

**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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 the elimination of relocatables were all 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 JUNE 25, 2007,  
AGENDA ITEM III.**

**SANTA MONICA-MALIBY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Measure "BB" Advisory Committee  
Committee Charges**

The purpose of the Measure "BB" Advisory Committee is to provide the Board of Education and district staff with the community's perspective regarding school site construction projects using funds from Measure "BB," which was voted on and passed November 7, 2006.

The committee shall ~~consist of a minimum of 11 members, not to exceed 15 members~~ **review applications for membership and make a recommendation to the Board of Education regarding membership and establish a process for moving forward.** All attempts will be made to include members of the community who will bring different views to the committee, including relevant expertise (e.g., technology implementation and requirements, construction, safety, curriculum/fine arts, environmental concerns, issues regarding cultural relevance; etc.), cultural backgrounds, geographical areas of the district, representatives from both Santa Monica and Malibu, SEIU, Santa Monica College, and the teacher's union.

The committee's charges are as follows:

1. Advise the board during the final stage and development of the comprehensive Facilities Master Plan.
2. Advise district staff in identifying potential project managers needed to implement construction projects.
3. Provide input to staff on identified Health and Safety priorities for Phase I projects.
4. Work with staff and project consultants to review projects that reflect board, district, and site priorities, **including issues of equity,** during all phases of **planning, design, and** construction.
5. Provide progress reports to the board as necessary and/or requested.

**FOR REVIEW BY MEASURE BB ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON JUNE 25, 2007,  
AGENDA ITEM III.**

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION/CONSENT  
06/28/07

FROM: DIANNE TALARICO/STEPHEN R. HODGSON/VIRGINIA I. HYATT

RE: AWARD OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CONTRACT FOR MEASURE BB  
BOND TO PARSONS 3D/I

It is recommended that the Board of Education award a contract to Parsons 3D/I (West Los Angeles, CA), in association with California Construction Management (Whittier, CA), to provide necessary Program Management services in conjunction with the Measure BB construction program, in an amount not to exceed \$80,000. It is further recommended that C.W. Driver (Pasadena, CA) and Bernards (San Fernando, CA) be designated as supplemental approved firms.

Funding Information

Budgeted: Yes  
Fund: 21  
Source:  
Account Number:  
Description: Consultant Services

COMMENTS: District staff developed a Request for Qualification (RFQ) document for Program Management services in conjunction with the Measure BB construction program. Thirty-two (32) companies were represented at the mandatory pre-qualification meeting on May 1, 2007, and Fifteen (15) firms subsequently submitted proposals. After review, six (6) firms were selected for interviews. District staff, its consultant, along with four representatives from the Measure BB Advisory Committee, conducted interviews and evaluated the capabilities of each of the firms. Of the six interviewed, three were selected as finalists, with negotiations proceeding with Parsons 3D/I.

The service contract with Parsons 3D/I is still being prepared, and staff is requesting that a preliminary contract be drawn up for a period of thirty days until such contracts are completed in order for work to begin July 1, 2007.

It is anticipated that by August 9, 2007, negotiations will be completed between the District and Parsons 3D/I and final

agreement be presented to the Board of Education for approval. It is estimated that over the life of the Measure BB construction program, the eventual cost of Program Management services will be in the range of \$4.8 million. At this time, the contract will address only Program Management services. Should performance standards be met, an amendment to the contract will be added for as needed Construction or Project Management.

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:

**FOR MEASURE BB ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW: 7/9/07, AGENDA ITEM VI .**

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION/CONSENT  
06/28/07

FROM: DIANNE TALARICO/STEPHEN R. HODGSON/VIRGINIA I. HYATT

RE: AWARD OF CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)  
AND PROGRAM-LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
(EIR)TO PCR SERVICES CORPORATION

It is recommended that the Board of Education award a contract to PCR Services Corporation to proceed with the Environmental Impact Report(EIR) process in conjunction with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to complete the Facilities Master Plan and initiate implementation of Measure BB construction projects, in an amount not to exceed \$                    .

Funding Information

Budgeted: Yes  
Fund: 21  
Source:  
Account Number:  
Description: Consultant Services

COMMENTS: Agenda Informational Item #I.01 dated 6/13/07, provided a detailed explanation of the CEQA and EIR process, the impact on the Facility Master Plan and the anticipated schedule for the review process.

Project History and Overview

In early 2005 the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (SMMUSD) initiated a planning process to prepare a District-wide Facilities Master Plan. Currently a Preliminary Draft Facilities Master Plan is being reviewed by district staff and will be issued for review on June 8, 2007. The Board of Education is scheduled to discuss the Plan and consider authorizing staff to initiate environmental review of the Plan under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) at their regularly scheduled Board meeting on June 28, 2007. During the environmental review process the Preliminary Draft Master Plan will be subject to additional refinement prior to being issued as a Draft Master Plan during the public comment and circulation period for the Draft Program-level Environmental Impact Report (Draft Program EIR). The Final Master Plan will be presented to the Board for approval

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: