

Oakland Unified School District

Board of Education
Paul Robeson Building
1025 2nd Avenue, Suite 108
Oakland, CA 94606-2212
(510) 879-8199 Voice
(510) 879-8000 Fax



DRAFT

ACCESSIBILITY OF AGENDA AND AGENDA MATERIALS

Agenda and agenda materials, if any, associated with this meeting are accessible on the Board of Education's World Wide Web Site at <http://webportal.ousd.k12.ca.us> or from any computer terminal in the Office of the Board of Education at the above-stated address.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE

Individuals requiring a reasonable accommodation to participate in meetings other than handicapped access, should notify the Office of the Board of Education seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting at either (510) 879-8678 (VM); or boe@ousd.k12.ca.us (E-Mail); or (510) 879-8739 (TTY/TDD); or (510) 879-8000 (Fax).

Minutes (Long)

Tuesday, August 19, 2008

6:00 PM

Board Room

Measure "B" Independent Citizens' School Facilities Bond Oversight Committee

John Cooke, Chair

Jody London, Vice Chair,

(Vacancy), Secretary

Joseph Debro, (Vacancy), David Won, Oscar Wright, Leslie Hamlett and William Ovid

A. Call to Order

Chairperson John Cooke called the meeting to order at 6:10 P.M.

B. Roll Call

Roll Call: Present: Leslie Hamlett, William Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke

Absent: Oscar Wright and David Won

C. Special Presentation



08-1809 Special Presentation - Jody London - Board Member-Elect

Presentation of Congratulatory Certificate to Committee Member Jody London upon her Election to the Board of Education.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[08-1809 - Special Presentation - Jody London - Board Member-Elect.pdf](#)

The chair on behalf of the Committee presented Member London with a certificate of appreciation that reads: "This certificate is awarded to Committee Member London acknowledging your election to the Board of Education of the Oakland Unified School District effective January 5, 2009."

Committee Member London stated she was looking forward to continuing to work with the Measure B committee as a School Board Member relying heavily on the committee and would like to continue the monthly site tours. Committee Member London will talk with Mr. Timothy White and Edgar Rakestraw on ways to recruit and fill the vacancy created by her election to the School Board. Committee Member London feels we should look to our school communities where we have big projects going on when recruiting new committee members.

Presentation/Acknowledgment Made

D. Adoption of Minutes



08-1419 Measure "B" Committee Minutes - Regular Meeting - May 20, 2008

Adoption of Measure "B" Committee Minutes - Regular Meeting - May 20, 2008 with consistent and correct spelling of member Won's last name.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[08-1419 - Measure "B" Committee Minutes - Regular Meeting - May 20, 2008](#)

at the different sites. I have seen them at the sites and was wondering if a site where the majority of the students speak a language other than English are we putting up the banners in a language other than English? At least the thank you part.

Assistant Superintendent Timothy White said at this point we have not gotten any banners other than the ones you have seen in the English Language. It took us a while to make sure we had the appropriate language and signage so at the completion of getting the acceptable languages we still want to make sure what languages we need to translate to. As we move forward, before the Christmas break you will start seeing the signs.

Committee member London said, It would be good to communicate with the community nearby that don't speak English. We had that presentation on District energy policy and the green building policy I am wondering if we have any idea how the Measure B improvements are comporting with the District energy policy and the green policy whether we are doing everything in accordance with that. I ask that question because we did the site tours two Friday's ago and the windows are being chosen based on their ability to withstand vandalism; which I think is entirely appropriate, but there is also a concern that those are not the most energy efficient windows and that's a conflict with our energy policy and some other needs we have and I was wondering how we made those decisions?

Mr. White said it is done on a case by case basis as we hire design professionals to go out and look at school sites and the scope of the project. We do make a case by case determination if we can; actually in some cases we do both. There is new technology that comes out all the time for different building components; windows in some cases have to compromise between safety issues and many cases those are some of the greatest issues that concern the site administrator. There have been so many repeated vandalisms that we have to trade off between those things that are aesthetically pleasing or those things that maybe energy conserving versus those things that may enhance the security of the property. In many cases the security wins out if there is such a heavy loss of equipment and the principals want to make sure they protect their inventory and classrooms.

Committee Member London said as you do the remodels, they don't have to be CHPS compliant but they are supposed to be done in accordance with our green policy and I am wondering if we are using low VOC paint and other less toxic materials? I have noticed on the tours that there people having to use cleaning products that make the hallways smell dreadful and if I was the person having to apply the product it would concern me for my health.

Mr. White said in relation to our modernization and capitol programs, we do make a concerted effort to specify the least harmful environmental products on the projects. The cleaning products are still in the migration stage of trying to find products that fit a happy medium between their efficiency and their ability to clean the wear and tear on the property versus their sustainability and environmentally friendly components. We are actually looking at several different vendors trying a single source that can supply us with green cleaning products as well as giving us products with sufficient strength in nature to address the urban issues of removal of graffiti.

Committee Member London said this becomes an indoor air quality issue and I think it is relevant for our teachers, students, and staff maintaining the facilities.

