

---

<b>Date</b> April 12, 2018	<b>By</b> Becca Cavell
-------------------------------	---------------------------

---

<b>Subject</b> Design Advisory Group Q&A Session	<b>Project Name</b> Lincoln HS Replacement	<b>Project Number</b> 17011
--	---	--------------------------------

---

**Present**DAG Members:

Dana Bach Johnson \*\*  
Ben Brandenburger \*  
Petyon Chapman \*  
Randall Edwards \*  
Steve Ewoldt \*  
Genevieve Fu \*  
Gerald Gast \*  
David Goldwyn \*  
Jim Hanson \*  
Julie Hays \*  
Jennifer Hill \*  
Jeremy Holden \*  
Tiffani Howard \*\*  
Eleni Kehagiaras \*\*

Amy Kohnstamm \*  
Caleb Kono \*  
Sean Madden (Co-Chair) \*  
Karen Marrongelle \*  
Christy Marten \*  
Raja Moreno \*  
Mark New \*  
Tiffani Penson \*  
Lee Rahr \*  
Esperanza Rodriguez\*  
Jill Ross \*  
Jessica Russell\*  
Scott Schaffer \*\*  
Eric Switzer \*\*  
Jason Trombley (Co-Chair) \*

Naomi Tsurumi  
Mary Valeant  
Mary Ann Walker  
Andrew Wilk \*\*

Other

Erik Gerding / PPS  
Chris Linn / Bora  
Becca Cavell / Bora

\* not present

\*\* joined by phone

---

**Distribution**

Erik Gerding file

---

**Minutes****1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE**

- A. Erik Gerding outlined the purpose of the meeting – to review the Board Work Session discussion that was held on April 10, and to update the DAG on changes to the Central City Plan, directly related to this project.

**2. REPORT ON BOARD WORK SESSION**

- A. Background
1. Office of School Modernization (OSM) has been working with the design teams for years to develop the Master Plan and the Due Diligence reports, with the associated costs estimates.
  2. Madison HS and Lincoln HS have similar schedules. Benson HS is in an earlier phase.

3. All project cost estimates have come in higher than the project budgets. Each team has been working to evaluate and reconcile the estimates, and have been scrutinizing their space programs to see if any reductions can be found. This is an iterative process – finding ways to reduce costs, achieve budget, and meet the project goals. It's not easy, but each team has been asking the question "what can we live without?". Estimating is currently at a high level, rough order of magnitude stage, and as recently as the last DAG meeting the project team didn't have final estimate numbers.
4. The LHS team has worked with the school to find a series of program reductions that may be palatable, but could be very painful. These have not yet been reviewed by the District, which needs to assess the impact of the reductions on the ability of its staff to deliver curriculum to the students.
5. OSM and Bora reviewed the design and construction schedule and have opted to pause in the work effort on LHS for a short period while the District considers its options. The schedule maintains the optimum delivery strategy of a single bid package and permit set issuance at the end of the design and documentation effort. If the project re-starts later than early June, 2018, it is likely that some form of fast track delivery will be required, with multiple bid and permit packages. This increases cost for design and risk during permitting.
6. The Bond budget situation is compounded by other factors, including the Middle School conversion work which has come in \$11.4M over budget and which needs to proceed promptly in order to meet schedule. The Tuesday Board work session on April 10 was primarily focused on this issue, and the Board has opted to pull \$11.4M from the 2017 Bond to offset the cost overruns. The Board has not yet given direction on which project or projects will be impacted by this loss of funds.
7. A second work session is likely to be held next week (week of April 16), to discuss the high schools, and there may be weekly meetings until the necessary decisions have been made.
8. PPS CFO made a presentation to the Board; Erik shared an annotated copy of that presentation with the DAG, noting that there are some inaccuracies in the information. Erik is very concerned that this document will be placed in the public record without any explanation, despite its inaccuracies:
  - a. In the summary on Page 5, the Ballot budget was not a recommendation by OSM but instead resulted from PPS leadership efforts to formulate an overall bond measure package for the ballot.
  - b. The "current project cost" is based on the Ed Specs and the work that the team has done over the last two years.
  - c. Most importantly, the \$196M reconciliation number reflects scope reductions that are not reported in this document and were not shared with the Board. The budget number reflects a value engineering effort on the overall building design and various program reductions that have not been reviewed nor approved by the Office of Teaching and Learning. It has not been determined that the resulting facility will be a fully functioning school that will support the Lincoln curriculum program. Additionally, this option will reduce the maximum enrollment capacity of the school by 8%.
  - d. Page 7 lays out a series of Bond Options.
    1. LHS team has stopped work and is not continuing to analyze / remove costs.
    2. Budget options include a variety of strategies to fund the work and/or reduce its scope.

