

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

APPROVED MINUTES

Monday August 20, 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 – Dennis Crane** moved and **David Kaplan** seconded; all members present approved minutes of August 6, 2007 meeting.
- III. **Discussion – Draft Facilities Master Plan and Recommended Measure BB Projects**

Process For Selection, Recommended Measure BB Projects – Gleam Davis discussed a method where the school sites are updated and given a status of the list of the projects for Measure BB work. **Gleam** thought that the sites may need to be reminded why the projects that appear on the list are there. The process of development of the projects list to allow the architects an understanding of the scope of work is important.

Laura Rosenbaum agreed and noted that the beginning of school in September will allow for numerous opportunities to meet with site committees. SMASH Back To School Night, for example, is on September 6, 2007.

Craig Hamilton stated that the District Advisory Councils (DACs) allow for input from District staff into the project selection and list development. He mentioned classroom standards as an example of how staff would appropriately be included in the planning of the projects. **Gleam** agreed and mentioned the Arts or Physical Education DACs would be appropriate for projects that include those types of learning facilities.

David Kaplan questioned the process being discussed of gaining input from the site, and the schedule timeframe that is currently in place. **Tom Tomeoni** indicated that the agenda includes a discussion of the schedule.

Gleam stated that there may not be a “sync” between the current schedule and the process of getting site/public input on the projects. She noted that there is an initiative to put a Parcel tax on the ballot to the voters in February, and if that happens, the Measure BB projects discussion could be overtaken with that discussion. **David Kaplan** thought that if the meetings at the sites could occur within the first two weeks of September that would be optimal. **Gleam** said that she thought that was unrealistic, given the number of competing activities at the school sites. She suggested that there might be joint site meetings to provide some efficiency in the schedule, or some other ways to move quickly to gain the public input.

Craig reminded the group that the list of projects is a working list, not set. The development of the projects needs to include some guiding principles, and be practical. The current list is over-budget. He stated that there needs to be practicality and a clear message, so as not to over promise.

Gleam stated that the subject is the process, not the menu. The menu can come after a communications with the sites. The current list is a “jumping off” point for the public discussion to proceed.

Guiding Principles

Craig stated that given the Instructional Program Overview presentation given by the Superintendent, **Dianne Talarico**, at the August 6th Measure BB Committee meeting, there is a framework for guiding the process of selection with some guiding principles. **Gleam** said that the Board has focused the discussion for facilities affected by Measure BB by applying excellence and equity. These are broad goals, but those are the two criteria that the Board has given. **Craig** said that these will assist the District to close the achievement gap, which is an implied priority. The point is that there needs to be some progress at each site. He discussed the Superintendent’s presentation that highlighted the use of technology as a way to support achievement of the goals.

Gleam suggested that a matrix might be developed to list all of the projects and “score” them against the guiding principles to evaluate. **Barbara** noted that there had been a lot of discussion around the project list. **Dennis Crane** said that it would be helpful for the Advisory Committee to come to consensus prior to making a full recommendation to the Board.

Ted asked whether the goal was to give a list of recommended projects to the Board, or give them the guiding principles. **Dave Kaplan** questioned whether the issues of sustainability and joint use were also included in the guiding principles. **Ted** stated that sustainability is a theme applied across the whole program, and concerning joint use, the ripe opportunities for application could be identified. These two issues are on a parallel track with the project list development. **Don Girard** stated that the Advisory Committee should develop a list for the Board to discuss. **Gleam** stated that the process of establishing a list of projects using criteria was appropriate. **Barbara** stated that she believed that what is needed is “criteria”, not guiding principles; something specific to test against and better to develop a list that is equitable.

Gleam stated that established criteria is valuable and then add Joint Use and Sustainability as value-added. **Ted** suggested that the Committee recognize **Wally Berriman’s** list developed and presented earlier in the year, and apply the discussion of the last 6 weeks. **Wally** discussed that a simple evaluation of the projects would be fire and life/safety. Relocatables are old and present a danger to fire and life/safety, and must be replaced with the construction of classrooms. That alone is a major piece of the project list, according to **Wally**. Aside from that, there are the needs for space and related issues, and those issues alone will drive a major portion of the phase one project list.

Gleam stated that a maximum value must be applied to the projects, and that work not be done in phase one that will be demolished or replaced in succeeding phases. **Laura Rosenbaum** reminded the group that the stated purpose of Measure BB was to address safety and repair issues, and they are not glamorous. Additionally, the sites and public needs to be reminded that the repairs won’t happen immediately, and some current students may have moved on before the work is complete. **Craig** discussed the political component of the discussions with the public, and stated that not all projects will get everything.

Tom suggested that he could come back to the Committee with some projects that have had criteria applied, to see what the scenarios look like. Also, economic feasibility should be a part of the overall values applied to the selection of the projects.

Joint Use – Potential Projects List

Tom stated there are opportunities for joint use that are waiting to be mined. He took the Committee through a slide presentation. There is a meeting on the subject of joint use on August 22, 2007, and **Laura Rosenthal** asked if the City of Malibu was included in that meeting.

Virginia stated that no, Malibu was not included; the meeting will be with the City of Santa Monica and Santa Monica College. She suggested that there be a future meeting to include City of Malibu on the subject, and **Laura** asked that she be included in that discussion. **Ralph Mechur** stated a desire that the meeting discuss viable options for Measure BB projects.

Tom mentioned that the Joint Use discussion should focus on feasibility. **Ralph** suggested that there are other opportunities for Joint Use besides facilities; electrical generation, for example. **Ted** raised the possibility that there be discussion of development of properties such as Workforce Housing. Various previous proposals were discussed and that they did not come to fruition due to economic factors in the past. **Gleam** stated that with Proposition X in 1992, the neighbors indicated that they prefer the land at 4th and Ashland (Washington East & West) be used as schools, not developed for other purposes. **Tom** asked if a list of potential projects could be addressed at the Joint Use meeting on the 22nd. **Barbara** stated that the City of Santa Monica was fully aware of the various Joint Use projects being discussed by the District. **Virginia** discussed the possibility of hiring a consultant to perform a feasibility study for the projects. **Barbara** believed that the architect assigned to the Samohi project would be the most natural opportunity for a feasibility study for a parking structure. **Don Girard** stated that funding issues would most likely drive the discussions with the City, and that those that were feasible for funding would most likely be the first considered.

Planning For Community Engagement

Tom presented some slides, included in the meeting packet. A discussion of the various site governance committees followed. District Advisory Committees (DACs) were also discussed, and

the question of which DACs are currently active was asked. **Larry** was asked by **Virginia** to develop a list of active DACs and provide that information to the Committee. **Gleam** suggested that certain members of the Advisory Committee should meet with the appropriate DACs to discuss the projects. Public input sessions were discussed, and **Laura Rosenthal** suggested that a few select meetings be scheduled and the public be invited to attend, rather than going out to many more individual site meetings. **Tom** suggested in the development of the projects, that the DACs be engaged in the discussion as the planners formulate elements of the Design Guidelines such as Pre-school and Special Education classroom requirements. Regardless, **Gleam** noted that a hallmark of the residents of the Cities of Santa Monica and Malibu is that they are very interested and engaged in this development process. **Judith Meister** noted that the design and project development team can also learn from the input from the public.

IV. Possible Action Items:

Subcommittee For Sustainability

Craig asked Ted for his thoughts on this issue. Ted indicated that he has identified three areas of work for the sub committee; first, bring the Board a draft resolution for sustainability to adopt; second, develop an overall sustainability plan, to be included in the design guide; and third, provide an individual sustainability review of the projects list. The first would include discussion and input from the Advisory Committee, the second and third to assist the Program Management team in the project development.