Adopted as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 5 - Leslie Hamlett, William D. Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 2 - Oscar Wright and David Wong
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0

Roll Call (Secretary's Observation)

Oscar Wright present at 6:39 P.M.

Roll Call: Present: Leslie Hamlett, Oscar Wright, William Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke
Absent: David Won

E. Public Comments Non-Agenda Items Within the Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Committee

08-1794 Public Comments - Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee - Non-Agenda Item(s) - August 19, 2008

Public Comments - Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee - Non-Agenda Item(s) - August 19, 2008.

Barry Luboviski, Secretary for the Buildings and Construction Trade Council for Alameda County. Luboviski said:

I am concerned and troubled about the Project Labor Agreement (PLA) and its performance. We viewed the PLA as contributing to addressing the overall need in our community of jobs, good jobs, real jobs with real training, real careers. We have a history of working in the District. Over half of the local contractors as defined by the City of Oakland and the Port of Oakland's data base; over half of the small local contractors are union signatory contractors and of the total data base of all the contractors, over half are signatory. We think that is an important issue for a healthy community; you need workers invested to have the opportunity and small local businesses that are also committed to local workers and committed to reinvesting money in this community. We support that and future discussions; if I know about them, Mr. White, I am happy to be down here with other representatives. We see this as a collaborative discussion.

Committee Member Hamlett asked what is the racial mix of your union members?

Mr. Luboviski said it varies, in some unions there is a high percentage of Latino workers.

The biggest challenge that remains in the area of recruiting and building networks within the communities of Asian and Pacific Islanders communities and among African American workers; there is a presence but I think it needs to be higher. One of the problems we have because of Prop 209, which we opposed, is putting those kinds of identifiers on it. But it should be noted when we negotiated the Port of Oakland Agreement, we put in there local hire. We have two important words in there: "especially Oakland." What that translated to in terms of our efforts with the Port of Oakland is a focus on the City of Oakland so we have built some partnerships with a number of organizations including Men of Valor, Cypress/Mandela Training Center, Youth Build and other organizations to further those efforts.

Committee Chair Committee Chair Cooke said you stated half of the contractors are signatory; is there a reason the other half has not signed?

Mr. Lubovski responded by saying it's over half and for a number of reasons; small new emerging business don't immediately come into fruition as signatory contractors. On our part unions, some Mr. White build relations with, some contractors on the basis of realizing they need to build capacity. We have seen instances where small local contractors are not ready for the market. It depends on what market you, they are in. If you are remodeling individual houses and you are competitive in that market and you move in to prevailing wage or public works and you are new at that and maybe economically it does not pencil out. You cannot afford a higher wage for your crew on remodeling houses. There are a lot of reasons that dictate business decisions in addition to the fact that some contractors do not want to be union for a lot of reasons. We don't believe it's the intent of the small local contractors. We think its because of prudent business decisions. What we have seen with companies like Masterpiece Painting, Turner Group and a number of the other companies is these were owners that had a relationship with the union. If you become union and take on the commitment to pay the benefits and the wages and you can't get the work in that area; now suddenly you are competing in an area with other contractors that are paying much lower wages, you are not going to be able to stay in business. It's an ongoing effort.

Committee Member Debro said: I am a general contractor and have attended some of the site visits and I have been appalled at the fact that there are no black workers. When I ask about it they say it is the PLA. What does that mean?

Mr. Lubovski said: Joe you and I have a long history and to be quite frank with you; I find many of your questions loaded. You've have given me an antidotal about who said what. The reality is when Dennis Locket was still alive he did a study independent through the City of Oakland and the city found over 1000 residents in the City of Oakland were in apprenticeship programs. Is it an error to say that there are no black workers? I think it would be a real dismay to the IBEW who has a black caucus. It is an area that I will acknowledge I think we need to increase. We are in a society that is - still with everything - a racist society that have divided people on class and on race that still exists. As trade unionist we oppose that. We have supported the PLA; not what I call good faith which is synonymous with a shell game and with promises that are unkept. But we have provisions in the PLA that can lead to contractors being brought to arbitration. We believe the only way we will achieve the goals you addressed in your comments are by putting in place consequences if you don't. We support that; I know discussions in the School District are

effective and I know moving forward we will see contractors held accountable.

Committee Member Ovid said: My observation is not loaded. When we visited that schools that is what we saw. I am glad to hear your comments bring me up to date on informing me more of the efforts. This is what we saw.

Mr. Lubovski responded my observation had to do with years of discussion with Joe to be quite frank. He and I disagree. It's on an ideologically basis. That is not to deny or refute both the visual observation and some of the realities. Quite frankly in my earlier comment I acknowledged the fact that we have arrived at a point that I am not satisfied with. The importance is that the unions are in essence no longer a bull work of figuring out ways to deny workers equal access. Does that mean the problem is solved? No, I certainly agree with you on that.