### 3. DISCUSSION

- A. *Question:* Amy Kohnstamm has suggested the re-formation of the defunct Bond Oversight Committee, and the Superintendent supports this. Is this different to the BAC (Bond Accountability Committee)?

Response: Yes – the BAC is a group of industry experts who advise the Board. It has a different remit. It meets next week – April 18.

- B. *Question:* suggestion to review the project costs with the lens of investment per student. Current enrollment numbers findable on PPS websites show: MHS at 1,070 students, LHS at 1,703 students and Benson HS at 994 students.

*Response:* noted, but the Ed Specs do not consider investment per student and aspire to comprehensive high schools with capacity for 1,700 students [capacity should be expressed as a range – perhaps 1,600-1,900 rather than “1,700” – the capacity depends on variables such as classroom utilization and occupancy rates]. Benson can’t be compared to a new school – the existing building is well over 300,000 SF and has significant structural problems as an unreinforced masonry building. Unfortunately, while the Master Plan recommended increasing capacity of LHS to more than 1,700 students, the Board has not yet changed its position to support this recommendation.

- C. *Question:* Page 3 of the CFO report states that the schools built in the 2012 Bond were adjusted to increase capacity and to include Maker Spaces. Why can’t LHS do this too?

*Response:* the 2012 Bond-funded projects were originally planned for 1,500 students, and the Ed Specs were increased after consideration to 1,700 students. Franklin was built for this capacity, and RHS’s commons spaces reflect this change, but the school facilities would need to be further expanded to accommodate full enrollment. The current Ed Specs include these previous adjustments.

- D. *Question:* could smaller schools be updated and planned for future expansion as capacity increases?

*Response:* LHS has a 91% capture rate; MHS has a 61% capture rate. We see that updated schools have an uptick in enrollment – PPS would like to see its students return to MHS. [it was noted that MHS students attend Benson HS in high numbers – a return to MHS could further reduce BHS’s enrollment.] This is a very nuanced and complex situation.

*Rebuttal:* looking at this as \$/student still has value. Even if MHS had a 100% capture rate, it would be significantly smaller than LHS.

- E. *Observation:* the projects don’t have enough funding because the Board didn’t request enough money. How will this time be any different? How will ACCURATE information be brought to the Board, to support effective decision making?

*Discussion:* OSM’s PMs and Director have been meeting to address this, and are trying to get information moved up to the Board; they want the Board to be more involved – the Due Diligence work was good, but was buried in a political process. The Bond Stakeholder Advisory process wasn’t given enough information to make effective decisions.

- F. *Question:* How can the DAG be of help? The Board doesn’t take questions during the Work Session.

*Discussion:* attend Board Meetings. Write letters to your Board member. Recognize there are many new staff in leadership positions at the District, and OSM is working really hard to try to get everyone up to speed on the history and hard work that has been done to date over several years. Meet again soon as a full DAG meeting to agree on a shared position and draft talking points for individual communication. Call Board members directly. To speak at Board Meetings, either sign up on the day or day prior, or e-mail Karen to be added to the list to speak.

- G. *Observation:* the process to date has been about EQUALITY and not about EQUITY. It’s time to change this.

#### 4. CENTRAL CITY PLAN UPDATE

- A. City Council recently approved two changes to draft language in the Central City Plan that would have affected LHS:

1. Draft language would have prohibited surface parking of any kind in the downtown area. Even parking under the grandstands would not be permitted. Only parking with occupied

# BORA

---

building space over it would have been allowed. City Council has approved an amendment to allow 100 surface spaces at LHS.

2. Superblock language required unrestricted public access at all times across sites such as LHS, as well as the provision of public plazas. This has also been exempted for LHS, with the requirement that LHS and PBOT reach an agreement about public access.
- B. A DAG member expressed concern at the speed with which PPS and the City acted to adjust the code language, with little or no time for the neighborhood to respond. The team noted that there is a lot of time ahead to consider site access and site security.

## 5. MEETING ADJOURNED

### Attachments

- A. Board Work Session – CFO presentation with OSM notes
- B. Revised schedule

### Next Planned Meeting

Thursday May 31, 6:00 – 8:00 PM, LHS Library

The foregoing is the writer's interpretation of the issues discussed. Please report any discrepancies or omissions to Bora within three business days of receipt of this document.

## END OF MEETING MINUTES