

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

MINUTES

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** – Laura Rosenthal moved, Dennis Crane seconded, and all present on that day approved minutes of June 25, 2007 Meeting
- III. **Introductions: New and Continuing Members**

Introductions- New Members Appointed by Board on June 28.
Chair **Gleam Davis** invited all members and participants to introduce themselves.
Brown Act Overview – Gleam provided a brief overview of the Ralph M. Brown Act, including a reminder that all business of the committee should be conducted in public. For example, members should not hit “Reply All” when responding to an email from Alison, and then launch into a discussion of an issue before the Committee, since that can constitute an email meeting. Likewise, a small group of members should not meet in private, then meet with another group, until more than a quorum has participated, since this is a “serial meeting”. **(Note: The MBBAC now has 17 voting members, so a quorum is 1/2 the voting members, or a total of 9 members. A formal overview of the Brown Act will be provided to all new District Advisory Committee members at the start of the school year.)**
Copies of the Preliminary Draft of the Facilities Master Plan were provided to all seven new members at the meeting. An Overview Powerpoint presentation of the Facilities Master Plan will be provided for new members and others. **Alison Kendall** will contact members to schedule a date in mid/late July.
- IV. **Presentation on Educational Objectives in Relation to Facilities** – Item was deferred to a future meeting. Superintendent Talarico said she will be presenting this presentation for the first time to the Board on July 12.
- V. **Discuss Phase 1 Priority Projects for Measure BB Funding**

Schedule for Board discussion and action on identifying priority projects for Measure BB
Gleam Davis and other members expressed confusion about the schedule for Board action and the Measure BB committee Role. She noted this is the first time the Committee has been provided with the associated costs by site of the proposed Priority BB Project list. **Dianne Talarico** noted that the list provides the project list, cost information and the staff recommendation of prioritizing secondary school projects. District staff noted that the next MBBAC meeting is August 20, and that August 23 will involve further Board discussion of the projects. Although Board will be discussing the project list on July 12 and endorsing a preliminary list and set of priorities on August 9, this won't be a “final” decision. Further input is expected in September from School sites.

Steve Hodgson provided a brief summary of recent and upcoming events (see attached schedule), including the Board endorsement of the FMP on June 28, the decision to sell \$60million in bonds to begin design and construction. He noted that the FMP will inform the project selection. In order to remain within the \$30/100,000 bond/tax rate a 7-8 year construction program is likely.

Cost Estimates: Wally noted that cost estimates in the Staff Report are based on HED data on square footage, recombined to reflect specific projects which are a portion of the total FMP program for each site. For hard cost estimating purposes, the following numbers were used, which include utilities, swing space and site work but not soft costs such as architectural design, CEQA, and permits. Costs: \$500/SF for high school, \$400/SF for middle school and \$300/Sf for elementary schools. In response to **Judith Meister's** question, he explained most of the projects are New Construction to get maximum benefit from the bond dollars, since district will not be eligible for Modernization funds for about 5-10 years. New construction will also provide swing space for future improvement and modernization programs.

Removing Relocatables and Swing Space - Generally, by the end of the Phase 1 program most school sites will not have relocatables except at a few like Franklin where they are needed as swing space for Phase 2. Phase 1 at Franklin includes the removal of the oldest relocatables, three which are more than 30 years old along the west alley. Most relocatables in the district are much younger, and were installed in 92-98.

Dave Resnick asked about the assumed hard versus soft costs. **Patrick Kennedy** estimated 20% soft costs. The \$110m of Secondary projects and about \$80 m of Elementary projects, plus soft costs of Program Management, architectural and engineering services, permits, contingencies and escalation approaches the \$268 million available. Need to make sure realistic total costs are considered. **Ralph Mechur** noted 30-35% soft cost had been experience on previous programs.

- VI. Program Manager Report** — Patrick Kennedy and Tom Tomeoni, Parsons 3di, Program Manager
- Role and range of services for Program Management team -Patrick Kennedy**, consultant to the District, presented information on the role of Program Manager, the scope of services, the rate structure. He noted Program management is generally 2-2.5% of the total improvement program amount, likely to be about \$4.8 million at 2% rate.
- Discuss General Schedule for Program Management Services in initial 3-6 months – Tom Tomeoni**, Program Manager with Parsons 3di assigned to the SMMUSD Program, presented a schedule and scope of services for the initial 6 months. He noted this was a June draft, but reflected the intensive initial effort to set up a program, establish procedures and protocols, and to initiate a number of major projects for the BB Projects. He noted that once the Master Program Schedule and budget and procedures are established, the construction work occurs at a steadier pace, probably over about a 6 year time frame. He will present an overall schedule and budget to the Committee on August 20, which will reflect the BB funds plus anticipated state matching funds. The Program Management team will advise on cost efficiency, phasing, state funding and other ways to get best use of the funding available.