Committee Member Wright said: I also visited the sites and all I saw was one black man at Oakland High School last Friday. That's the only time I have seen a black person on the job. I was over to Oakland High School and talking to couple of the workers and most of the people don't live in Oakland. We may have a policy that say's hire Oakland but it is nonexistent; not evident in the City or the School District. Most of the contractors don't live in the city; a lot are not unionized. If we have a policy here with this School Board that say's we have to have a certain percentage of minority people there or black people then it should be held to it. It's not a joke that it is happening. It's sad that it is happening. I remember when we did it all. I have poured slabs on the Golden Gateway Project where we had 75 black men, we did everything. And lately we don't get anything. We have one thing in Oakland and I had something to do with that when Dr. Ward was here. We got with the Alameda County Labor Council and we put a carpenter program at McClymonds and they agreed that once the students went through there they would be able to go into an apprenticeship on the job apprenticeship. That was about two or three years ago. We need to do something about it.

Mr. Lubovski responded that we are talking about people's lives and their future. I certainly agree with you Mr. Wright, it is not only not a joke it should be the most serious issues we are talking about. If we are going to make it as a community we can't sustain our communities without decent jobs for people so we agree. I didn't mean to deny or set up false premises. What I wanted to do basically is to demonstrate to all of you my willingness and that of leadership of our council to dialog with you to look at achievements that have been made and to better those achievements; that I am not about the business of either covering up or denying and that I think there is certainly some truth to some of the observations; that's a problem, that's why there is the need to compel contractors rather than merely ask them on who they are hiring; and I think you will see a different leadership. I came into the trades in 1965 and I remember when the first black worker came into the trade. I remember stealing a copy of the test for my trade for a man named Benjamin Lust who got tested. It was a phony test;. It was designed to keep black workers out of the trade and my local was in West Oakland so I am very aware of what I think is a sad and destructive history of the trades going back to the 50's and 60's. I am certainly not going to be here to deny that or deny that some of the same kind of racism and anti-human behavior still exist. I think what you will see with the leadership today it is not something that is encouraged, something championed or something that is denied. Workers that are now coming into the trades are still dealing with many of the same struggles that workers

were dealing with in the 70's and the 60's. I think there is a bit of a different environment so what I am saying and suggesting is that I am here on behalf of the trades and we offer humbly to partner with you; not to come here and tell you something or to deny your observations. My comments with Mr. Debro were maybe misplaced but I have known Mr. Debro for a long time. Mr. White and he has known me. We've had some comments back and forth from Mr. White to Mr. White. That is in no way to deny that there is a need, whether Mr. Debro and I agree or disagree. The one thing we must all agree on is that we have to do an effective job for the young people in our community if we are to sustain our community. On behalf of the unions I am saying we are willing to continue to struggle and to do that.

Chair Cooke said this committee also agrees with you that we have to do an effective job for the youth in our community and that is not limited to the construction but certainly goes into the classroom and within the walls of the school.

Presentation/Acknowledgment Made

F. Unfinished Business



[08-1228](#)

Report - Oakland High School Modernization Project

Presentation of Report on Oakland High School Modernization Project funded by Measure "B".

Attachments: [08-1228 - Report - Oakland High School Modernization Project.ppt](#)

Brent Randall LCA Architects made a presentation regarding the work being done at Oakland High School.

We've been hired by OUSD to complete the ongoing work at Oakland High School. They are trying to do a whole mechanical upgrade in one summer for a building that is approximately 150,000 square feet. Our company is currently punch listing the building which is in the final stage of verifying what the contractor's done and making sure what we drew up is what they have done out there. It looks like it will happen in time for the opening of school. The District was under pressure and obligation to address the indoor air quality that was of concern at Oakland High School. We really wanted to do all the work under modernization but because of the urgency of the work, it that had to be separated out and fasted. Currently on site there are nine portables and a real lack of parking. The main building build in the 1970's is very innocent, brutalistic architecture, and it's kind of difficult to understand where the main entry is to the campus. We had a chance to meet with Clement Mok, the former principal of the school site. He said the site needed a stronger sense of identity and clarity for where you are going in the building. Building E on the site is an older auto shop building that currently is used as two computer classrooms and Building F is the remnant left from the original 1920's Pink Palace, the original Oakland High School. It was the third oldest school in California. To address the concerns that the District had in terms of providing more parking, providing a clear sense of identity, and accessibility we have arrived at this solution. We have taken care of providing the parking by creating a new 2 story classroom Building G. It is located next to

