

**PIEDMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**M E M O R A N D U M**

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Randall Booker, Superintendent  
Michael Brady, Measure H1 Program Coordinator

RE: **FACILITIES UPDATE**

---

I. SUPPORT INFORMATION

During summer months when students are away from campus, the District is typically busy with maintenance and facilities improvements. This summer was especially busy because of the additional planning work now underway for the H1 facilities bond program. What follows is an update on the District’s ongoing and recently-completed facilities work.

Given the length of this update, the following table of contents may be useful:

A. <i>Summer Projects</i>	p.2
B. <i>Measure H1 Project Updates</i>	p.2
i. <i>Establishing Design Goals for New High School Facilities</i>	p.2
ii. <i>Gathering Teacher Input</i>	p.3
iii. <i>Applying for State Matching Funds</i>	p.4
iv. <i>Evaluating Construction “Delivery Methods”</i>	p.4
C. <i>Witter Field: Proposed Engineering Studies &amp; Lighting Improvements</i>	p.5
D. <i>HKIT Designs: Public Review &amp; Input</i>	p.6

This and other written updates involving the Measure H1 Facilities Bond Program are archived at [www.measureh1.org](http://www.measureh1.org).

## A. Summer Projects

The following summer work was preliminary to and necessary for the Measure H1 projects previously approved by the Board of Education:

- Survey and topography study of the Magnolia Campus, including the Witter Field complex.
- Completion of geotechnical services and soils analysis for engineering of the new STEAM building and theater foundations.
- Completion of HAZMAT survey for building demolition.
- Engineering and hydrology investigation of Witter Field drainage and other conditions to define scope of needed work.
- Installation of wireless electronic locks and new doors and hardware for PMS and parts of PHS and MHS consistent with the recently-approved Safe Schools Plan.
  
- Maintenance and repairs in PMS classrooms and bathrooms using prototype methods (epoxy coating).
- Procurement of prototype furniture for three elementary and middle school classrooms.

The following summer work included routine, deferred maintenance and other projects *unrelated* to Measure H1:

- Construction of a new Highland Avenue Gate at Havens (ongoing).
- Construction of new storage at PMS' Morrison Gym (ongoing).
- Reconfiguration of PMS' copy room to create two new offices, a conference room, and copy room.
- Tree removal at PMS to avoid damage to PMS, sanitary sewer and storm lines along Magnolia Avenue, and private property bordering the PMS campus.
- Deep cleaning of all classroom and common areas District-wide.
- Repair of security alarm in PHS' 30's building and Witter Field House.
- Reinforcement of projector screen brackets at Havens.

## B. Measure H1 Project Updates

### i. Establishing Design Principles for New High School Facilities

HKIT, the District's architect, has begun design development for the new STEAM building and theater. Some of the key design issues concern how best to:

- preserve and honor historical Piedmont while designing 21st century facilities;
- build facilities that are large enough to house the needed classrooms and labs while considering the size and scale of the Magnolia site and the height and bulk of all structures; and
- improve the high school quad and make the overall campus more inviting.

HKIT is reviewing all comments received from the community town hall meetings, as well as from students and staff, to help in this design process. Also, Facilities Steering Committee members John Gibbs and Jane Lin are providing input to HKIT on design of the Quad. Both Mr. Gibbs and Ms. Lin have extensive experience in architecture and planning. Ms. Lin is an urban designer and a California-licensed architect with a specialty in “neighborhood design.” Mr. Gibbs is a registered landscape architect and urban designer whose work includes educational campuses, park design and streetscape enhancements. He helped design the Beach hardscape during the Seismic Bond Program.

## ii. Gathering Teacher Input

HKIT has had a series of meetings with PHS teachers and administrators to review classroom and educational needs, and to ensure that staff have early input into the design process with HKIT. For example, HKIT has met with: science teachers Shelley Seto, Glen Melnik, Tom Huffaker, and Marna Chamberlain; MHS principal and former science teacher Sati Shah; computer science teacher Nathan Mattix; Director of Instructional Technology Stephanie Griffin; and art teachers Gillian Bailey and Susan Simonds. These meetings helped HKIT more specifically define the classroom needs of these programs, and refine its overall space calculations for art classrooms and computer labs.

HKIT also met with members of the performing arts staff -- Kim Taylor, Joe Piazza, and Jan D’Annunzio -- to discuss needs for the new theater. (Amy Moorhead, Cathy De Vos, and Andrea Mullan will join the conversation in future meetings.) The heart of the discussion was about function -- how the current theater building (including lobby, backstage and other spaces) is used: what features of the current theater meet the needs of our educational programs; and what additional features and spaces are required to better support our programs and meet the needs of students, both now and in the future. There was also discussion about aspirations for the new theater, including the interior spaces and features as well as how the theater building fits with the surrounding buildings and quad.

Much of this discussion focused on a strong interest in designing new buildings that help unify the campus and complement the surrounding buildings and quad. The new buildings should be inviting without compromising campus security, and should create functional separation between public areas and academic and classroom spaces. The new buildings should not have “blank” exterior walls that detract rather than enhance the campus environment.

