

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Construction Bond Oversight Committee

AGENDA
August 30, 2012
6:00 – 7:30 PM

West Campus Education Center
2020 Bonar Street
Berkeley, CA 94702
Training Room
(510) 644-6066

6:00 PM – 6:30 PM

Tour of West Campus Education Center with Baker Vilar Architects

6:30 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes
3. Public Comments (limited to 10 minutes)
4. Staff Report
 - a) Update on Berkeley High School Projects including Derby Field
 - b) Update on South of Bancroft Phase III
 - c) Update on West Campus
 - d) Update on Other Projects
5. Committee Member Comments
 - Discussion of Berkeley High School Parking Lot on Tennis Courts
6. Monthly Report from Audit/Project Tracking Committee
7. Future Meeting Dates:
 - September 20th – Discussion with the Auditor (Tentative)
8. Adjournment

Enclosures:

<i>Minutes (Draft)</i>	<i>July 19, 2012</i>
<i>Facilities Plan Update</i>	<i>August 22, 2012</i>
<i>BHS Phase II & III Information</i>	<i>August 22, 2012</i>
<i>Project Labor Agreement Report</i>	<i>August 22, 2012</i>
<i>Information on the High Five Program</i>	<i>August 22, 2012</i>

And Enrollment

Berkeley Unified School District

FACILITIES PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1720 Oregon Street, Berkeley, CA 94703 (510) 644-6066 Fax: (510) 644-8703

Draft Minutes of the Meeting of July 19, 2012

Members Present: Stephanie Allan Susi Marzuola Eric Weaver
Nicolie Bolster-Ott David Goldin

Staff Present: Lew Jones, Director of Facilities
Chanita Stevenson, Administrative Coordinator

Board Members Present: School Board Director, Josh Daniels

Consultants Present: Elena Ayana, Turner Construction Bob Diaz, Turner Construction

1. *Call to Order:* The meeting was called to order at 6:04 PM.
2. *Approval of Meeting Minutes:* The following changes were made to the minutes:
 - A clarification was made to the May minutes regarding comments related to the pool at West Campus to reflect:

The pool at West Campus will be built, paid for and maintained by the City of Berkeley if the proposed bond measure passes in November.

Member Goldin moved to approve the minutes as amended and Member Bolster – Ott seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. *Public Comments:* There were no public comments.

4. *Presentation from Turner Construction*

Bob Diaz, Project Executive from Turner Construction provided the committee with a document comparing the various delivery methods. Below details an excerpt of presentation along with questions from various committee members regarding each method.

- **Lease Lease Back:**

1. It is more of a financial arrangement between the District and the Developer. It is a method of developing a school property as opposed to hiring a general contractor. Lease Lease Back allowed School Districts to contract with a developer to build a school. The school district leases the developer the property and the developer builds the school. Over the course of time the District makes lease payments or pays off the developer once monies are available.
2. Districts utilize this method if they have additional criteria to address that is not allowed under the public administration code. For example, if the agency has local participation goals, they can stipulate that certain trades are obtained from local business. Another reason is that they would like a builder to work with a contractor in the beginning and

have some of the subcontractor trades design build the project. Staff noted that generally a lot districts do lease lease back to avoid an adversarial relationship with the contractor.

3. Co-Chair Allan asked:

- a. What effect does this method have on a project labor agreement? None. Subcontractors have to sign a letter of assent.
- b. Has the district done this type of agreement? Staff responded no, but many districts are exploring this option. Mr. Diaz stated that the downside to Lease Lease Back agreements are the financing costs that are incurred to pay back the developer.

4. Secretary Weaver asked:

- a. Are there any additional costs associated with financing? A Guaranteed Maximum Price Contract (GMP) is signed and the process is transparent. There usually are not any additional costs, because any savings goes back to the owner. Incentives are sometimes offered to the builder. In the beginning, it seems more expensive but in the end it may not be more expensive.

5. Member Goldin provided history regarding the Lease Lease Back and noted that districts utilize Lease Lease Back to select the contractor. Since BUSD has the funds, he wondered if there was a way to select the contractor without having to enter into this type of financial agreement. He noted that it is important to select a group with a long history of doing Lease Lease Back.

6. Staff asked how large does a project have to be utilizing a Lease Lease Back:

Mr. Diaz stated that it is not about the scale of the job but the type of work you would like to do and what needs to be accomplished. He gave an example of Oakland Unified who wanted to have local participation. Staff states that the Maintenance Building could be a possibility. Member Goldin stated that BHS Phase II/Phase III would have been a good candidate for this method.

- **Design/Bid/Build:** Most familiar method. The owner hires an architect and puts the project out to bid. The project is awarded to the lowest bidder.
- **Construction Agency Manager:** Owners hire construction managers to augment staff to provide their expertise in construction, technology, costs, scheduling and constructability. The construction manager works with the architect and contractor. It is still a design/bid/build process.

Pitfalls of these two may involve claims, schedule delays and litigation.

Additional Delivery Methods discussed were:

- **Construction Manager/ Multiple Prime:** Owner hires a construction manager. Construction manager works with the design, creates bid packages. The owner puts all trades out to bid to subcontractors. The owner holds the contracts with the contractors. The pitfall is that there are additional administrative costs associated with this type of contract. Also, the owner may be

exposed to trade contractor claims for productivity or coordination. However, this risk could be alleviated if a construction manager is hired at risk to manage the project. The construction manager could be liable for liquidated damages. Staff noted that Multiple Prime contracts were explored, but the administrative burden was too much for the district to handle. It could only be used for something small.

1. Co-Chair Marzuola asked how is the CM selected and how are the trades bid? Typically on qualifications. Price is not typically a factor. The trades are bid and the lowest bidder is selected.

Turner prefers this type of method.

- **Construction Manager at Risk:** The public agency does a value based selection based on qualifications and the construction management firms will compete on general conditions. The construction manager creates a guaranteed maximum price. It is good for special or complex projects. There is an ability to overlap design, bid, build for a shorter schedule.
 1. Secretary Weaver asked with CM at Risk can the District still have a criteria for a Project Labor Agreement and does it reduce problems with the owner?

CM at risk would run into problems if bidders are restricted. The CM will have some elements of advertising and accepting bids. This can reduce problems with the owner because bids are evaluated carefully by the CM for exclusions and to make sure that all risks are covered either in the GMP or in the contingency.
- **Design/Build:** This is a new idea but executed differently by different agencies. An agency can hire the architects to create the design and offer it to a prequalified group of design/build firms who could win the bid on lump/sum price or on some value based criteria where price and qualifications are considered. Another way this could be done (ie: SFO Terminal 2) is where the Design/Build firm and Architect team up and compete for the project based on qualifications. Design and Build can occur at the same time, because San Francisco Airport does its own permits, which would not work for schools. Staff noted that there is DSA minimum (>\$10M) for design/build projects.

Additional Questions and Comments:

- Co-Chair Marzoula asked is there a reason why our district can not use Lease Lease Back?

Member Goldin stated that financially there would be no reason to do lease lease back and the only upside will be for the district to choose the developer. Turner noted that lease lease back could also be utilized to fulfill conditions not allowed under public contract code such as local participation.

- Staff asked if there are any alternative methods that should be explored:

Turner believes that a Multiple Prime contract would be useful for the smaller projects. A larger project would be fine to utilize Construction Manager at Risk delivery method. Staff noted that there may be problems with purchasing and accounts payable with too many contractors. This would not be a good fit for all projects.

5. *Staff Report*

- **BHS Summer Projects:** At Berkeley High School, the Roofs, the Flooring and Painting Project at the G Building and the Bridge Project are on schedule. The BCT follow-on project submittals are in and work will begin next week, however this project is still on schedule.
- **BHS Science Labs Update:** The BHS Science Rooms went to the Board for schematic approval. The Board approved moving forward with only two of the three science rooms, because one of the science rooms was smaller than the two. The Board also had questions about when the B-Tech science lab will be created. Member Bolster-Ott asked if Independent Study students will still have to continue to register for science courses at the high school. Staff responded yes, however the independent studies students may benefit from a science lab at B-Tech. Board Director Daniels also clarified that Independent Studies students are enrolled as Berkeley High School Students. Member Goldin asked how much would it cost to design all three classrooms. Staff responded that the Superintendent and the Board would have to make the decision to move forward.
- **BHS South of Bancroft:** At the Stadium Building, the systems are primarily up. We have a few issues with final fire alarm inspection. The Building has received all the furniture. There were a few issues raised during the Committee's walkthrough (plumbing and the addition of a railing at the top of the stadium). The Consultants are still exploring the plumbing issue and a price has been provided to the District regarding the railing. Staff is working with Superintendent and the BHS Administration to determine if the railing makes the building more safe or unsafe. Board Director Daniels asked what makes the railing addition unsafe. Staff responded that it may encourage students to play on the railing. The cost is around \$10K. Co-Chair Allan requested more information regarding the protection of plumbing in one of the rooms on the second floor. Staff stated that the issue is with the engineers to determine a solution and will happen. Member Goldin asked about closeout with the Contractor and if it will end in a claim. Staff responded that he believes the project will close out without claim. There was a completion agreement signed. The contractor will pay \$125K to the District for being late. The District compromised our claims, to avoid costly litigation against the contractor. Payments are being withheld from the current payment. Change orders are currently at 3% and we currently hope to resolve everything amicably. The original deadline was almost a year ago.
- **BHS Phase II & III:** Demolition is currently underway. The job is a little behind as the steam tunnel required additional abatement work. The demolition of the Milvia street side will begin on Monday. The scoreboard was put up today. Training is scheduled to happen on August 1st. The Laundry Room price from Alten is around \$90K. The District is evaluating the bid. Staff is still researching the track options raised at the previous meeting.
- **West Campus:** The move is set for July 30th through August 8th. The 2nd floor will move in first. There are still issues and Staff believes that we will end in a claim. Some funds were released from retention to pay sub-contractors. Member Goldin asked if the District plans to paint the other buildings. Staff discussed that a painting and roofing project has been awarded at West Campus. The paint project will paint the Boy's Gym, Auditorium and the Girl's Gym. The roofing project will include replacing the Boy's Gym and Auditorium roofs. The original scope

also included the Girl's gym, but this roof will be completed next year. The roofing system will be changed to a single ply system instead of hot tar.

