percent or ten classrooms, whichever is less. The addition of portable classrooms is included in this exemption."

It is also important to note that CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(b)(3), indicates that projects that follow the "The Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, 1995" ("Standards") shall be considered to have avoided significant impacts on historic resources. Furthermore, as specified under Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines, projects that conform with the Standards are considered categorically exempt from CEQA as relates to historic resources.

Based on the above, the District should be careful to consider the CEQA exemptions described above after approval of the Master Plan and associated Program EIR as individual projects are being implemented. Most of the District's future projects under the Master Plan are likely to individually qualify as exempt from CEQA as minor additions to schools.

Opportunities for Public Input

In addition to on-going public participation related to development of the Facilities Master Plan, the process for the Program EIR will provide several opportunities for public input. In the early stages of the environmental review process a Notice of Preparation (NOP) will be issued to notify agencies and the public that an EIR will be prepared. The NOP, which is circulated for a 30-day period, will solicit input from agencies and public regarding their views

on the scope and content of the EIR. Following this scoping period a Draft Program EIR will be prepared. After District review, the Draft Program EIR will be circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45-days or more. Following the circulation period for the Draft Program EIR, the District will respond to comments and prepare a Final Program EIR for the Board to consider along with approval of the Master Plan at a public hearing.

The Measure BB Advisory Committee is scheduled to review this recommendation at its meeting on June 25, 2007.

MOTION MADE BY:

SECONDED BY:

STUDENT ADVISORY VOTE:

AYES:

NOES: