



SECTION III: PROJECT SITES

INTRODUCTION

The scoping exercise for the Measure B Facility Program started with evaluating the individual campus Master Plans and developing the renovation scope list, then striking a balance of the two against the available funds. The process for determining the campus Master Plans was very different from the process for developing the renovation scope. The final step was to set priorities by determining which projects would be funded because Measure B is insufficient to fund all of the desired projects.

Process for updating Master Plans:

The individual campus Master Plans were updated through an intensive site and community-based participation process. Since the original Master Plans were completed in April 2000, there was a need to revisit them to ensure that the projects identified were still the priority projects and that the locations, size and configurations of the new facilities were still the best solutions. Cost constraints were not initially considered in developing the Master Plans because a campus Master Plan should be the best solution to respond to academic needs. For prudent long-term planning, the Master Plan should include all new buildings desired, in the event of other funding opportunities in the future. Exclusion of some of the potential projects from the Master Plan might constrain their consideration as future projects.

The participation process for updating the Master Plans included holding a series of widely publicized meetings at each school site, which were attended by the school's principal, school staff, parents, and other interested parties. These meetings were held in three phases: the first phase occurred between October 2003 and October 2004, the second between April and June 2005, and the third between August and October 2005. A majority of these meetings was dedicated to brainstorming ideas and identifying existing and future facility needs and their relative priority.

The first step in updating the Master Plans involved conducting two initial meetings at each site: one for all interested parents and community members, and one



for interested staff members. These initial meetings were held in October 2003. Meeting with the two groups separately was essential in order to revisit issues and priorities that were important to each group without the influence of the other. The attendees were invited to volunteer to serve on a site committee to work with the District and its consultant team on the Master Plans.

Following the initial school site meetings, Building Program Review Committees were formed at each site. Meetings with these committees occurred from November 2003 through February 2004. The four Building Program Review Committees were composed of the site principals, school staff members, and parents. The Building Program Review Committees met multiple times to review and refine the results of the school site brainstorming sessions and the prioritization of the recommended construction projects at each site. (Refer to Appendix B for meeting notes.)

With assistance from the District's consultant team, the Building Program Review Committees developed the list of new construction projects desired and the priority requested for them in the site-specific Master Plans. The consultant team offered suggestions, exploring different methods to accommodate the various projects in an efficient manner. In the course of the committee meetings, a couple of major concerns were identified at three sites that warranted further investigation prior to finalizing the Master Plans. Crocker required a traffic study by an outside consulting engineer to respond to a significant safety issue, separation of vehicle and pedestrian traffic. (Refer to Appendix E for a copy of K D Anderson Traffic Engineer's traffic study.) At North, evaluation of the historical significance of the campus had to be conducted to determine how that might influence the planned additions. (Refer to Appendix F for a copy of the Historical and Cultural Report by Pacific Legacy and the subsequent correspondence from Page Turnbull.) At South, the issue was the encroachment in the area of San Mateo Creek. A determination of the limits of the environmentally sensitive areas had to be made to avoid engaging the multitude of governmental agencies with jurisdictional authority over matters related to environmental considerations. (Refer to Appendix G for Environmental Science Associates' Biological Constraints Analysis.)

Although some major items still needed to be resolved in order to proceed with development of the Master Plans, the projects were determined and their priorities were established with understanding of the general constraints. Through this iterative



process, consensus was built around the more favorable solutions. These meetings resulted in direction to the consultant team for use in preparing draft Master Plans, which were then presented to the Board of Trustees in a Board Study Session for discussion and additional public comment.

The purpose of the March 1, 2004, Board Study Session was to update the Board and community on the outcome of the committee meetings and to present the Master Plans with desired projects, including their programmatic requirements and site priorities. It was made clear that the list of desired projects extended well beyond the available funding; however, some of the new buildings could be scaled back in size and some of the existing buildings slated to be demolished could instead be adapted for reuse. The Board's direction was to proceed with procuring the professional services necessary to produce the traffic study at Crocker, the historical context information at North and the biological constraints analysis at South. The Board also directed the Administrative Council to determine District-wide priorities for developing equity among the sites and consistency in supporting the visions of the future curriculum. In addition, the Board directed CPM to scale down some of the buildings and review alternative ways to achieve the same goals more efficiently. (Refer to Appendix B for Meeting Notes.)

In the September 29, 2004, Board meeting, the Board of Trustees was presented the updated draft Master Plans for each school site that reflected the outcome of the various special studies, scaled-back projects and more cost-effective solutions. The Board reviewed the Draft Master Plans and received public comments at its regularly scheduled meeting. Subsequent to the September Board meeting, the revised Master Plans were presented in separate staff and parent meetings at each site. Additional comments received on the Draft Master Plans from the site meetings were incorporated in revised Master Plans that were presented to the Board in the October 20, 2004, Board meeting. Some minor revisions were then made and presented to the Board at the November 1, 2004, Board Study Session. The Board directed the consultants to proceed with the Implementation Plan based on the revised versions of the site-specific Master Plans.

Once the Master Plans were generally accepted by the Board, the consultant team proceeded with an in-depth budget analysis to ensure that the priorities established in



the November 1, 2004, Board Study Session and represented in the revised Master Plans could be accomplished with the projected funding available through the life of the Measure B Facility Program. The Master Plans were presented again at the November 10, 2004 Board meeting to ensure that community members had ample opportunity to comment.

Prior to the November Board meeting, the District conducted an interview and selection process to determine a group of architects to provide A/E services for the master planned projects. The District selected four architectural firms, all of which could potentially be assigned to projects. Of the four firms, two were contracted and each was assigned two District campuses. DLM was assigned South and West Elementary schools, and WRNS was assigned Crocker Middle School and North Elementary School.