- **Derby Field:** Construction has started. Migratory birds caused some delay to the project and we had an ornithologist go to the site to provide a report that the birds will not be disturbed. Construction has resumed. PG&E has slipped and is planned to begin in August.
- **Other Projects:** Berkeley Arts Magnet and LeConte Transformer Projects are on schedule. The Malcolm X Solar Project is on schedule. The lockers for King and Willard Girl's Gym will be received in 1-2 weeks and is slightly behind schedule. King Media Elevator is ahead of schedule, the inspection is scheduled for August 10th.
- **Other Projects in Design:** The King Field goes to the Board on August 22nd for schematic approval. There is some interest in this project as some members of the community would like an all-weather track. The Board approved the Hopkins Preschool Modernization Project with a significant increase to the budget (\$525K). Co-Chair Marzuola asked if the mold issue was addressed. Staff responded that this issue has been addressed and a drainage issue will be corrected during this project. Jefferson Modernization – the District is exploring whether or not additional seismic work is needed. The architects will provide a recommendation. The District is still working with the site regarding the communication and Crowden School concerns. The District held an additional community meeting to address the concerns of the parents. West Campus CTE facilities – There are two components that will have to be reviewed. The Architect made an error on the estimate during their presentation to the Board in terms of the work that could be completed. To stay within budget, work will be completed in the old administration building and no work will be done in building E. It will be structured to bid the old administration and bid Building E as an alternate.

6. *Schedule Next Meeting:*

The next meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

- August 30th – West Campus Tour and Presentation
- September 20th or 27th – Discussion with the Auditor (Tentative)

7. *Adjournment.* The meeting adjourned at 7:51PM.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: William Huyett, Superintendent
FROM: Lew Jones, Director of Facilities
DATE: August 22, 2012
SUBJECT: A Report on BHS Project

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board requested occasional reports on the completion of the South of Bancroft project at Berkeley High School. The project include the demolition of the Old Gym and the west bleachers, a new classroom and gym building, a small new facilities building, the demolition of a portion of the Donahue gym building and landscape improvements.

The project has a number of distinct phases or milestones. The contractor is required to install the scoreboard by August 1, 2012, to demolish the old gym by August 2, 2012, to delay starting the demolition of the west bleachers until after the 2012 football season and to finish the new small bleachers by mid-June 2013, to complete the new classroom and gymnasium by mid-December 2013, to remove and store the portables (for BUSD re-use) and to demolish the BOC at the Donahue Gym after the new classroom building is complete, and to complete site work during the summers. The overall substantial completion is scheduled for late August 2014. The schedule is doable, but is not generous.

There are three areas we will report on. The first is the schedule, the second is the finances and the third is a catch-all category.

Delays in a project can be caused by the Owner (including hidden conditions), by the contractor, or can be excusable delays (such as excess rain or an earthquake). As of August 10th, the scoreboard was completed on schedule, but the demolition of the Old Gym is not on schedule. There are two reasons for the timing. The first is that additional asbestos was uncovered during the demolition and the demolition sub-contractor took longer than was originally planned. Any delays concerning the hidden asbestos removal is the District's responsibility. While no formal agreement has been reached, the project may be 10-15 days behind schedule due to the District and may be a few days behind schedule because of the demolition sub-contractor. The District and the contractor have begun to discuss ways to make some of that time back.

The project has four approved change orders totaling \$125,608. The primary ones are the additional asbestos and the laundry room in the

new stadium. Together these account for over 90% of the change orders authorized to date. The more recently discovered asbestos is being done on a time and material basis with a credit for the regular demolition work. The cost will be significant, but the amount has not been finalized in a final change order and is not included in the amount above.

In general the job has started well. The superintendent, the inspector and the architect all worked together on the King seismic project which was very successful. There has been some concern expressed by the contractor on two issues – over zealousness on submittal reviews and a concern about the method of pricing change orders. We have instituted a system to shortstop submittal review when the contractor has a specific concern. Change order pricing is always an issue early in the job, but we think that matter has been resolved.

DISTRICT GOAL

V-B – Parcel Tax and Bond Revenues: Provide the best possible education for all students by effectively utilizing local parcel tax and bond revenues.

POLICY/CODE

California Public Contract Code 20110- 20118.

FISCAL IMPACT

No impact to receiving the report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Review and provide any appropriate feedback.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: William Huyett, Superintendent
FROM: Lew Jones, Director of Facilities
DATE: August 22, 2012
SUBJECT: Information on the High 5 Program and Enrollment

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The High 5 program is an initiative which can help young students be better prepared for kindergarten and is therefore tied to the District's 2020 plan. The High 5 program permits students who are born in certain months the right to attend kindergarten in two successive years. The program implementation occurs over several years. This year, students born in November are assigned to the High 5 program; next year they will attend regular kindergarten. The following year, the same will be true for October births and the following year after that for September births.

The District has a very large kindergarten class this year. A large class could have large implications for the district. Staff needed to separate the impact of potentially higher enrollment from the impact of the High 5 program. In 2009, the Board commissioned a study to examine population trends and zone boundaries. The demographic projections stated that the kindergarten population would reach its peak in the 2012-13 school year. The demographic study predicted a total of 733 kindergarteners in that year. Based on our current enrollment, it appears that the demographic study is still accurate. We may want to consider a new study in the future, but not at this time.

The impact of the High 5's program was not studied and has not been presented to the Board. To provide a simplified analysis, the chart below presumes that if the population is stable, the same number of children are born every month, and all eligible students were to attend the High 5 program, we would expect the following:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>
High 5's	61	122	183	183
Regular	733	733	733	733
Total	794	855	916	916

While it is possible that not all eligible students will attend the High 5 program and other variances may account for a lower population than

shown above, but the graph indicates that the facilities impact of the High 5 program could be as high as 9-10 classrooms District-wide. The current District facilities plan does not account for a decision to have significant number of our students attending kindergarten for 2 years. This year is the first year of the mandatory High 5's program. We have approximately 40 students enrolled in the program.

