



Regular Public Meeting-Study Session  
June 23, 2011

Dr. Ruth Ann Marston presided over the PESD No. 1 Governing Board Meeting in the Phoenix Elementary School District Governing Board Room

Other Board Members present at the meeting were:

Mr. Doug Allsworth  
(Absent)

Ms. Susan Bliss

Ms. Liz Meza

Dr. Louisa Stark

Also present were:

Ms. Myriam Roa  
Superintendent

Mr. Tom Lind  
Assistant Superintendent  
for Curriculum and Instruction

Mr. Kenneth Baca  
Assistant Superintendent  
for Business Services  
(Absent)

Mr. Randy Dickason  
Executive Director for  
Human Resources

Ms. Eleanor Moyza  
Board Secretary

---

**A. Study Session – 8:30 a.m.**

1. Call to Order – Dr. Ruth Ann Marston, President
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Magda Nuñez
3. Request Approval of Emerson Court Renovations
  - a. Historic Preservation Update - *Ben Barcon from ADM Group introduced his team and proceeded to update the board on the renovation project for Emerson Court. The complexity of the roof removal required compromise with the historic preservation office. Originally the plan had an 8 inch increase in elevation, but with a meeting with historic preservation. A steel plate will only raise the building ½ inch with will not impact the appearance of the outside of the building. The second issue was the chimney; option 1 was to take it down, option 2 was to replicate it. ADM would like to proceed with the removal of the chimney, he reported that the historic preservation team supported that 1<sup>st</sup> option and would like the governing board to approve the removal of the chimney as well. Dr. Marston asked how far down would he suggest taking it down. ADM's plan would be take down the chimney to the parapet wall, and not remove it all the way down. Reuse of the clay roof tiles: most of the tiles will be saved (75- 80%) and using new tiles only for the inside of the courtyard. Dr. Marston reported that many people may know where there may be similar matching tiles; and ADM will look to see if they find any more originally matched tiles. The options for 7<sup>th</sup> street elevation with a vertical lift were presented. American with Disabilities Act(ADA) requires wheelchair access at the front door. ADM requests direction on the elevation so they can submit the board's preference to the historic preservation next week. Ms. Bliss asked what the cost differences of the lift vs. the ramp. The lift option costs \$30-35,000, the wheelchair ramp (from a previous option) cost \$60,000. Dr. Marston asked the city historic preservation officer about the lift option and reported that the city did not have a problem with the lift option. Children who are under the age of 3 may not be able to make the front stairs, parents with very small children can use the lift for strollers or standing up. Maintenance schedule is provided for a*

regular schedule and will increase the cost, the yearly inspection does not cost too much, and the lift should be lubed and maintained every six months. If the lift breaks down other entrances are still available.

- b. Roof Options – Wood vs. Steel trusses. Costs are \$1.281 million to replace all the existing trusses with wood trusses and last 60-70 years and are supported by historic preservationists. Metal is \$2.873, or \$800,000 more and lasts forever. Dr. Stark asked about termite prevention treatment and Mr. Barcon assured that the treatment is included. Ms. Bliss asked about reusing the older wood trusses, and Mr. Barcon explained it would not be good use of resources (time, inspection, ordering materials) to try to reuse existing wood trusses.
- c. Floor Plan – ADM presented a review of the revised plan from the last board meeting showing parking, the lift with the sidewalks from parking lots to the front of the building. ADM has met two or three times with employees. At the last meeting the board requested a door between HR and Payroll; there are already two doors for HR and Payroll to use that go out to the courtyard with access from the courtyard; Mr. Barcon requests direction to add another door. A fitness center will not be considered at this time. Instead showers will be installed. The board requested a shower for those who rode bikes or walked to work. An expansion of the teacher's workroom and two showers next to the existing bathroom was alternative option to the fitness center. The showers are made of fiberglass and are ADA/wheelchair accessible. The board requested lockers for employees to keep a change of clothes.  
Two separate motions are recommended to give direction capturing the discussion, so that ADM can move forward to bring a guaranteed maximum price at the August 11, 2011 regular board meeting.

A visit to other districts is planned to get an idea of how the board room should have furniture and technology renovated.

**Ms. Bliss made a motion to accept the conceptual plans presented to the board with the changes to add the showers and eliminate the fitness center, and a lift rather than a ramp in the front.**

**Dr. Stark seconded, and asked about the visibility of the building façade.**

**Ms. Bliss amended her motion to include maximum visibility of the façade (via wrought iron or lighter lift screen wall). Dr. Stark accepted and seconded the amended motion.**

Items A.3.a., b., and c. were passed unanimously.