the athletic field. We are planning to completely gut the existing old shop building and reconfiguring it to a much more efficient classroom building complete with accessible elevators, stair case, student and staff restrooms, two dedicated science and art classrooms, a special development center with a wash area kitchen and dedicated restroom as well as state of the art classrooms. The auto shop building will be converted into a Wildcat Wellness Center: an on-site health clinic for students and the local community. On Park Boulevard and MacArthur Boulevard there is no identifier of what this school is. We thought it important to provide a monument sign there. Currently what you see is the restroom facility behind the tree for the athletic fields. We propose a sign be there announcing that this is Oakland High School. Right now the main entry into the school is very hard to find from MacArthur Boulevard so we will be providing a canopy that reaches out to MacArthur Blvd so that students and the public will know where the front door is. Part of this is indoor air quality concern. There is really isn't adequate covered area before students come into the building in mass quantity for them to dry off before coming into the building if it is raining. We have provided better security with ornamental picket fencing; the canopy kind of raises above that and draws your attention back to the main entry. Inside the building, the current corridors were very dark and hard to understand where you were in the building. The final proposed renovation for the corridor ties in with the sockets above and we want to mirror that on the floor with patterns so that you get a real sense of identity for each classroom. The main central space for lighting in the building is not very balanced; there is a lot of glare on the East side as well as a large element that hangs down in the ceiling that makes it dark. The materials have not been update since the 1970's. Part of the renovation is to lighten that up and provide clarity where the main events are in the room. The design also tries to reinforce the character of the building. In the back of the school the District wanted to improve the appearance of the school and we are proposing an entry sign that will help screen the trash compactor as well as provide clarity to the public of the Wildcat Wellness Center and when students are outside having lunch they don't have to look at the trash compactor.

Questions were asked by Committee Members:

Committee Member London asked: What is the District policy on parking and why are we adding parking spaces?

Brent Randall responded that this site has an emergency access lane on one side of the building that is packed out every day with about 30 cars that should not be there.

Committee Member London asked is it teachers or students?

Brent Randall responded all teachers.

Committee Member London asked I have heard complaints from other school sites that they don't have enough parking spaces for teachers particularly in schools that are in urban areas such as next to the Rockridge BART Station where all the parking in the surrounding areas is stickered so teachers have to go and move their cars every hour. One of our commitments, and if it is not we need to have one, is to do more to get our staff and students traveling using public transit or bicycles; I'm wondering if you are going to put bike racks in at the campus? That would help you get some CHPS points for sure.

Brent Randall responded we are not providing extra parking; they are so under parked now we are just trying to get it back so that staff has a place to park at this point. In just meeting the minimum requirement parking for staff - this isn't for high school student parking - it is just for staff. In terms of bicycles we are so under parked for staff that we do not have room to actually accommodate the amount of bicycles needed to earn the credit for CHPS. We'd have to provide some huge area for some 200 bicycle racks just to achieve that credit point.

Committee Member London asked: Do you have any bike racks?

Brent Randall responded not at this point.

Committee Member London stated that's unfortunate. I think we send a strong signal. I have been driving by a site that is being modernized this summer and they have gone from some crummy bike rack to having 3 banks of really nice bike racks in prominent locations around the school site and I think it will send a real strong message to the students and the community about if you ride your bike to school there is a nice place to park it; it's outside the office; someone will keep an on eye on it during the day and it think that real important. I really encourage you to find a way to get some bike racks on that site.

Committee Member London told Mr. White she would like to read the MOU for the Health Clinic.

Mr. White responded certainly you can take a look at the documents for the clinic.

Discussed and Closed

G. New Business



[08-1521](#)

Measure "B" Project Budget Increases for Seven Existing Projects - As Specified

Ratification by the Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee of Project Increases for Seven (7)

Existing Projects:

Chabot Portable Replacement	\$1,400,000.00
Cleveland Modernization	560,000.00
Cole Intercom/PA/Clock	18,237.00
Cox CDC Relocation	170,000.00
Hoover Modernization	525,630.00
Lafayette Intercom/PA/Clock	15,602.00
McClymonds Intercom/PA/Clock	85,806.00
Total	\$2,775,275.00

approved by the Board of Education on June 25, 2008 as Legislative File No. 08-1563.

Funding Source: Measure B - General Obligation Bond

Attachments:

[Document\(s\)](#)

[08-1521 - Measure B Project Budget Increases for Seven Existing Projects - As Specified.pdf](#)

The items before you are for a series of budget increases associated with the approximately seven projects with a cumulative total of \$2.7 Million. The seven different projects total \$1,400,000.00 increase for (1) Chabot Portable Replacement Project. We had increased construction cost with the construction project associated with the two story classroom building. We did have increases in the actual construction costs associated with some changes to the projects and in terms of the original delays when the original budget was done. (2) Cleveland modernization project of \$560,000 budget increases was necessary due to unforeseen conditions such as gas line replacement, rotting wood, hazardous materials abatement and additional fees associated with the designed for those changes. (3) Cole intercom clock and PA as well. (4) Lafayette intercom clock and PA. (5) McClymond's clock and PA. Those increases were associated with hard bid costs. We brought all these before the committee previously. We got a single bid and accepted the bid and these costs reflect the necessary budget to accommodate them. (5) The Hoover increase for \$525,630 is associated with changes in the phasing of the project. We originally requested additional work through the District for restroom tile and redesign to make our restrooms vandalism resistant, wheelchair lifts, painting, and cabinets as well as sink placement. This project was also one that we planned three years ago and came through with a budget that was then developed and in three year we have had certain escalation costs. So these are also intended to cover actual update costs.

Committee Member Wright asked: Will this be the last increase in the budget?

Mr. White responded: Yes, these will be the last increases; you will not see these seven projects come back for additional increases.

Committee Member Wright asked" Are most of our contracts cost plus?