This document is intended to raise the impact of the High 5 program, not to provide a recommended solution. If the High 5 program continues, staff has explored several ideas which would need to be further refined before any recommendation is made:

1. Add another elementary school. There have been previous discussions about re-converting a portion of Franklin to be an elementary school. Such a change would be complicated and require detailed planning and would change the character of the adult school;
2. Add space at the pre-k sites to accommodate High 5 programs;
3. Expand Malcolm X to well above 500 students; and,
4. Reduce or eliminate RTI and flex rooms district-wide.

The District is already counting on increased capacity at Jefferson to account for the larger population projection and to equalize seating in the zones. There may also be some small increase in capacity when we initiate the plan to replace the current aging portables at our sites with the newer BHS excess portables once the new building at BHS is constructed. These changes will not add sufficient new classrooms to accommodate the High 5 program without considering the ideas listed above.

DISTRICT GOAL

IA, IIG and V-B.

POLICY/CODE

Board approval of zones and capacities.

FISCAL IMPACT

Exploring the options may require some consultant expenses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Consider the information in this report. Provide direction on a process to explore the impacts of the High 5 program.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: William Huyett, Superintendent
FROM: Lew Jones, Director of Facilities
DATE: August 22, 2012
SUBJECT: Facilities Plan Update

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This report is an update of the Facilities Construction Plan approved by the Board on March 10, 2010 and as last amended on January 11, 2012. Data in this report is current as of August 10, 2012. This report includes updates of all active construction projects. Maintenance projects are detailed in the Maintenance Quarterly Reports.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

LeConte

<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Replace transformer.</u>
Date Approved by Board:	September 22, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	Camissa and Wipf
Project Manager:	Turner
General Contractor:	Decker Electric
Current Project Budget:	\$469,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$19,000. Inflation increase on April 27, 2011 (\$14,000) and inflation increase on January 11, 2011 (\$5,000).
Schedule:	Winter 2010/11 Preliminary Design done and submitted to PG&E Summer 2011 PG&E Approved preliminary design Fall 2011 Approve project manager and designer Spring 2012 Finalize design, PG&E approval Spring 2012 Bid and award Summer 2012 Construction
Status:	Construction
Issues:	PG&E process is unpredictable.
Completion Date:	September 2012
Changes since last report:	Work began. All work needed for PG&E has been completed. PG&E is scheduled to install the new power on August 17 th .
Lessons learned:	PG&E approval process makes it difficult to schedule a summer project.

Malcolm X

Project Type: Replace roof and install solar panels over the annex.

Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011

Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: None

Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable

Design Team: HY Architects

Project Manager: Turner

General Contractor: Rodan Builders

Current Project Budget: \$613,000

Adjustment to Budget: \$6,000. Inflation increase on January 11, 2011.

Schedule: Fall 2011 Approve project manager and designer
Winter 2011/12 Design finalize, PG&E approval
Spring 2012 Bid and award
Summer 2012 Construction

Status: Construction

Issues: None.

Completion Date: September 2012

Changes since last report: The roof was removed and a new roof base sheet installed. The cap sheet was also installed and the solar installation has begun.

Lessons learned: The type of roofing material specified may need to be re-examined on future projects.

BAM

Project Type: Replace transformer.

Date Approved by Board: September 22, 2011

Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: None

Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable

Design Team: Camissa and Wipf

Project Manager: Turner

General Contractor: Decker Electric

Current Project Budget: \$469,000

Adjustment to Budget: \$19,000. Inflation increase on April 27, 2011 (\$14,000) and inflation increase on January 11, 2011 (\$5,000)

Adjustment to Budget: \$14,000. Inflation increase on April 27, 2011

Schedule: Winter 2010/11 Preliminary Design done and submitted to PG&E
Summer 2011 PG&E Approved preliminary design
Fall 2011 Approve project manager and designer

Status: Spring 2012 Finalize design, PG&E approval
 Issues: Spring 2012 Bid and award
 Completion Date: Summer 2012 Construction
 Changes since last report: Construction
 PG&E process unpredictable.
 Lessons learned: September 2012
 Work began. All work needed for PG&E has
 been completed. PG&E installed the new power
 on August 8th.
 PG&E approval process makes it difficult to
 schedule a summer project.

Project Type: Replace roof and install solar panels.
 Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011
 Funding Source: Measure AA
 Public Process: None
 Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable
 Design Team: HY Architects
 Project Manager: Turner
 General Contractor: Rodan Builders
 Current Project Budget: \$1,121,000
 Adjustment to Budget: \$11,000. Inflation adjustment on January 11,
 2012.
 Schedule: Fall 2011 Approve project manager and designer
 Winter 2011/12 Design finalize, PG&E approval
 Spring 2012 Bid and award
 Summer 2012 Construction
 Status: Construction
 Issues: None
 Completion Date: September 2012
 Changes since last report: The roof was removed and a new roof base sheet
 installed. The cap sheet will be installed by
 August 18th and the solar installation will begin
 next week.
 Lessons learned: The type of roofing material specified may need
 to be re-examined on future projects.

Jefferson
Project Type: Expand Classes/Modernize.
 Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011
 Funding Source: Measure I
 Public Process: Six Site Committee meetings and three

Community Meetings will be held. The site was involved in architect selection.