DLM was contracted first and was assigned to meet with the South and West school communities to review and refine the Master Plans for each school. From April through June 2005, DLM conducted site committee meetings during which CPM and school staff provided DLM with the Master Plan's background. Throughout the process, DLM explored the architectural context of each campus and presented various design options using presentation drawings and massing models. The exercise culminated with the presentation of the updated South and West Master Plans to the Board at the June 22, 2005 Board meeting.

From August through October 2005, WRNS conducted Master Plan refinement meetings at Crocker and North schools. Similar to DLM's efforts, WRNS met with CPM and District staff to become familiar with the Master Plans. During these meetings WRNS reviewed the previous Master Plan to confirm the facility needs and developed alternative options. The process involved explorations of various design solutions using massing models and drawings and concluded with a presentation to the Board on October 12, 2005.

Process for Developing Renovation Scopes:

The process to determine the renovation scopes was dictated almost exclusively by state and local agency requirements and sound building maintenance practices.



Consequently, site and community participation was limited. The goal was to produce a comprehensive renovation scope list for each campus with cost estimates that itemized every building and site component that required repair, replacement or improvement.

An assessment of existing facilities formed the basis for the renovation scope list. The condition assessment was developed through the involvement of many resources, first and foremost, was the District's Maintenance and Operations Department. Mr. Rollie Carr and his staff provided a wealth of information on the condition of the existing facilities. Other District personnel, including Mr. Larry Raffo, Assistant Superintendent, all of the site principals, and the custodial personnel, assisted with the development of the condition assessment. Specialty consultants were employed to perform the seismic evaluations, architectural barrier identifications (ADA compliance), electrical and low-voltage assessments, and evaluation of all of the District's roofs. Together with CPM's in-house experts, this team developed a comprehensive assessment of the condition of the existing facilities.

Before the actual condition assessment was conducted, the archived plans and specifications had to be evaluated and preliminary information catalogued. All of the existing plans in the District's possession were organized, inventoried, copied and scanned to digital format for availability on-line. Copies of missing plans were ordered from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) and added to the District archives. This base knowledge is critical in assessing the condition of the buildings and their infrastructure, in evaluating structural integrity, and in determining the presence of asbestos, lead and other materials now considered hazardous.

The condition assessments started with in-depth site investigations in July 2003. Every building, roof, exterior, room, closet, attic, crawl space and corner of each campus was visited, photographed and assessed in a series of site meetings with the District's maintenance and operations staff, administrators and teachers. Subsequent site visits occurred with the specialty consultants. Buehler and Buehler Structural Engineers, Inc. performed multiple site investigations after careful review of the archived plans. The resultant seismic evaluation (Appendix D) translated into a high-priority renovation scope for structural retrofits. (Refer to Section IV of this report for program schedule.) Disability Access Consultants Inc. (DAC) initially prepared the Barrier Removal Plan, as mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), in August 2000. CPM engaged



DAC to update its prior findings because significant code revisions had been enacted and some work had been done since the prior study. DAC also assisted CPM with preparing a draft transition plan, as required by ADA and DSA (Exhibit "I"). Vanden Bos Electric, Inc., evaluated the electrical systems and assisted CPM with the evaluation of the low-voltage systems and their pathways. The low-voltage systems include fire alarm, data, phones, clocks/bells, intercom, cable TV and energy management systems (EMS). Tremco Roofing Inc. provided the roof condition assessment, list of suggested repairs, and cost estimates.

The result of this intensive effort was a comprehensive list of all building and site items that needed to be repaired or improved at each site. This draft renovation scope list was reviewed on site with Larry Raffo, Rollie Carr, and each site administrator in a series of meetings. Once the list was refined and adopted, it was imported into a database and categorized by types of scope, such as life-safety items, building shell integrity items, ADA requirements, infrastructure items, classroom improvement items and other specific types of improvement. Cost estimates were prepared for the individual line items.

Process for Determining Funded Projects:

Prioritization of all the Master Plan and renovation projects was necessary because even combination of the Measure B bond with the other available funding sources was not sufficient to fund all of the projects. The Board of Trustees was faced with the difficult task of determining which projects could be funded under this program and which would have to wait for other funding sources. At the November 1, 2004, Board Study Session, the Board was presented with the conceptual cost estimates, preliminary project budgets and cash flow analyses that indicated a significant budget shortfall. Several different scenarios that would balance the scope and budget were prepared for this study session. These scenarios ranged from all-renovation scope to all-master-planned projects with no renovation scope. In this study session, the Board directed consultants and their collaborators to explore further "Scenario C," which constituted a compromise between new building projects and renovation scope.

In preparation for the next Board study session, CPM and its sub-consultants worked intensively to prepare more detailed cost estimates, a cost-loaded renovation



scope database sorted by categories, updated budgets, updated cash flow analyses and an overall program schedule. As a part of the effort to balance the scope with available funds, the Master Plans at North and West also were revised and presented at the November 1, 2004, Board study session.

It was determined at the final Board Study Session on December 13, 2004, that CPM should proceed with preparation of the draft Implementation Plan, per the Master Plan projects identified in Scenario "C", inclusive of the Crocker office. The Board decided to fund all of the life-safety, ADA and building shell integrity renovation scope items because they are essential. The Board directed the Administrative Council to review the remaining renovation scope items and work with the consultant team to prepare a balanced project budget focusing the discretionary scope on items that directly benefited the students, such as classroom improvements and technology to support the curriculum.

The following sections set forth the individual site project scope lists and budgets. The campus Master Plans and schedules can be found in Section IV.