

## Meeting Minutes of March 8, 2022

**Members Present:** Sheryl Drinkwater, ~~Carla Schneiderman~~, Damian Park  
Wade Skeels, Ken Berland, Alejandro Pimentel

**Staff Present:** John Calise, Chanita Stevenson and Carol Pacheco

**Guests Present:** Kelli Jurgenson, Prachi Amin, Chris Moreno, and Cal Walsh

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM.

Roll Call: Members Park, Skeels, Drinkwater, Berland, Pimentel, and  
~~Schneiderman~~. All present except Member Schneiderman

All Staff Present

2. Approval of Agenda: 6:06PM

Motion by Member Park to approve the agenda  
Second to approve by Chair Drinkwater  
All in favor  
Motion Carries

3. Public Comments:

- a. Rono Cho is a parent and PTA member at Emerson Elementary School and has attended Subcommittee Meetings to discover that there is a Tennis and Parking Structure Project slated for \$25,000,000. She thinks Emerson Elementary School needs to be considered, and the aging infrastructure in all the elementary schools should be a priority rather than a tennis and parking structure. She is asking the CBOC to, "make sure all projects meet the stated priorities of Measure G".

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 25, 2022, approved at 6:08PM

Motion to approve by Member Drinkwater  
Second to approve by Member Park  
All in favor  
Motion Carries

5. Staff Report VPCS:

Marcus Hibser (MH), of HY Architects, gives a presentation on the Project Selection Process.

Discussion and Committee Comments:

- a. Member Skeels (WS) has a question about how the funding gets allocated and if each project gets specific bond money set aside for specific programs, can the District elaborate on that? Executive Director Calise (ED Calise) responds, “in the planning sheets there are actually allocations,” buckets”, for projects that were promised to the community. There are projects that were on that list that MH just shared with members, there's money allocated for CTE for every two years in each issuance, and that money is allocated in order for CTE to receive matching grants. There's also money for technology every couple of years. The IT tranche is sold on a shorter tranche so they fit into a different tax value for the community.” WS is asking more generally if when the Bond was created did the District get together and decide at that time what projects would get funded? ED Calise replies, “the list of projects was created by the Superintendent's Advisory Committee which started in 2018 and worked all the way through early 2019 to give to the Board to use to create the project list and on this list there were projects called Marque Projects which were highlighted to the community to sell the bond.”
- b. Member Park (DP) would like to know, “did the plumbing and the paint come up in the community outreach for Emerson?” ED Calise responds, “it did, and that is why on the project sheet there is money allocated for Emerson infrastructure. It's coming down the road.”
- c. DP would like MH to speak more to the term “equity”. MH notes that it is difficult to quantify and define equity - “it basically comes down to making sure you have equivalent facilities to support the students at each campus. Making sure we are bringing facilities to the same standards across the board to the best of our ability with the funds available.”
- d. Member Pimintel (AP) has a question regarding the stakeholder engagement process and the public outreach. MH highlighted the combination of meetings held throughout with District staff and their departments as well as the individual campuses. MH continues, “When we went to each campus and asked the principal to set up a committee with various stakeholders including students, they held a 90 minute meeting where they asked various questions about what they loved and what they hated about their individual schools. We took detailed notes at these meetings and incorporated them into the final assessments.”
- e. Member Berland (KB) interjects that he would like to go on the record by saying, “in my opinion the Little Theater for ninety million is too high of a price tag”. ED Calise points out that the price tag is actually several different wings. “A huge problem with safety and seismic, the stagebox is ancillary and needs to be done”, continued ED Calise. Chair Drinkwater (SD) interjects that she had, “attended the community outreach for BCT with HY Architects and it is a complicated project made even more difficult because of its historic status.”
- f. DP would like to ask MH if they, “start the community off with a blank slate or do they give the community an idea of what is possibly needed or could be done?” MH

replies, “Indeed it is more of a what do you love and what do you hate type of discussion. The idea of what is working and what should not be replaced was more of a starting point. Don’t try to control the outcome but help to guide the exploratory outcomes of these meetings. All the while being careful not to promise everything would be doable, but wanting to discover needs and deficiencies”. DP wonders if a blank slate approach might not be the best way to get better community engagement. He recommends “a more tailored approach in the future”.