Schematic Approval Date: March 7, 2012
 Design Team: WLC Architects
 Project Manager: Turner
 General Contractor: To Be Determined
 Current Project Budget: \$7,707,000
 Adjustment to Budget: \$472,000. Increased allocation and inflation adjustment on January 11, 2012.

Schedule:
 Summer 2011 Architect Hired
 Winter 2011/12 Board approval of schematic design
 Fall 2012 Project submitted to DSA
 Winter 2012/13 DSA approval, project bid
 Late Spring 2013 Construction begins

Status: Design
 Issues: Project started slowly due to competing pressures at the school.

Completion Date: August 2014
 Changes since last report: The Construction Documents are 50% complete. A seismic review has been conducted. Staff may recommend an increased budget to further strengthen the building.

Lessons Learned: There has been some concern about outreach efforts. Regular updates may help alleviate this concern.

Rosa Parks

Project Type: Solar Panels (project listed in Auxiliary budget).

Date Approved by Board: September 22, 2011
 Funding Source: Measure AA
 Public Process: None
 Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable
 Design Team: Design-Build (SunPower/Kyoto)
 Project Manager: BUSD
 General Contractor: Sun Power
 Current Project Budget: \$157,000
 Adjustment to Budget: \$7,000. Inflation increase on April 27, 2011 (\$5,000) and inflation adjustment on January 11, 2012 (\$2,000).

Schedule:
 Winter 2010/11 Preliminary Design done and submitted to DSA
 Summer – Fall 2012 Finalize design, DSA approval
 Fall 2012 Construction

Status: Permit
 Issues: This budget will supplement a grant from PG&E (\$200,000). Project has moved very slowly through PG&E and DSA.
 Completion Date: December 2012
 Changes since last report: Sun Power prepared and submitted a construction document set to DSA. The District and SunPower have been working on a supplemental agreement to expand the system.
 Lessons learned: PG&E and DSA process have been very slow and unreliable.

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

KING

Project Type: Upgrade the Large Field.
 Date Approved by Board: March 7, 2012
 Funding Source: Measure AA
 Public Process: Site involved in architect selection. There will be several Site Committee Meetings and one or two public meetings.
 Schematic Approval Date: August 22, 2012 (planned)
 Design Team: Baker Vilar Architects
 Project Manager: Turner
 General Contractor: None
 Current Project Budget: \$936,000
 Adjustment to Budget: None.
 Schedule: Spring 2012 Architect hired
 Fall 2012 Design completed and submitted to DSA
 Spring 2013 Project bid
 Summer 2013 Construction begins
 Status: Design
 Issues: Some of the participants want to modify the scope of the project and install an all-weather track.
 Completion Date: September 2013
 Changes since last report: A Site Committee Meeting was held on August 8th. The estimate has been received.
 Lessons Learned: None.

KING AND WILLARD

Project Type: Replace the lockers in the girls gyms.
 Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011
 Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: None
Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable
Design Team: HY Architects
Project Manager: BUSD
General Contractor: Engineered Products
Current Project Budget: \$265,000
Adjustment to Budget: \$(142,000). Inflation adjustment on January 11, 2012, proposed reduction on April 11, 2012.
Schedule: Spring 2011 Architect hired, project designed and bid
Summer 2011 Construction begins
Status: Construction
Issues: No issues.
Completion Date: September 2012
Changes since last report: The demolition was completed. A small concrete pad was poured. The lockers have been ordered and we anticipate installation at the very end of the summer.
Lessons Learned: The sites have not thought about their locker room needs for a long time. There were late changes by both sites.

HIGH SCHOOLS

BERKELEY HIGH

Project Type: Stadium building
Date Approved by Board: September 5, 2007
Funding Source: Measure AA and Measure I
Public Process: Five Site Committee Meetings, one Community Meeting and Board approval. Site Committee involved in architect selection. Earlier meetings were held in developing the master plan.
Schematic Approval Date: August 20, 2008
Design Team: Baker Vilar Architects
Project Manager: Van Pelt (was Parsons)
General Contractor: JLC Construction
Current Project Budget: \$9,318,000
Adjustment to Budget: (\$282,000). Inflation adjustment of \$708,000 on January 9, 2008, inflation adjustment of \$826,000 on January 14, 2009, inflation adjustment of \$806,000 on January 13, 2010, bid savings reduction of \$2,782,000 on September 22, 2010, add for washer dryer is predicted to be \$100,000.
Schedule: Late Fall 2007 Architect Hired
Summer 2009 Project submitted to DSA

Status:	Spring 2010 DSA approval, project bid Summer 2010 Construction begins Complete
Issues:	Contractor is very late.
Completion Date:	August 2012
Changes since last report:	The building was completed and occupied. A few documents are required before the project can be presented to the Board for acceptance. The laundry room project may be detailed in the next phase in future reports. The laundry room construction has begun.
Lessons Learned:	Communication within the site for this project has been problematic. Alternate mechanisms may be needed in the future.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>New Building and Grounds</u>
Date Approved by Board:	Construction Phase 2 September 5, 2007, Design Phase 3 January 9, 2008, Construction Phase 3 April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA and Measure I
Public Process:	Five Site Committee Meetings, one Community meeting and Board approval (shared with stadium project). Site Committee involved in architect selection. Earlier meetings were held in developing the master plan.
Schematic Approval Date:	August 20, 2008
Design Team:	Baker Vilar Architects
Project Manager:	Van Pelt
General Contractor:	Alten Construction
Current Project Budget:	\$30,455,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$28,089,000. Inflation adjustment of \$280,000 on January 9, 2008, adding design of Phase 3 of \$2,800,000 on January 9, 2008, inflation adjustment of \$302,000 on January 14, 2009, inflation and slight scope adjustment of \$918,000 on January 13, 2010, approval of Measure I construction phase and inflation adjustment of \$28,438,000 on April 27, 2011, inflation adjustment of \$351,000 on January 11, 2012, adjustment to decrease the budget by \$5,000,000 on April 11, 2012.
Schedule:	Late Fall 2007 Architect Hired for Phase 2 Late Spring 2008 Architect hired for Phase 3 Early Spring 2009 and Summer 2010 Project submitted to DSA