Mr. White responded : Yes, cost plus and property and overhead; hard bid. It is important we have this discussion as a committee. In most cases we will actually come to the Board after establishing a budget with the Measure B Committee. Our budget is based on several things but it is not based on anything concrete. After we the get the approval, we actually go out using the approval we have gotten from the committee and the Board to hire design professionals and inspection professionals to actually flush the scope out. In many cases at that point we see a change in the budget and have more information about the condition of the property and the actual scoping of the property as we get a chance to fine tune those items.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: Is there any way to fine tune the original budget so that we come closer to these figures in the beginning rather than have to increase the budget that has been approved?

Mr. White responded: I think we are making efforts to do that; one of the resistances to doing that is we don't want overly inflated budgets that have way more money in it than necessary for the project. So in the case of maybe half of the ones on this memo they are actually bid costs. So even though we put together preliminary budgets and then did some adjustment and fine tuned those knowing exactly what the scope was when we actually put the projects out to bid. The bids came in at what which was over the approved budget amount. So for us I think it is an opportunity to come back and be transparent about what

the actual hard costs are versus what the actual cost and it prevents me and my staff from over budgeting on a project in an attempt not to come back and have public scrutiny. We would rather have the public scrutiny about what the actual cost are and share that with you and the reason for any change in the cost and have that part of the public record.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: On Cleveland you say it is the gas line and rotting wood. We did not know this in the beginning or is this something that surfaced after the initial bidding?

Mr. White responded: We did not know this in the beginning.

Rocky Borton, Lead Project Manager for the Facilities Department further responded - At Cleveland the dry rot was an unforeseen conditions. Once they opened the walls they found the dry rot and it affected a stairway and it had to be replaced. We find dry rot a lot once you open the wall. It's something we cannot explore in the beginning because we don't open up walls when we are evaluating the scope on the project.

Committee Member London commented on the Chabot Project. The amount requested is \$1.4 million and the amount in the actual papers I saw was \$1.1 million, so where is the other 300 thousand?

Mr. White responded: I talked to staff about that after looking at the notes and the \$1.1 million is an older calculation of the figure and inconsistent with the \$1.4 million. The actual amount needed to cover the construction expenses is 1.4 million and that did not get updated on this sheet. Some of this goes back to when we did not have a quorum for the June meeting and you are just now see this.

Committee Member London asked about Cox, the reason for the delay. Is it the inspections by the county health department? If it was their untimely inspection why do we have to pay for it?

Mr. White responded: Cox is one of our most needy schools, Cox needs a lot of work across the board and it is a campus we share with a charter school and it is a sore point. It is one of the schools we neglected during our last capitol program upgrades. It was an inspection associated with the Child Development Center (CDC) and those have a different type of inspection than the others.

Committee Member London stated: It was a different process so we did anticipate how long the inspection would take?

Mr. White responded - Initially it was a project phased one way and we ended up changing the phasing of that because of the licensed CDC. When we started the project we were not aware of the association with the CDC;. We thought we had the licensing done and we did not want to take that building out of service for the children so we had to change the phasing to rush it in.

Committee Member London said: In the back up documentation some of the contingency amounts are put in at different points in that table you use; it is more of a cleanup thing I believe but it's confusing to me. it's separated out as a contingency for budget purposes

only and the contingency seemed to be rolled into the main budget. I was just wondering if that was important.

Mr. White responded: It's a housekeeping matter for us. It has to do with how the project manager actually uses a particular documentation form.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: Did the county's late response have anything to do with the history of Cox with arsenic and lead underground and across the street at Verdese Carter Park?

Mr. White responded: I don't think so.

A motion was made by Jody London, seconded by Leslie Hamlett, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 6 - Leslie Hamlett, Oscar Wright, William D. Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 1 - David Wong
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0



08-1522

Measure "B" Budgets for Four (4) New Projects - As Specified

Ratification by the Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee of Project Budgets, Key Codes and Scope of Work for Four (4) New Projects:

Playground Inspections	\$100,000.00
Sequoia Portable Installation	80,000.00
Castlemont Landscaping	174,445.00
Laurel Annex Bldg Fire Alarm	100,000.00
Total	\$454,445.00

approved by the Board of Education on June 25, 2008 as Legislative File No. 08-1564, with recommendation that the Board of Education invite students to participate in the design and buy into maintaining the benefits of the project.

Funding Source: Measure B - General Obligation Bond

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[08-1522 - Measure B Budgets for Four \(4\) New Projects - As Specified.pdf](#)

Mr. White gave a presentation regarding the request for budget increases. The items before the committee today is for four new projects rather small but we think important. The projects originally came before committee back in June and one of the inquiries was it looked like we had seen these before but since we did not have a quorum in June we are bringing them back tonight. Playground inspection - we had a retirement in one of our shops, John Elmore who retired did playground inspections for us. We are required to make playground inspections by the state and until we fill that position we got a

lot of playgrounds that we want to continue to inspect particularly as we have a strategy now to go after additional funding from the Williams Uniform Complaint Act. As a result of these inspections, we will use the findings and wrap them up in reports and apply for grant funding. Portable installation at Sequoia, Castlemont landscaping, and Laurel annex building fire alarm replacement. Total of new projects comes to \$454, 445.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: Could you expand on the \$174,000 spent on landscaping at Castlemont what does that entail?