ACTION: **Gleam** moved, **Laura Rosenthal** seconded, all members present approved; Ted Bardacke to chair the Sub Committee For Sustainability, with additional members Craig Hamilton, David Kaplan, and Dave Reznick.

Subcommittee For Joint/Shared Use

The Advisory Committee expressed a desire to have a sub committee review the issues of joint and shared use, and provide the Advisory Committee guidance. The Committee members nominated for the sub committee were: Barbara Stinchfield, Chair, Larua Rosenthal, Bob Stallings, and Dave Reznick.

ACTION: The Advisory Committee will wait until after the meeting with the City of Santa Monica on August 22, 2007 to finalize formation of this committee. The Action was tabled.

V. Public Comment – Concerning Item #III, Discussion Of Draft Facilities Master Plan and Recommended Measure BB Projects:

Lisa Proft, mother of a child in the 3rd Grade at Edison, and Chair of the School Site Council - Lisa reminded the Committee that the Edison community is very aware of the Measure BB initiatives, and they are fully engaged in wanting input into the process of determining what will be done at their school. She stated that her understanding of the goals of Measure BB were surrounding safety, and that safety is a huge issue at Edison, due to the neighborhood surrounding it. She stated that in the neighborhood around Edison is subject to gang violence, for example. She believes that the configuration of the buildings and playground needs to be addressed to provide more barriers to the streets outside of the school property. She stated that the money spent on these types of initiatives will be dollars well spent, given the many needs she detailed at Edison. She stated that these types of projects would take precedence over technology, since she believes that the electrical system at Edison would not have the capacity to incorporate the new technology that is being discussed at other sites. She stated that given the previous discussion of establishing criteria for the completion of work at the sites, Edison would fit well into that criteria.

Grace Phillips, , member of the Edison Site Governance Ad Hoc Facilities Subcommittee – Grace detailed some issues and challenges facing the school such as the size and location of the playgrounds; some issues with some of the work that parents have done at the site being damaged by District personnel. She stated that Edison community doesn't feel that it is treated equally; for example, the buildings need paint. She questioned whether the paint that is on the

building currently contains lead. She discussed the potential hazards that are present at the site, indicating that the location of the site is near the I-10 Freeway, and the Edison community is subjected to car exhaust. She discussed the fact that the playground is on a sloping terrain, and that it isn't possible for the children to use that area for that purpose. She said that the needs of the Edison site would outweigh the needs at other sites.

Adjourned at approximately 6:30 pm.

NEXT MEETING: September, 2007- 4-6pm

Attendance:

Measure BB Advisory Committee Members:

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

Board Liaisons:

Kathy Wisnicki, Board Liaison (non voting member) (unable to attend)
Ralph Mechur, Board Liaison (non voting member)

SMMCCTA Liaison:

Harry Keiley (not present)

SMMUSD Staff:

Dianne Talarico, Superintendent (not present)
Steve Hodgson, Interim CFO and Asst. Superintendent (not present)
Virginia Hyatt, Purchasing Director
Wally Berriman, Director of Facilities/ Director on Special Assignment
Sarah Wahrenbrock, Assistant to Superintendent (not present)

District Consultants:

Tom Tomeoni, Program Manager, Parsons 3d/i
Alison Kendall, FMP Project Manager, Kendall Planning + Design (not present)
Julia Hawkinson, Deputy Program Manager, Parsons 3d/i (not present)
Larry Fugal, Deputy Program Manager, Parsons 3d/i-CCM

Measure BB Advisory Committee – Sub-Committees (Attachment)

Sub-Committee For Sustainability:

Ted Bardacke – Chair

Craig Hamilton
David Kaplan
Dave Reznick

Sub-Committee For Architect Selection:

Craig Hamilton – Chair
Dennis Crane
Don Girard
David Kaplan
Elaine Rene-Weissman

Sub-Committee For Community Outreach

Gleam Davis – Chair
Craig Hamilton
Judith Meister
Kathy Wisnicki
Wally Berriman
Virginia Hyatt