- g. WS asks, “has about \$170 million already been allocated?” ED Calise clarifies that all of the \$380 million has been allocated.
- h. Kelli Jurgenson (KJ) recommends an Agenda item to be noted to go into more financial detail of how the projects get funded and money is allocated specifically. WS agrees it sounds like an agenda item for the next meeting or the time after.
- i. KB asks if there was CBOC input in this process. ED Calise replies, “no, because the CBOC purview is to review financial audits and report to the public”. SD points out that as members of the public they were invited to attend site visits and she did attend especially to BHS meetings because she had a high school student at that time. ED Calise points out there were former CBOC members who are active in the community who did attend many meetings.
- j. Chanita Stevens (CS) points out that B-Tech is on Measure I.

#### Staff report VPCS:

- a. KJ gives an update on the Change Order Log
  - i. No changes noted at this time.

#### 6. Discussion: Guidelines

- a. DP gives a presentation regarding the guidelines and the BY-Laws. He believes they have clarified everything that was in dispute, and “the only problem is section eighteen, setting the agenda”. As an independent committee they should be fully independent and create their own agenda. “As an independent committee we should be able to answer yes to all the questions,” on a checklist presented here.
- b. DP then suggests a way to move forward with section eighteen, “to make sure we can create an agenda and give the District enough leeway and, we should be able to set the agenda to be fully independent”. KB agrees with the importance of setting an agenda. He would support moving forward with section eighteen as it is written, to rely on the District for help as needed. WS appreciates the effort put forth by DP and also agrees with the importance of being independent with the ability to set their own agenda. However, “personally I’m okay with how the agenda has been created in the past” he said. He does feel that, “everyone has been able to add items to the agenda in the past and it hasn’t been a problem”, for him. He also thinks the CBOC has more responsibility than just to look over audits. WS states, “there is an oversight obligation and independence is a big part of that.” AP agrees with WS and wants to know why DP feels the agenda process needs to change. KB thinks it’s about timing and the ability to review sooner than later and that the CBOC can bring some of their views to the District and to the community, voters, and stakeholders. Then they could get a handle on things earlier than later. To, “get out in front of projects before they even become projects” states KB. SD wants to interject that, “getting items on to the agenda has never been a problem” and she doesn’t

understand where all the independence concern comes from, once she was able to look over DP guidelines she realizes he wants to bring “his agenda” to the committee. She doesn’t think CBOC should be a venue to bring each member's own agenda. DP states, “as an independent committee it should be up to the members to create whatever agenda they may like, including what projects would be coming.” DP and KB worked on a document that perhaps had some inaccuracies and ED Calise did not want that document or discussion put on the agenda as such. DP doesn’t think having accuracy is an issue. KJ wants to clarify that she and ED Calise both told DP that they were happy to add it to the agenda for next time, once they had had an opportunity to discuss the inaccuracies with DP and correct them before they went on the record and were not accurate. “Happy to agendize for you once we have met with you to correct the inaccuracies in your document.” ED Calise states, “we should not knowingly add to an agenda something that has inaccuracies.” AP is not opposed to a new agenda process, but does not think there is a problem as it is now. WS believes if a line is added just below the last line of the guidelines as it applies to the agenda, there should be language that co-created the process with aid from the District. He would like to, “find some common ground.”

- c. DP will tweak the language to reflect what the committee suggested and vote on it at the next meeting.
- d. DP speaks to the Guidelines he is suggesting would be what the CBOC would adopt in accordance with the Ed Code and Brown Act. A document that is helpful to the committee with what they are tasked with as CBOC members. KB would like to adopt these Guidelines and put it to a vote at the next meeting.
- e. Question for next time is whether or not adopting these Guidelines is legal or not.

7. Agenda Process:

- a. KJ gives a review of the Agenda Making Process for the upcoming April 19th meeting;
  - i. On April 1st, the draft agenda is sent to the committee and they will have one week to submit agenda recommendations, which will be due on April 8th. This gives staff one week to do due diligence and get the necessary documents together. The final agenda will be posted and disseminated on April 15th.

8. Executive Director Calise would like to thank Chair Drinkwater for her service, as this is her last meeting with the CBOC.

9. Action: Approval of the resolution to meet remotely 3/19/22 - 4/22/22

Motion to approve by Member Berland  
Second by Chair Drinkwater  
Roll Call Vote:  
Member Park votes no  
Member Skeels votes no  
Member Pimentel votes no  
Chair Drinkwater abstains  
Member Berland votes no

All against  
Motion does not carry

10. Discussion:

The meeting on April 19, 2022 to be held at the Facilities Offices located at:  
1005 Parker Street in Berkeley, California.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 7:30PM.