Mr. White responded: There are actually two things happening for the Castlemont Landscaping?

(1)The site does not have proper drainage so there is a big issue associated with the drainage. Right now a lot of the sloping slopes towards the foundation and we want to correct that and prevent any further erosion. (2) We do need further scoping on both projects and that requires us to have some profession input; we need a landscape architect as well as some engineering services. Given an approval for this project we will hire a civic engineer and a landscape architect and flush out the project and more clearly define what the needs are in both areas.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: Where will the landscape take place? In front of the School?

Mr. White responded: Primarily in the rear of the school.

Committee Chair Committee Chair Cooke-By the libraries?

Mr. White responded: Yes, it's kind of a quite area in the back of the 100's , 200's and 300's buildings and the library is in the middle.

Committee Chair Cooke said: I really feel if we are going to be spending \$174,000 for trees, grass, and flowers, that we need a commitment that they are going to protect this landscaping and involve their students by letting them know the cost of the landscaping so that we don't lose that in a week. I would appreciate having the administrators at the site telling us what plans they have in place to help maintain the landscaping. That's quite a bit of money for a high school that does not have a library.

Committee Member London stated: Given that we are in a drought situation, when we look at landscaping do we look at drought resistant landscaping? We are spending \$174,000 on the lawn at Castlemont.

Mr. White responded: Always! It is consistent with our energy and water policy that we do make use of drought resistant materials.

Committee Member London asked: Is there a way we can involve the students in actually designing and implementing the landscaping. That might give them more ownership.

Committee Chair Cooke stated: I am sure with three high schools on the site someone must have informed the students that we are making these upgrades. Do you know whether that

has been done Mr. White?

Mr. White responded: No, I can't tell you if the students have been notified. I know the site administrators are looking forward to the project. They have been anticipating it for two years.

Committee Member Ovid asked: Is the horticulture or landscaping academy still at Castlemont?

Mr. White responded: I don't believe so

Committee Member Debros asked: Since you are having the students take ownership is there any way of addressing that?

Mr. White responded: We can send a note of the committee concerns to the three principals that run that campus. I know they support this project. Their issue is they have tried to maintain the landscaping there with some semblance of a condition that is conducive for their students to go out and enjoy and it has been very difficult with the cut back in custodial staff and they way we budget. I think making it known to the principals that they need to own the investment and help maintain it is a good idea.

Committee Member Debros asked: Has this been bid?

Mr. White responded: No, it has not.

Committee Member Debros stated: I thought what Dr. Cooke had in mind was to involve the students with the installation of the landscape and that way they would have some ownership.

Mr. White responded: I am not sure how to do that. We can approach the principals and tell them your ideas and desires.

Committee Chair Cooke stated: It is my understanding that we don't get into day to day operations of schools just as we don't get into day to day operations of the different departments; however, I feel there should be some kind of plan already in place to maintain the improvements. It should be known that it is coming; what is it we are going to do to maintain it; and should be included in the site administrator's plans that are submitted on a yearly basis improving self esteem. The students should be involved in at least the designing.

Mr. White responded: We want to improve the area making it a more inviting living space. It benefits us in a lot of ways as the District continues to have discussions about things such as a closed campus policy, you want to make sure that there is as many living spaces on that campus as possible and this would actually add and contribute to that.

Committee Chair Cooke stated: We want to send a message to the students that we care.

Special Legal Council Brown: I want to help clarify that the discussion that is going on with the committee has been with respect to cost savings and maximizing efficiency which

is in the statutory jurisdiction of the committee with respect to the expenditure of bond revenue and it appears as though what you want is being recommended or discussed is a recommendation to the board with respect to some sort of policy or consideration of aspects of a project that one may be able to conclude to students that it may be considered or explored. I think Mr. White there was an engineering aspect of this project and a drainage aspect which would probably involve engineering design, construction, and hard scope more so than landscaping; more so than the trees and flowers. I hear the committee formulating an idea making a recommendation to the board and if that is the case I want to make sure that it was articulated clearly so that it can go into the minutes and that it can actually be transmitted to the board.

A motion was made by Jody London, seconded by William D. Ovid, that this matter be Adopted as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 0
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 1 - David Wong
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0



[08-1796](#)

Project Budget Increase for Oakland High School - Modernization Project

Adoption by the Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee of Project Budget Increase for Oakland High School Modernization Project in the amount of \$13,197,597.00, increasing the current amount from \$12,750,000.00 to \$25,947,597.00 and a recommendation to the Board of Education that the project increase, as recommended by the Committee, be funded.

Funding Source: Measure B - General Obligation Bond

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)

Presentation from Mr. White regarding the increase request for Oakland High School.

The item before you is associated with the improvements presented to you today by Brent Randall regarding OHS and the removal of the portables and the replacement with the two story classroom building and the improved amenities. Oakland High School is our flagship high school. It is drastically under improved and invested in. We improved lighting, the indoor air quality and several other projects integrated there at once; those improvements associated with the modernization and two story building are before you right now; the modernization of the campus and the health care clinic. This item before you tonight is one of two we want your approval on.