Status:	Winter 2010/11 DSA approval, project bid Late Spring 2012 Construction begins Construction
Issues:	Coordination with Phase 1, combining the two phases into one project, portable removal and other logistical challenges.
Completion Date:	October 2014
Changes since last report:	Known hazardous materials were removed. The demolition is well underway. Additional asbestos was uncovered between two concrete slabs, requiring new abatement. The scoreboard was installed, tested, and training conducted on August 1 st .
Lessons Learned:	Site communication on identifying and removing stored material has been problematic.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Community Theater Accessibility</u>
Date Approved by Board:	November 1, 2010
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	WLC Architects
Project Manager:	BUSD
General Contractor:	Omni Construction
Current Project Budget:	\$641,000 (includes completed project)
Adjustment to Budget:	(\$9,000). Bid savings of \$50,000 on August 31, 2011. Adjustment to recognize increased costs of change orders on January 11, 2012 (\$40,000)
Schedule:	Fall 2010 Settlement with schematic design approved Fall 2010 Architect Hired Early Spring Project submitted to DSA Summer 2011 Construction begins Summer 2012 Follow-on project
Status:	Construction
Issues:	Project was a settlement of a lawsuit. There was confusion over implementation and there was a few design and contractor-caused issues. DSA was a significant challenge.
Completion Date:	September 2012
Changes since last report:	Construction began. The front curb was cut. The rails have been measured and fabrication has begun.
Lessons Learned:	Earlier communication could mitigate some of the concerns.

<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>G/C Bridge Strengthening</u>
Date Approved by Board:	April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None.
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	WLC Architects
Project Manager:	Van Pelt
General Contractor:	Cumisky Construction
Current Project Budget:	\$560,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$45,000. Inflation adjustment of \$5,000 on January 11, 2012, recommended adjustment of \$40,000 to account for the bid.
Schedule:	Summer 2011 Architect Hired Fall 2011 Project to be submitted to DSA Summer 2012 Construction begins
Status:	Construction
Issues:	Coordination with other projects and summer school.
Completion Date:	September 2012
Changes since last report:	The contractor placed steel and concrete. He had a problem with the first concrete pour and had to chip out concrete and has now re-poured that section.
Lessons Learned:	To Be Determined.

<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Roof A Building</u>
Date Approved by Board:	April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	WLC Architects
Project Manager:	Van Pelt
General Contractor:	Yancey Roofing
Current Project Budget:	\$718,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$7,000 Inflation increase on January 11, 2012.
Schedule:	Fall 2011 Architect Hired Early Spring 2012 public bid Summer 2012 Construction begins
Status:	Construction
Issues:	Coordination with other projects and summer school.
Completion Date:	September 2012

Changes since last report: The project began and is approximately 85% complete.

Lessons Learned: To Be Determined.

Project Type: Roof G Building

Date Approved by Board: September 22, 2010

Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: None

Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable

Design Team: WLC Architects

Project Manager: Van Pelt

General Contractor: Yancey Roofing

Current Project Budget: \$370,000

Adjustment to Budget: \$15,000. Inflation increase on April 27, 2011 (\$11,000) and on January 11, 2012 (\$4,000).

Schedule: Fall 2011 Architect Hired
Early Spring 2012 public bid
Summer 2012 Construction begins

Status: Construction

Issues: Coordination with other projects and summer school.

Completion Date: September 2012

Changes since last report: The project began and is approximately 85% complete.

Lessons Learned: To Be Determined.

Project Type: G Building Paint and Flooring

Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011

Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: The Site Committee reviewed the colors.

Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable

Design Team: WLC Architects

Project Manager: Van Pelt

General Contractor: Am Woo Construction

Current Project Budget: \$1,019,000

Adjustment to Budget: \$10,000. Inflation increase on January 11, 2012.

Schedule: Fall 2011 Architect Hired
Spring 2012 public bid
Summer 2012 Construction begins

Status: Construction

Issues: Coordination with other projects and summer school.

Completion Date: September 2012

Changes since last report:	The contractor demolished flooring. The new flooring has been installed. Cleaning and waxing has begun this week. The painting is complete.
Lessons Learned:	To Be Determined.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Three Science Labs</u>
Date Approved by Board:	April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure I
Public Process:	There have been two Site Committee meetings.
Schematic Approval Date:	June 27, 2012 (note 2 of 3 rooms approved)
Design Team:	HMC Architects
Project Manager:	Van Pelt
General Contractor:	To Be Determined
Current Project Budget:	\$936,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$9,000. Inflation increase on January 11, 2012.
Schedule:	Spring 2012 Architect and project manager hired Spring 2012 schematic design Fall 2012 Project submitted to DSA Spring 2013 DSA approval, project bid Summer 2013 Construction begins.
Status:	Design
Issues:	None.
Completion Date:	September 2013
Changes since last report:	The Board approved two of the three rooms. It is probable that the third room will be deferred until a future project. The schematic design and design development are complete.
Lessons Learned:	Better communication between the High School and the Superintendent may have permitted the third classroom to be approved.

