



538 NINTH STREET SUITE 240 • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94607 • T 510 625 9800 • F 510 625 9801 • WWW.HKIT.COM • A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION

# MEMORANDUM

Date: June 21, 2013

Purpose:  Meeting Minutes  Phone Minutes  Other:

To: FILE

From: Jeff Evans

Project Name: Longfellow Middle School Cafeteria Project Number: 90036

Subject: Community Presentation #2- Held 6:30 PM on June 10, 2013 File:  JF  CF  CCF

Attendees:	Company
Judy Appel	School Board/Parent
Julie Sinai	School Board
Javetta Cleveland	Co-Superintendent
Pat Saddler	Principal
Joy Moore	Berkeley U.S.D.
Tyra Herr	Berkeley U.S.D.
Dana Merryday	Berkeley U.S.D.
Ryan Lau	City of Berkeley
Gretchen Montoya	Longfellow Teacher
Nina Ziskin	Longfellow Teacher
Deirdre Sims	Longfellow Teacher
Veronica Stewart	Longfellow Teacher
Sean Porcamba	Longfellow Teacher
Sandra Lane	Longfellow Librarian
Charlotte Shelton	Student
Ivy Roberts-Wright	Student
Sofia Wilkinson	Student
Carl Bridgers	BUSD CBOC Member
Rachel Knudson	Parent
Alison Bernstein	Parent
Chris Duncan	Parent

Abigail Surasky	Parent
Sara Hicks-Kilday	Parent
Russell Bayba	Parent
Jason Wilkinson	Parent
James Grandison	Parent
Tyche Hendricks	Parent
Richie Smith	Parent
Peter Shelton	Parent
Bettye Hayes	Parent
Barbara Cousert Pace	Parent
Paridise Hightower-Roberts	Parent/Neighbor
Lori Kasle	Parent/Neighbor
Daniel Miller	Parent (future)/community member
Tracy Hollander	PTA Council
Ellen Weis	PTA Council
Yavette O'Shea	PTA Council
Margot Reed	PTA Council
Maya Cavsan	Neighbor
Caryl Esteves	Neighbor
Tony Wilkinson	Neighbor
Marby Wilkinson	Neighbor
John Von Eyck	Neighbor
Ben Rosenthal	Neighbor
Vera Jackson	Neighbor
C. Hauphmen	Neighbor
Rebecca Young	Neighbor
Andrew Redfern	Neighbor/Home Owner
Rob Sass	Neighbor/Home Owner
Beebo Turman	Community Member
Mauricio Davila	Turner Construction
Ethan Heinrich	Turner Construction
Tom Brutting	HKIT Architects
Jeff Evans	HKIT Architects
Lew Jones	Berkeley U.S.D.

Comments:

The purpose of the community meetings was to discuss: 1) History and Process; 2) Site Responsibilities and District Responsibilities; 3) Proposed Café Project; 4) Schedule and Logistics; and 5) Questions, Discussion, and Public Comments.

The meeting was opened and facilitated by Judy Appel.

## **I. History and Process**

Director of Facilities Lew Jones took the lead in this section.

The 2010 Bond plan began in earnest in 2009.

A Superintendent's advisory Committee was called together

In preparation for project planning, the Board approved hiring a consultant to look at all of the cafeterias. An option for remodeling Longfellow's cafeteria and an option to replace Longfellow's cafeteria was explored and estimated. The new option was placed across Ward Street to not add a building to the impacted Longfellow site

An overall District-wide plan that incorporated many wishes was compiled

That Plan was \$400 million

A clear goal of the Committee and the Board was to replace the cafeteria at Longfellow

The Committee wanted to have a Prop 39 bond (55% threshold). This also limits the assessed value maximum (\$60/\$100K)

The Committee wanted to keep the cumulative plan below the maximum tax below the highest amount (\$172.80/\$100K)

These choices and several others made the bond need to be smaller than initially planned

The dollar amount of the bond was set at \$210 million.

The Board approved a survey and reviewed and commented on the proposed projects and adopted the final list for approval. Once again replacement was a high priority

The final list of projects had 2 main types:

Building system replacement, which included portable replacement

Special projects, including BHS, Longfellow café, CTE, adding classrooms in north zone, solar.

All of the bond literature was definitive on the plan to build a new cafeteria at Longfellow

The citizens approved the bond in November 2010

The Board approved the project list in Feb-April 2011

The Board has reaffirmed that list multiple times since then

### Process to Develop Plans

The Board approves the Facilities Plan

The Facilities Division contacts the Principal to initiate the project

A Site Committee is established by the Principal. Included in that Committee are neighbors, teachers, classified staff, parents, the Food Service Director and there was one student

The membership is reviewed by the Superintendent's Cabinet

In this instance, the Site Committee interviewed two architects and recommended one

Facilities negotiated with the preferred firm

The Board approved the architect and project manager

We planned for six Site Committee Meetings and one Community Meeting prior to making a recommendation to the Board

We added a Community Meeting

Board approval is scheduled for June 26th

## **II. Site Responsibilities and District Responsibilities**

Co-Superintendent Javetta Cleveland took the lead in this section.

1. The Board has the ultimate authority to decide projects and approve designs.
2. Central staff has the responsibility to implement projects as approved by the Board, recommending hiring consultants, scheduling projects, estimating projects and keeping projects in budget if possible and recommending budget adjustments if needed.

3. The site is involved in the detailed decisions within the overall framework of project scope and project budget.
4. Central staff takes the feedback from the site and completes a plan within the scope and budget and sends to the Board for approval at schematic design. Sometimes the budget needs to be enhanced to cover all scope items
5. Neither the central staff nor the site can modify the basic scope of the project or recommend radical changes to the budget.
6. The Board can choose to approve or reject the design, abandon the project or hold additional meetings

### **III. Proposed Café Project**

HKIT went through a shortened presentation of the café project. Since this was expressed in the last Community meeting it is not repeated here.

### **IV. Schedule and Logistics**

Turner took the lead in this section. The project is planned to take a little over a year and work is scheduled to begin in late 2014. The project manager met with the City to explore street calming and street closure options. No decisions have been made about which street option to pursue. The Board will weigh in on this matter.

**V. Questions, Discussion, and Public Comments.** The following were comments from the public. In some instances, answers were provided. If so, they are listed in italics.

- A. Concern over the process being too closed.
- B. A person wanted to know whether other options were considered (such as using the gym space for a cafeteria).
- C. Concern over the loss of the garden. Garden program funding is separate from the project.
- D. Concern over the process and the notification for meetings.
- E. It was noted that 6<sup>th</sup> grade students currently cross the street.
- F. There was a concern that delaying the project could jeopardize the funds.
- G. It was noted that the existing cafeteria is very poor and has low use during the lunch period and little use outside of the lunch periods.
- H. It was clarified that socialization was considered in design
  - a. Additional lunch time and period are needed
  - b. A decision of whether there is assigned seating was discussed but is not a part of the design.
  - c. King Dining Commons was used as a model to assist in the design.
- I. It was noted that students dislike the current cafeteria.
- J. There was a concern that there was insufficient contact to the south to notify neighbors.
- K. There was a comment in favor of the proposed cafeteria space.
- L. There was a question about the hiring of a garden consultant. There was a further comment that more development is needed with the garden program.
- M. There was a comment that garden and nutrition go hand in hand, and need to be integrated into the design.
- N. There was a comment that science teachers need to be involved in developing garden spaces, regardless of funding for the garden project.
- O. There was a concern raised that a full service kitchen be built.
- P. It was noted that science teachers could develop a garden with native plants.
- Q. It was clarified that the Board recently voted to maintain some portion of the garden/cooking program.

- R. There was some clarification on the role of the site committee and the neighbors in planning a new facility at BUSD.
- S. There was a comment that a garden on California Street could interrupt classes (classrooms are science CRs).
- T. It was clarified that there is money in the budget for developing three proposed garden spaces and money for providing soil.
- U. It was clarified that there is a need for a cafeteria with natural light, in order to provide a good environment for the students.
- V. It was stated that there are a number of areas of common agreement including the need for a cafeteria, a desire to have a vibrant garden/culinary arts program; and an interest in incorporate garden program with instructional services.
- W. A comment was made that at the street crossing that flashing lights be considered.
- X. It was clarified that the new garden(s) on the main campus might be planned and implemented before the café project to avoid disruption to the gardening program.
- Y. There was a suggestion to move garden/culinary arts to: front of site, to consider angling the building for more light and whether a rooftop garden had been considered. *HKIT and the Site committee looked at alternatives early on that included culinary arts at the front, and decided it was a better plan to have dining at the front followed by serving, then kitchen with culinary arts by the kitchen. The garden is located at back for proximity to culinary arts and garden, for better sun light, and for open welcoming building front. The front of the site would be in shade of building plus garden at front would require fence which is not preferred. The building heights were kept close to those of neighboring buildings. A rooftop garden would be expensive (an elevator is needed), a potential safety concern (the students would need to be protected) and may be difficult to permit. There is not a lengthy and full track record of rooftop gardens approved by DSA, and there have been instances where items DSA is less familiar with have difficult review/ approval process.*
- Z. There was a comment to increase the amount of garden space on the site adjacent to the proposed café building *HKIT Design includes 1,300 square feet of landscape area and 1,400 square feet of garden area.*
- AA. Another concern was raised about the process.
- AB. Another concern was raised about the street crossing.
- AC. There was a question about the breakfast program- do students eat in classrooms. *The answer is yes.*
- AD. There was a question about the impact of delaying the project for additional process. *The answer is that any delays at this point will delay the project for as long as the additional process.*
- AE. There was a comment that there should be greening throughout the campus
  - a. More green areas
  - b. Remove paving
  - c. Create permeable areas
- AF. There was a comment that many students use library to eat lunch, students do not like the cafeteria.
- AG. There was a comment that the community is involved and supports the school.
- AH. There was a question about why it take so long for this project to start? *The answer is that the District did not have financing to do the project. The Board recently moved the project forward so it could happen more quickly.*
- AI. There was a question about whether the pipes in the cafeteria are safe? *The answer is yes.*
- AJ. There was a comment in support of the program and the principal. There was a further comment that the proposed project will be a benefit to the school.

AK. There was a comment supporting both the cafeteria project and the garden programs.

AL. There was a concern over delay.

AM. There was a comment that the safety of students was paramount.

AN. There was a comment advocating for both the garden and the cafeteria.

AO. There was a comment expressing the importance of teaching students about gardening and food growth.

AP. There was a comment stating there needed to be more emphasis on the garden in the project design.

AQ. There was a comment that the design should be re-thought.

AR. There was a comment stating that the Site Committee asked many of the same questions as those tonight, including:

- a. Height of the building.
- b. Setbacks.
- c. Adjustment made to design based on comments.
- d. Needs of students.

AS. There was a comment on the notification process - contact with neighbors may need official mailers from District

AT. There was a comment about strengthening the process to notify constituents.

AU. There was a comment that we should avoid delaying the project.

AV. There was a comment that the design is imbalanced and the garden needs further development before proceeding.

XX. There was a question about whether there were bells or a PA in the new building? The concern was about neighborhood noise.

JE/nh

Copies: For Distribution  
Mauricio Davila, Turner Construction  
Chris Sindayen, Turner Construction  
Pat Saddler, Longfellow MS Principal

Enc.: Community Presentation Slides