Committee Member London stated: I am not ready to vote on this. I would like more explanation on this. \$13,000,000 is a pretty significant augmentation and \$9,000,000 is construction cost and \$4,000,000 is ancillary cost and I would like a better understanding. This is not the first piece of this project. How many more \$13,000,000 are there for

Oakland High School coming at us and why did we get this one now?

Brett Randall responded: When we first begin working with the District on this project the District does what it can to figure out what they need for the project and get that to us as a budget and we start developing project scope. We have been through many different options on how to deal with the site; in terms of whether or not to keep the portables; just to replace the portables in kind; we presented various options to the District. The District responded saying our projected budget for construction was \$12.2 million at that point our estimates were coming in around \$16.7 million that included the new two story classroom and renovations to Building F. The site is very under parked and it was decided to put all the portables into a two story classroom building. That's where we got to the presentation that we showed you today.

Mr. White responded: To add to that Oakland High School has had no work done on it in the last 30 years and it is one of those school sites in the inner city that drastically was neglected. It also needed a state modernization project so there is matching funds for us. We did not want to do a patch job because you are heavily criticized for that. Additionally we are responding to many complaints about the condition of that school site from the inner city community. Those complaints ranged in the hundreds associated with Williams Complaints. We struggled with Williams Complaints over several months; responded and they continued to pour in. This is one of the most ambitious summers with \$16,000,000 worth of work in about four months. That is just scratching the surface of the work that needs to be done there. I really want to advocate for this work at Oakland High School. It is our flagship high school and they deserve it.

Committee Member London stated: This is an issue that came up earlier in the meeting and it just seems like we should have been doing a better job on the scoping of the project as this is a pretty big chunk to miss. We need to at some point look at how we do our facility master planning because I don't disagree the work needs to be done and the kids deserve it but I just think we should be more careful how we are spending the public's money.

Brett Randall responded: Two factors that may have affected - cost escalation, gas prices has really gone up since the original estimate for the project.

Committee Member London asked: What does gas have to do with the cost of construction?

Brett Randall responded: It affects the price of all materials.

Committee Member Debro stated - That is a 100% increase and that does not account for 100%.

Mr. White said he would like to keep the committee focused on what we are building there. I understand escalation cost associated with the economy notwithstanding. The focus is that we get the opportunity to right size the amenities for that campus and take care of the dilapidated portables and give them a building suitable for their educational programs.

Committee Member Debro stated: I guess the reason I was a little exercised is my company did the remodeling 30 years ago and the costs were considerably less and it seems strange that you would increase the amount from \$12 million to \$25 million.

Mr. White responded: It is entirely a different scope of work and so it is not an amendment but it is entirely a new scope of work that does not address what was originally done. I agree the cost of things in the Bay Area is astronomical. If there was some way to get around it I wish that I could. Years ago I worked in Los Angeles and I was surprised at the cost of a building. As a group I think we are getting accustomed to those cost when you start talking about things we want to do like sustainable architecture, greening of the buildings using non-VOC type of products, non-formaldehyde products. Those things cost a lot of money. As we say those things, as a District that we want to institutionalize as a policy and they get wrapped into other things that cost a lot of money. It's expensive. We wish it could be done a little bit differently. I had a discussion with the Superintendent the other day regarding when I was in Compton in 2000 we built a school, the Bill Clinton School, for between \$14 million to \$17 million and that same school here would cost twice that amount of money back then.

Committee Member Debro stated: I think you can account for the cost by the change in the scope of work so what you should be giving us was the changes in scope. I think if there was a substantial change in the scope then it makes sense.

Mr. White responded: The original scope did not include the two story building.

A motion was made by Joseph Debro, seconded by Oscar Wright, that this matter be Recommended Favorably. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 6 - Leslie Hamlett, Oscar Wright, William D. Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 1 - David Wong
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0



08-1797

Project Budget Increase for Oakland High School - Modernization Project - Williams Settlement Project

Adoption by the Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee of Project Budget Increase in the amount of \$1,994,338.00, increasing the current amount from \$16,490,000.00, to \$18,484,338.00 for Oakland High School - Modernization Project - Williams Settlement Project - and a recommendation to the Board of Education that the project increase, as recommended by the Committee, be funded.

Funding Source: Measure B - General Obligation Bond

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)

Project Increase for Oakland High School Modernization Project - Williams Settlement Project presented by Mr. White

We have discussed this already. These are projects that we have grant applications in to the State for the Williams' eligible work as associated with the poor indoor air quality, high Co2 levels at that school. We received over 200 complaints about the indoor air quality. We did a significant application to the State for a grant and I believe it is the largest Williams' application filed with the State to date. The work was done in about three months and as you heard today should be completed by the time school opens. The funds associated with the project are all funds that are part of the grant reimbursement so as we spend the money it is all eligible for reimbursement from the State.

Committee Member London asked - So if I understand you correctly if we approve this additional augmentation it will augment our request to the State to the entire \$18.5 million and if eligible and granted we will be able to replenish our Measure B Funds.

