

## Frequently Asked Questions - PUSD Measure E Bond Program (Last Revised 12/16/08)

1. Who are the consultants currently working on each project and their respective responsibilities in ensuring the successful implementation of the Measure E construction?

<b>Firm</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Responsibility Area</b>
ATI Architects & Engineers	Havens Rebuild	Architect of Record - Seismic & Modernization work Schematic Design Interim Portable Planning
murakami/Nelson	Beach Elementary Ellen Driscoll Retrofit Maintenance Facility PHS Retrofit Wildwood Elementary	Architect of Record - Seismic & Modernization work Schematic Design Interim Portable Planning
R.P. Gallagher Associates	All Projects	Structural Engineering
Maryann T. Phipps EStructure	PHS	Structural Engineering Peer Review
Seward L. Schreder Construction, Inc.	Maintenance Facility	Developer
Amy Skewes-Cox, AICP	Evaluate possible Interim Portable Locations	CEQA (CA Environmental Quality Act) Consultant for Interim Portable Planning
Vila Construction Company	All projects	Program and Construction Management Interim Portable Planning
Webcor Builders	Havens Rebuild Ellen Driscoll Retrofit	Developer
Theodore C. Zsutty, Ph.D.	Beach Havens Ellen Driscoll Wildwood	Structural Engineering Peer Review

2. What is the chronology of work completed to-date on the Measure E Seismic Strengthening Program?

Time Period	Work Completed
Dec 2007	<p>The PUSD convened a Community Meeting, where consultant, Gina Bartlett, of the Center for Collaborative Policy, and architects and engineers of murakami/Nelson and R. P. Gallagher Associates, provided the community with a comprehensive view of the seismic strengthening needs of the school district facilities.</p> <p>In addition to the engineering findings presented, a 'Red – Yellow – Green' tag naming convention was used by consultants to describe the relative seismic strengthening needs of buildings on each campus. It was recommended that all red and yellow tagged buildings be brought to common life safety standards (green status) and that campuses with red tagged buildings be addressed first, before those with yellow tagged buildings.</p> <p>Red Tag    Havens Glass Wings (vacated), PHS Quad Bldg, PHS Student Center, PHS/PMS Integrated Fire Alarm, PUSD Maintenance Facility</p> <p>Yellow Tag    Wildwood &amp; Beach Elementary (1930's construction), Ellen Driscoll Auditorium, Havens 1930's construction and Administration Building</p> <p>Green Tag    PMS, PHS Alan Harvey Theatre, Havens 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Wing, Havens Multipurpose Room</p>
Jan 2008	<p>The Board was presented with a proposal by community members Mark Becker, Jim Nybakken, and Andy Ball to consider rebuilding the Havens campus at a fixed maximum price. The proposed project start date was June 2009, with a targeted completion date of August 2010, in time for the start of school.</p>
Apr 2008	<p>The Board approved a Preliminary Service Agreement between PUSD and Webcor Builders to pursue the Havens rebuild proposal.</p>
Jun – Jul 2008	<p>The design schematic work for the remaining projects (PHS, Maintenance Facility, Ellen Driscoll Auditorium, Wildwood and Beach Elementary Schools) was completed by murakami/Nelson and presented to the Board in this time period.</p>
Jul – Nov 2008	<p>Contracts were approved between PUSD and murakami/Nelson for Design Development and Construction Documents for PHS, Maintenance Facility, Ellen Driscoll Auditorium, Integrated Fire Alarm System for PMS &amp; PHS, and Wildwood Elementary School.</p>
Sept – Oct 2008	<p>The Board authorized PUSD to begin negotiations with a Developer for the Maintenance Facility and approved a final contract. Construction was scheduled to begin on October 8, 2008, with a targeted completion date of February 27, 2009.</p>

Oct 2008	The Board reviewed the overall program and project budgets developed, based upon the design schematic work completed for all projects.
Nov 2008	The Board reviewed interim portable needs, and priorities in evaluating possible options. Opportunities for public input were scheduled for November 12, November 18, December 1 (Joint meeting of the Board and City Council), and December 10.

3. Now that the engineering investigation, analysis, and design schematic work is complete, what are the program budget, component project budgets, and funding sources for each project?

Site/Location	Site Budget	Measure E	State/City
Maintenance Facility	\$ 2.0 M	\$ 2.0 M	\$0.0 M
PMS	\$.4 M	\$.4 M	\$0.0 M
Ellen Driscoll Auditorium	\$2.9 M	\$2.9 M	\$0.0 M
Havens Elementary	\$25.5 M	\$20.8 M	\$4.7 M
PHS	\$9.7 M	\$3.9 M	\$5.8 M
Wildwood Elementary	\$9.4 M	\$8.2 M	\$1.2 M
Beach Elementary	\$12.2 M	\$11.2 M	\$1.0 M
PUSD Bond Program	\$5.6 M	\$5.6 M	\$0.0 M
Sub-total	\$67.7 M	\$55.0 M	\$12.7 M
Program Contingency	\$1.0 M	\$1.0 M	\$0.0 M
<b>Total Program Budget</b>	<b>\$68.7 M</b>	<b>\$56.0 M</b>	<b>\$12.7 M</b>

\*As presented at the 10/22/08 Board Meeting

4. What is the proposed project sequencing and construction time-line for each project?

#### Academic School Year

Project	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Maintenance	XXXXXXXXXX			
PMS	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		
Ellen Driscoll		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		
Havens		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		
PHS		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XX	
Wildwood			XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
Beach				XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

\*As presented at the 10/22/08 Board Meeting

5. In the current economy, will the District have enough funds to complete all of the identified work?

Yes. According to the District's bond counsel, KNN Public Finance, sufficient bonding capacity exists to complete the identified seismic strengthening and associated modernization work at the targeted school/district facilities.