I’d like to express my gratitude to all staff members who made themselves available during the summer to talk with HKIT and share their experience, insight, and vision with the design team. They have created outstanding educational programs and they are essential partners in the design process.

### iii. Applying for State Matching Funds

When HKIT’s preliminary plans are 30% complete, the District will be able to begin the application process for State matching funds for school modernization. The application for modernization funds must include detailed floor plans, interior and exterior elevations, demolition plans, and other materials. The District is working closely with funding consultant Chris DeLong to maximize eligibility for State funds. Mr. DeLong estimates that the District’s eligibility for modernization funds is at least \$4.4 million. The District may also be eligible for other State funds, such as funds to support technical education programs. Any State funding received would be in addition to the \$66 million authorized under Measure H1.

### iv. Evaluating Construction “Delivery Methods”

The District will have a choice of “delivery methods” for construction of the new high school facilities, and District staff will present the range of options at a Board of Education meeting in September. A brief summary of the various options, which have already been considered by the Facilities Steering Committee, follows:

*Design-Bid-Build.* This method is widely applicable, well understood, with well-established and clearly defined roles for all parties involved. The District would retain full control over the project because the project features would be fully determined prior to selection of a contractor. A design package would be issued to interested contractors, who would submit bids for the work and select their own subcontractors. The contractor submitting the lowest responsive bid would be selected to perform the work. The contractor would then be responsible for

constructing the new facilities according to the pre-established design. Under this method, the Architect typically has limited oversight of the construction. The potential downsides of this method are: contractors can lie to secure the lowest bid and then generate change orders to increase the total price; the District would assume all responsibility for change orders; the District would have little input in the selection of subcontractors; and the potential for construction-related litigation is high.

*Design-Build.* This method provides the District with a single contract and a single point of contact for the design and construction of the project, with a guaranteed maximum price. The contract would be fully inclusive of all services and products to be delivered by the developer and architect, avoiding District involvement in some of the issues that typically complicate a "low-bid" delivery method like Design-Bid-Build. The potential downsides are that, unless the scope is well defined, the District would be at risk for low quality construction, and the architect would work for the contractor/developer rather than for the District.

*Multiple Prime.* This is a method can be used to "fast-track" construction because work in each construction discipline is bid separately. The Construction Manager administers the construction through individual contractors who work directly with the District. The potential downsides are that this method is not well suited to complex projects, where it can be difficult to administer a large number of contracts, and there is no guaranteed maximum price.

*Lease/Leaseback.* Lease-Leaseback (LLB) provides many of the same advantages as Design-Build, with additional benefits. The District would engage an architect to develop the plans and specifications and then works to identify a developer early in the design phase to perform preconstruction services throughout the design process. This would allow the developer to perform constructability reviews to identify potential conflicts in the plans and/or challenges in constructing the project. The architect, District, and developer would conduct value engineering analyses to manage the project budget, and establish a guaranteed maximum price for the projects. Contractors would be selected based on quality rather than the lowest bid, and the District could review/approve subcontractors. Under this approach, the District, developer, and architect would work as a team, and typically there are lower incidents of litigation. The potential downsides are that complicated lease structures and recent court cases have called into question LLB practices.

### C. Witter Field: Proposed Engineering Studies & Lighting Improvements

The turf and track at Witter Field, which were last replaced in 2007, are nearing the end of their useful life and should be replaced. An eight-year life cycle is typical, but the District has managed to extend the useful life of both the turf and track by two years through diligent maintenance, despite a range of problematic drainage issues. The underground drainage system is inadequate and as a result water typically pools under the surface after rain. This subsurface pooling stretches and tears the turf. In addition to replacing the turf and track and addressing the poor drainage, there are other needed improvements to the Witter Field complex. These include upgrading the lighting with more energy-efficient LED fixtures, and modifying pathways and seating for greater accessibility.

The District has been planning -- and saving -- for turf and track replacement for many years. Fees from facility rentals, and contributions from both the Boosters and the City, have been set aside in a separate fund (the Capital Facilities Fund, or "Fund 40") for this purpose, and the fund has a balance of \$789,918. Although this fund is sufficient to cover the anticipated turf and track replacement, it is not sufficient to cover the additional costs related to improving drainage, lighting, and accessibility. Under the terms of Measure H1, bond funds may be used for supplement the funds already set aside for improvements to the Witter Field complex.

The scope, duration and cost of work at Witter are not yet known. These will depend on requirements imposed by state and actual bids received. District staff recommend moving forward with design development and replacement of the lighting, using funds available in Fund 40. No Measure H1 funds would be used at this time, although they would be needed to complete the drainage and accessibility work, which would likely be done during the Spring and Summer of 2019. Staff will present this recommendation to proceed now with the engineering studies and lighting improvements at the Board meeting on September 13.

## II. **RECOMMENDATION: REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

Review and discuss H1 Facilities Bond Program and other facilities updates.