OTHER SITES

HOPKINS PRE SCHOOL

<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Modernization</u>
Date Approved by Board:	April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	There have been several Site Committee meetings and one Community meeting.
Schematic Approval Date:	June 27, 2012
Design Team:	HKIT Architects
Project Manager:	Turner
General Contractor:	To Be Determined

Current Project Budget: \$1,771,000
 Adjustment to Budget: \$591,000. Inflation increase on January 11, 2012, increase to add fire alarm proposed April 11, 2012.

Schedule: Spring 2012 Architect and project manager hired
 Spring 2012 schematic design
 Fall 2012 Project submitted to DSA
 Spring 2013 DSA approval, project bid
 Summer 2013 Construction to begin

Status: Design
 Issues: Short construction season may be a challenge. The scope was adjusted to account for code issues and programmatic issues.

Completion Date: October 2013
 Changes since last report: The Board approved the schematic design and an increased budget.

Lessons Learned: To Be Determined.

WEST CAMPUS

Project Type: District Office Project

Date Approved by Board: August 20, 2008

Funding Source: Measure AA and Measure I

Public Process: Two Site Committee Meetings, one Community Meeting, approval by BUSD Board, approval by Design Review (City), approval by Zoning (City). Earlier Community Meetings were held on earlier project scopes.

Schematic Approval Date: August 20, 2008 and September 10, 2008

Design Team: Baker Vilar Architects.

Project Manager: Parsons

General Contractor: Angotti and Reilly

Current Project Budget: \$14,750,000

Adjustment to Budget: (\$237,000). Inflation adjustment of \$1,200,000 on January 14, 2009, inflation adjustment of \$1,028,000 on January 13, 2010, adjustment after bid approval of (\$2,715,000) on September 22, 2010, adjustment to account for change orders (\$250,000).

Schedule: Fall 2008 Architect Hired
 Summer 2009 Project submitted to DSA
 Spring 2010 DSA approval, project bid

Status:	Summer 2010 Construction begins Construction
Issues:	The project detailed does not include earlier design proposals. There were problems with the installation of temporary power. The contractor is very late with the project and is proving to be uncooperative.
Completion Date:	August 2012
Changes since last report:	The power was turned on. All major systems have been installed. BUSD moved into the building. Preliminary punch list was done in all areas BUSD is occupying.
Lessons Learned:	The project manager requiring monthly schedule updates may have highlighted problems earlier.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Board Room</u>
Date Approved by Board:	August 20, 2008
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	Two Site Committee Meetings, one Community Meeting, approval by BUSD Board, approval by Design Review (City), approval by Zoning (City). Earlier Community Meetings were held on earlier project scopes.
Schematic Approval Date:	No one date.
Design Team:	Baker Vilar Architects
Project Manager:	Turner
General Contractor:	To Be Determined
Current Project Budget:	\$1,991,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$1,641,000. Significant scope adjustment, including adding City into project (\$1,258,000) on September 22, 2010, inflation adjustment (\$142,000) on April 27, 2011, recognition that the City will not partner and inflation adjustment on January 11, 2012 (\$241,000).
Schedule:	Early Spring 2010 Architect Hired Late Spring 2011 Project submitted to DSA Summer 2012 Revised Plan Submitted to DSA Fall 2012 Construction begins
Status:	Permit/Bid
Issues:	The mural will need to be removed and a replacement mural designed.
Completion Date:	March 2013
Changes since last report:	Revised drawings were submitted to DSA who have requested additional fees.
Lessons Learned:	Earlier formal City approval to participate in the

project would have saved time and some money.

<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Charter School With CTE Possibilities</u>
Date Approved by Board:	April 27, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	Three Site Committee Meetings and Two Community Meetings. Site Committee participated in architect selection.
Schematic Approval Date:	December 14, 2011
Design Team:	Beverly Prior/HMC Architects
Project Manager:	Turner
General Contractor:	To Be Determined
Current Project Budget:	\$6,762,000
Adjustment to Budget:	\$1,762,000. Budget was increased by \$1,000,000 on August 31, 2011 because an additional building was added when initial programming was completed and increased on January 11, 2012 to add seismically strengthening a wall and for inflation adjustment, library demolition added to the project (approved January 11, 2012).
Schedule:	Summer 2011 Architect Hired Summer 2012 Project submitted to DSA Fall 2012 DSA approval, project bid Winter 2012/13 Construction begins
Status:	Design
Issues:	There has been some discussion of equivalent facilities. There is some concern that the current plan calls for continued use of the District's three classrooms in the administration building. We will bid two different scopes of work for the old shop building due to budget constraints.
Completion Date:	Winter 2013/14
Changes since last report:	Construction Documents are 75% done. We are planning to do an earlier demolition project to help the schedule.
Lessons Learned:	To Be Determined.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Charter School Temporary Remodel</u>
Date Approved by Board:	June 29, 2011
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None, although the Realm Director participated