Bonds will be issued in series to fund the various projects based upon the implementation plan and projected budget. The first \$15 million of general obligation bonds was issued in July 2006, including \$10 million of current interest bonds and \$5 million of zero coupon bonds. As of June, 2008, approximately \$9 million remains from the first issuance.

The District is preparing to conduct a second issuance sometime in 2009. KNN confirms that PUSD has bonding capacity of \$28 million for this next issuance. The combined budget of the next three projects in line (Havens, Ellen Driscoll, and PHS) is approximately \$38 million. Assuming all State modernization and local funding is captured for Havens and PHS (\$10.5 million total), and the unexpended \$9 million from the first issuance is applied towards these projects, PUSD anticipates needing approximately \$20 million in Measure E funding to complete these projects. When Measure E was approved, it was assumed that bonds would be sold in four series to fund all of the projects. Given current market conditions, KNN is in the process of developing a recommendation as to whether to fund the remaining projects (Wildwood and Beach) with a total of three or four issuances.

6. Where are we in the application process for State funds for each project?

The District has retained the firm of Hancock, Gonos, and Park, to submit applications to the State to help pay for the Measure E Bond Program work. The application to determine eligibility is complete. The consultant estimates that PUSD is eligible for approximately \$11 million. Access to the funds is triggered by the Division of the State Architect's (DSA) approval of each project. Only after plans have been approved by DSA, may the District submit an application to the Office of Public School Construction for State modernization funds. Plans have been submitted to DSA for approval of the Havens Elementary School, Ellen Driscoll, and Piedmont High School work. Once approval has been received, the District will apply for approximately \$11 million in State funds to help pay for the bond program projects. Funding formulas are unique to each site as determined by the State.

### **Interim Housing**

7. Given the project sequencing, what do consultants suggest the District consider in developing an Interim Portable Plan to implement the Measure E construction program?

- Given the nature and location of the seismic strengthening work for each project, it was determined by consultants that project phasing is not a viable option. Therefore for all projects, the consultants recommend that buildings be unoccupied during the entire period of construction.
- In order to minimize costs, consultants recommend that portables be placed in as few locations as possible for the duration of the three-year construction program. Savings realized from doing this can be applied towards actual construction.
- In order to minimize the number of portables needed, and to minimize disruption to the educational program, consultants recommend that portables be located near current school sites, in order to gain access to common school spaces such as libraries, auditoriums, and play spaces.

8. What is the tentative timeframe for making decisions on the Interim Portable Plans?

Nov 12	Review of possible interim portable locations Review evaluation criteria of possible options Opportunity for Public Input
Nov 18	Presentation of current concepts/options for possible interim portable locations Opportunity for public input
Dec 1	Joint City Council and School Board Public Hearing on options under consideration, and discussion
Dec 10	Board authorization of further investigation of specific sites Opportunity for public input
Jan 14	Report of findings from staff / consultant investigations Based upon the staff report, the Board may direct staff to proceed with next steps as defined in Question 10

In order to adhere to the construction time-line, the Board will need to decide no later than its January 27, 2008 meeting, what plans to pursue.

9. At the December 10, 2008 meeting, what did the Board direct staff to do?

- a. Of the possible locations being considered for portables, the Board authorized staff to work with the appropriate entities (Fire Marshall, City Traffic Engineer, CEQA Consultant, and DSA) to conduct further investigations and to assess the viability of the following options:
  - Locate whole elementary school at Emeryville Unified School District, a site available for lease
  - Locate whole elementary school at Blair Park, a site undergoing a Cumulative EIR with Coaches Playfield, that is being conducted by the City of Piedmont
  - Split elementary school between Beach Blacktop / Beach Tennis Courts and Wildwood School Blacktop, and if necessary pursue alternatives if these locations are not deemed to be viable
- b. The Board supported that the Havens site and portables be used by PHS in 2009/10.
- c. The Board suggested that staff remove Witter Baseball Field and Witter Softball Field from further investigation and consideration.
- d. The Board also asked staff/consultants to develop a matrix that documents all sites that have been considered, recommended evaluation criteria to assess viability, and staff's/consultant's findings and assessment of viability. The locations include:
  - Beach Blacktop/Beach Tennis Courts
  - Beach Tennis Courts/Beach Playfield

- Blair Park (across from Coaches and adjacent to Moraga Avenue)
- Bonita Avenue (between Vista and Oakland Ave)
- Bonita Avenue (between Vista and Magnolia)
- Central Piedmont Tennis Courts
- Coaches Playfield
- Dracena Park
- EBMUD Reservoir
- Emeryville Unified School District School Site for lease beginning 2009/10
- Hampton Field
- Havens campus (for PHS classrooms in 2009/10)
- Magnolia Avenue (between Hillside and Bonita)
- Mountain View Cemetery / Claremont Country Club
- PHS parking/blacktop areas (adjacent to gyms and music building)
- Wildwood Blacktop
- Witter Baseball Field only
- Combination of Witter Baseball Field / Wildwood Blacktop/Witter Softball Field
- 801 Magnolia

10. Once viable locations have been identified, what are the next steps for implementing the plan?

- a. District to coordinate logistics with City of Piedmont and/or City of Emeryville
- b. Architect to develop design schematics for each location, working with Piedmont's Fire Marshall, PG & E, and the Division of the State Architect
- c. Work with City's traffic engineer to develop mitigation plans for traffic and parking for each location
- d. Submit construction documents to the Division of the State Architect for approval
- e. Initiate CEQA review process with CEQA consultant
- f. Initiate RFP process for portable lease and installation