Dave Resnick pointed out that although the BB Priority Project might be considered to be a draft, it will be used by Program Manager (and CEQA consultant) to begin work, and that there is be a cost in time and money to change it significantly. **Tom Tomeoni** said that this can be addressed by setting up a process for changes to the list, and it was important to keep the whole program moving and identify critical decision points and a process for changes.

Judith Meister noted school sites won't see the list until September and may not agree on the priorities. **Dianne Talarico** said that the list is based on a comprehensive needs assessment by an independent consultant, with meetings with Principals, a District wide presentation in March, and meetings at every school site to review the recommendations. **Kathy Wisnicki** stated the plan was produced with an extensive process, but there will be political sensitivity. The Committee will play an important role in delivering the message that it is time to move forward to implement the plan. **Larry Gray** noted importance of establishing procedures so school input comes from the Principal and goes through Wally's staff to Tom in order to avoid chaos and attempted "end runs." **Gleam Davis** noted she has a collection of emails on specific master plan issues to pass on to Tom.

Ted Bardacke asked when the Board needs to finalize the list? Can Pre-program activities occur while the political process is underway to finalize list. Tom noted that adequate consultation with stakeholders is important. He suggested a goal of September for Site Input and decisions on the final projects needed to stay on schedule with Architect selection.

Ralph Mechur warned Committee to be aware of need to build consensus and avoid conflict, which is worse than loss of value due to construction cost escalation. Remember we spent 1.5 years on Master Plan process. Staff has bravely proposed Phase 1 to Board as a way to begin process. Committee should not try to pick projects, but should focus on making sure consultants and staff are doing their jobs or weigh in on priorities. Need to realize risk of inaction or conflict could damage the District's ability to win renewal of the Parcel tax in 2008.

David Kaplan added school sites need to buy in. **Jenny Lipson, SMCTA** added teacher input is needed.

VII. Discuss PCR Scope of Services for Draft Program EIR – Jay Ziff, PCR

Reviewed attached staff report and PCR Proposal for EIR Preparation for July 12 Board action
Discussed preliminary schedule for Draft EIR Scoping, Preparation and Public Review

Jay Ziff, Principal at PCR, presented the scope of work for the Program EIR.

Alison Kendall asked how alternatives would be defined for the FMP, given that some projects might actually have beneficial impacts. Could one alternative be both Phase 1 and 2 projects, to facilitate proceeding with that phase? **Ted Bardacke** made a related comment, noting that some projects could improve water and storm water management, and hoping that alternatives would not be simply an exercise in reducing the amount of construction, but could explore feasible options for phasing or design.

A member asked that the HED technical work be used to the maximum extent to avoid duplication in survey work. Ted asked if the City of Santa Monica work for the LUCE Land Use and Circulation Element Update could be used-**Karen Ginsberg** said not available yet, but Jay said Kaku-Fehr and Peers have done most of the City traffic modeling and can use previous studies if relevant. Jay noted that EIR will suggest potential policies for the District to include in FMP and procedures, and **Tom Tomeoni** noted that the PM firm will also be helping to define sustainability and other strategies, though design guidelines, standards and materials. **Elaine** asked for a key date at which the Project BB list would need to be defined. The committee asked who will interface with the CEQA consultant to integrate sustainability and other issues. District staff, consultants, LEED/CHPS experts and Ted Bardacke on Committee were all identified as resources.

ACTION: Dennis Crane moved, Ted seconded recommendation to Board to approve the EIR Contract with PCR. Approved unanimously.

VIII. Public Comment –Jenny Lipson of SMCTA was present, noted teacher input needed.

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)
Don Girard, SMC (unable to attend)
Chris Harding (unable to attend)
Laura Rosenthal
Laura Rosenbaum
Ted Bardacke
Elaine Rene-Weissman
Larry Gray
Judith Meister
William Jepson
David Kaplan

Board Liaison:

Kathy Wisnicki

SMMUSD Staff:

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

District Consultants:

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

MINUTES APPROVED AT 7/30/06 MEETING WITH CHANGES NOTED.