Mr. White responded: Yes

Special Council Brown said : I just wanted to point out that one of the committee's earlier recommendations and objectives in the annual report was to maximize funding and that is precisely what staff did. I just want to make a point of the progress of this committee has made in supporting staff in going after those funds, in getting them is remarkable. There is not another school district that put in that application and like Mr. White said it is the largest application submitted to the State. I watched his staff work on this. It shows the kind of work that can be accomplished when you have dedicated staff and committed committee members and there were some obstacles and even conversations with the County. That is a lot of money not coming out of Measure B Funds.

Mr. White said: We spent more time on the application than the project itself just putting together the application took us six to seven months.

Committee Member London stated: My understanding is we are not guaranteed that will be approved. I personally went to Sacramento four times and went to Mr. Swanson and Mr. Perata's Offices. They are all in support of us.

A motion was made by Leslie Hamlett, seconded by Joseph Debro, that this matter be Recommended Favorably. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 6 - Leslie Hamlett, Oscar Wright, William D. Ovid, Joseph Debro, Jody London and John Cooke
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 1 - David Wong
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0



Discussion by the Measure "B" ICSFBO Committee of Proposed Local Vendor Business Policy.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[08-1798_Proposed_Local_Vendor_Policy \[Compatibility Mode\].pdf](#)
[Document\(s\)](#)

Local Vendor Policy for discussion.

Mr. White stated: I believe the Chair or someone requested we give you an update on where we are with the Local Vendor Policy recommendation so that is what before you today. We can continue the process and take it to Board when it is completed. We have been actively engaged with the community on the development with recommendations of Local Vendor Policy. Staff is very optimistic about the policy and the outcome of having a policy.

Committee Chair Cooke asked: So it has not been taken to the Board yet?

Mr. White responded: No, the recommendations of the committee have gone to the Board. The Board did act on the Committee's recommendation by directing staff to engage the community in the development of the policy. My understanding what we were bringing to you today was just an update. We engaged Ms. Shondra Scott from 360 Consulting Firm and she has a brief Power Point Presentation to show you.

Ms Scott said she is the owner of 360 Consulting Firm helping the District with the Community Engagement Project and with Measure B Local Vendor Policy to engage more vendors in Oakland with contracting opportunities with the Measure B Funds and well as purchasing and procurement. She is a native of Oakland, went to Oakland Unified School District, and a property owner in Oakland since 1990. She has worked closely with the District in getting the Measure G passed and part of Measure B. The committee recommended to the Board that the Board adopt a policy to increase the local hiring of Oakland businesses and residents that are impacted by and paying for Measure B Funding. The District did not stop at the Measure B Funds but Purchasing and Procurement. The Board welcomed your recommendations and Vice President Spearman put a resolution before the Board to ask the staff go back and come up with a policy recommendation that should roll out in late fall of this year. With that she also said she would like to engage the community in input in that recommendation so it is not a scenario where staff comes up with a policy and had not engaged the community and the community had no input. What happens next is that we have gone out to the different communities, different chamber organizations, different ethnic chambers, the Metropolitan Chambers and have given up input. Local vendors, local contractors, diversity experts, and unions as well so that we would have a broad range of input so that this policy covered the depth that the Board is looking to since they have not had a policy in all this time and we wanted it to be as aggressive as possible to meet the goals of increasing the local vendor utilization money and also recycling the money that is being funded by the residents of Oakland for Measure B back into the local economy. Some of the recommendations have gone as far as to recommend that there be some preference points given to residents who live in Oakland and own a business in Oakland. We are working closely with Tim White, Assistant Superintendent and his staff. Dr. Mayor in her first two days on the job came to one of our meetings. Some of the other things recommended as far as facilitating the objectives which are:

- (1) Hiring businesses owned by local residents; and
- (2) Developing a monitoring component

Committee Member London stated: I would like the members of this committee to be notified of the meetings of the group and I think we would like the opportunity to attend the meetings.

Committee Chair Cooke stated: The bottom line issue is not to just have the business located in Oakland but to make sure people working in that business live in Oakland.

Committee Chair Cooke introduced our new interim Superintendent, Dr. Roberta Mayor.

Dr. Mayor said: I just want to thank this committee since it is a voluntary role for all of you and I thank you for your commitment to the District for helping ensure that we provide the very best for our students and community. Dr. Mayor said she will join some of the site tours.

Discussed and Closed

G1. Board Secretary's Note

Edgar Rakestraw, Jr., Secretary, Board of Education, having been recognized by the Chair, recommended that at next meeting, the Committee fill the position by election of a new Secretary, to succeed Parker Thomas, who at 3:56 P.M. today submitted his resignation as a member of the Committee. Rakestraw further announced that he had asked the District's spokesperson to publicize the now two vacancies on the Committee according to criteria: a) seeking a person active in a business organization representing the business community located within the district; and b) seeking a boni fide person holding membership in a taxpayer organization located in the District.

H. Adjournment

Chairperson Cook adjourned the meeting at 8:20 P.M.

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____