	in design decisions.
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	BUSD
Project Manager:	BUSD
General Contractor:	BUSD with some sub-contractors
Current Project Budget:	\$75,000
Adjustment to Budget:	None.
Schedule:	Summer 2011 Board Approval Spring 2012 Design Finalized Summer 2012 Construction
Status:	Complete
Issues:	There was an agreement to expand the number of students at the site next year. This modified the design, but did not delay completion.
Completion Date:	Summer 2012
Changes since last report:	The project was begun and completed since the last report.
Lessons Learned:	None.
<u>Project Type:</u>	<u>Roof of Two Buildings and Exterior Painting of Three Buildings</u>
Date Approved by Board:	January 11, 2012
Funding Source:	Measure AA
Public Process:	None.
Schematic Approval Date:	Not Applicable
Design Team:	Beverly Prior/HMC Architects
Project Manager:	Turner
General Contractor:	To Be Determined
Current Project Budget:	\$700,000
Adjustment to Budget:	None
Schedule:	Spring 2012 Architect Hired Summer 2012 Project bid Late Summer 2012 Construction
Status:	Construction
Issues:	None.
Completion Date:	November 2012
Changes since last report:	Bids were received. Colors were selected. The roof tear-off of both the auditorium building and boys gym is complete. The auditorium roof is mostly complete. The paint colors were selected. The painting will start late next week and be completed by the end of September. The two roofs will be done with cold process (the bid was hot tar) roofing and the girls gym roof was deleted to make this change. The girls gym will

Lessons Learned: be added to the CTE project.
The type of roofing material specified may need to be re-examined on future projects.

DERBY FIELD

Project Type: Improved Field

Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011

Funding Source: Measure I

Public Process: Three Site Committee Meetings, two Community Meetings and Board approval. Site Committee participated in architect selection.

Schematic Approval Date: August 31, 2011

Design Team: WLC Architects

Project Manager: Van Pelt

General Contractor: To Be Determined

Current Project Budget: \$3,793,000

Adjustment to Budget: \$188,000. Budget was increased by \$150,000 on August 31, 2011 to recognize the accelerated schedule and to accommodate desired amenities and on January 11, 2012 for inflation (\$38,000).

Schedule: Summer 2011 Architect Hired
Fall 2011 Project submitted to DSA
Spring 2012 DSA approval, project bid
Summer 2012 Construction begins

Status: Construction

Issues: The project schedule is extremely tight. Gaining approval of the City (street changes), PG&E (pole relocation) and DSA is a challenge.

Completion Date: Spring 2013

Changes since last report: The demolition is largely complete. We uncovered some underground hazardous piping which delayed the project. That piping has been removed and the grading will begin again next week.

Lessons Learned: To Be Determined.

DISTRICT-WIDE

Project Type: Elevator Controls at King Media

Date Approved by Board: April 27, 2011

Funding Source: Measure AA

Public Process: None.

Schematic Approval Date: Not Applicable

Design Team: HY Architects

Project Manager: Turner

General Contractor: Dream Ride Elevator

Current Project Budget: \$150,000
Adjustment to Budget: \$49,000. Inflation adjustment of January 11, 2012, recommended adjustment on April 11, 2012.

Schedule: Winter 2011/12 Architect Hired
Early Spring 2012 Project submitted to DSA
Spring 2012 DSA approval, project bid
Summer 2012 Construction begins

Status: Punch List
Issues: None.
Completion Date: Fall 2012
Changes since last report: The project was awarded and the construction is complete. The elevator inspector needs to sign off on the project.

Lessons Learned: To Be Determined.

OPSC approved an unfunded approval for the BHS project. The Emerson project was delayed until August.

The majority of the furniture orders have been received. We expect furniture for the late added classrooms (Cragmont and John Muir) to be delivered late this week and the Realm furniture, also ordered late, to be delivered in the week of August 20th.

The Joint Administrative Committee for the Project Labor Agreement has met two more times.

Many technology orders have been placed.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: William Huyett, Superintendent
FROM: Lew Jones, Director of Facilities
DATE: August 22, 2012
SUBJECT: A Report on the Project Labor Agreement (PLA)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board requested occasional reports on the implementation of the Project Labor Agreement (PLA) approved by the Board on October 12, 2011. The following have occurred since that date:

1. The District has two projects under construction which are governed by that agreement (BHS Phase 2 and 3, and Moellering Field).
2. A joint council was created and has met four times.
3. A format for reporting on local hiring was created for BHS. A similar form will be used for the field project. As of the end of June, there were 4.5% BHS graduates and residents, and 36.2% green corridor residents, and 1.7% Berkeley apprentices (credit from another project). The goal for local hiring (including local residents and green corridor) is 30%. The goal for apprentices is one for every \$5 million.
4. A career fair was held.
5. There has been some participation in the advisory committee.

Areas that need improvement or greater focus are:

1. Green academy assistance (speakers, field trips, mentoring, internships). The District has not requested this assistance yet.
2. Advisory Committee Meetings. While this has initiated, it needs to gather momentum if it is to be effective.
3. Engaging the High School in career fairs in this next school year.
4. Pre-apprenticeship program assistance. The District is not ready to request this assistance.
5. Exploring the feasibility of alternative training such as Cypress Mandela. The District's CTE coordinator visited the program, but no decision has yet been made to participate in these programs.

Some jurisdictions have had problems with PLAs if the weak areas are not publicly discussed early in the program. We plan to return to the Board in several months to update our progress.

DISTRICT GOAL

V-B – Parcel Tax and Bond Revenues: Provide the best possible education for all students by effectively utilizing local parcel tax and bond revenues.

POLICY/CODE

Board direction. No specific Education Code section.

FISCAL IMPACT

No impact to receiving the report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Review and provide any appropriate feedback.