3.c. Board room - Mr. Barcon continued with issues to consider for the renovations to the governing board room: first, whether a permanent platform vs. temporary movable platform. The second issue is the level of technology to be included in the board room and the third issue is the folding partition which would allow using the room as two rooms with more flexibility. A bid alternate will be obtained; the board requested a sound proof partition; ADM described an insulated option with whiteboards, and the board asked for a long lasting partition. The square feet of the plan for the governing board room is 2480 sq. feet (compared to a school media center is 3-4000 sq. feet); with dimensions of 30 ft. by 64 ft. that will accommodate 165 people (as compared to current board room 30 by 40; renovation will be much wider). Both Littleton and Tolleson districts will be toured by board members for ideas on podiums, layouts, and technology. Board preferences were discussed regarding the function, visibility, technology and furniture for the governing board room.

**Dr. Stark made a motion to approve the configuration of the space presented to the board without decisions about technology or furnishings. Ms. Meza seconded the motion.**

Item A.3 c Board Room was passed 3 with one (Ms. Bliss) abstaining. Ms. Bliss explained that she abstained because she wanted more detailed discussion on the furniture.

d. Landscaping Options – *The discussion focused on the salvaging as many palm trees as feasible as requested by the board in a previous board meeting, by relocating them if possible either to front or side of the building. Mesquite, Olive and queen palms trees in the courtyard will be remove, some doors were relocated to keep fan palms in the courtyard. The walls to 7<sup>th</sup> street will be taken down to put more grass in the front, keeping the electronic marquee, noting addition of trees to south and north parking area with additional lighting (combination of bollards, planters and poles) for walking and safety. The board adjourned temporarily (approximately 30 minutes) to tour the grounds. The board reconvened after a tour of the grounds.*

*Susan Bliss made the following recommendations regarding the philosophy of the landscaping; it should be consistent with the historic and community preferences and saved utility costs; maximize shade for staff in courtyard, maximize shade for community, maximize enhanced color as pro-environmental and low maintenance and sustainable solutions, as cooling the building with shade will save on utility costs.*

*Dr. Stark noted that there would be a fair amount of shade window coverings for openings around the building structure, and that if trees on the west side could be planted some way it should be looked into.*

*Dr. Marston confirmed the community wanted shade and said it was a priority.*

*Mr. Barcon discussed sustainability and signage.*

*Ms. Bliss moved that the landscaping be reevaluated in light of increasing the amount of shade for staff, for the public and for the building consistent with the historic nature of the building and the site subject to anyone's favorite palm trees.*

*Dr. Stark asked if Ms. Bliss meant that she wanted these items to be studied and brought back to the board, and Ms. Bliss replied 'yes,' and Dr. Stark seconded the motion.*

*Landscaping is one of the last items completed, but ADM wants to bring a plan to the city by July 7<sup>th</sup>. A revised plan to be brought to the board before July 7<sup>th</sup> was discussed. June 27<sup>th</sup> was suggested for another study session (the following Monday at 8:30 am).*

*The motion was read back and passed unanimously.*

*Ms. Bliss made a motion regarding the interior of the courtyard, subject to the first motion regarding shade(living/provided by trees); that as much color as possible; that the existing plan be reevaluated with the eye to maintaining existing flowering plant, adding plants and again maximize shade.*

*Ms. Meza asked if the motion included shade. Ms. Bliss replied that if possible there should be more shade trees in the courtyard for staff, maintain the hibiscus, have as much color as possible. Dr. Stark said the plan should consider sustainability and whether this plan will be more costly to the District and factored into. Ms. Bliss also mentioned LEED certification.*

*Ms. Bliss said she would accept an amendment any of the shade or enhanced color will have to be as environmentally sensitive and water usage sensitive as can be done (is not asking for tropical landscaping). Dr. Stark added also that the plan be sensitive to maintenance, accepted the amendment, as did Ms. Bliss.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

*Ms. Bliss made a third motion that the ADM group conduct an LEED charette for all of the landscaping and all of the renovations to the building with an eye towards getting some level of certification for the building as soon as is reasonable.*

*Mr. Barcon described the LEED certification is a process of about four hours and will not affect the deadline of July 7<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Stark asked that she did not want the process to be a large added expense. Mr. Barcon described the process, and estimated LEED certification and commission may cost \$60,000.*

*Dr. Stark suggested board members be a part of the preliminary charette.*

*Ms. Bliss moved that ADM reevaluate all the landscaping plants for the entire site, and all of the renovations with an LEED charette and bring the results back to the board to decide pursuing certification. Dr. Stark accepted the substitute motion and seconded.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

*Ms. Bliss moved that the existing signage on the slanted pedestal be evaluated; requested a mock up of the new signage, asking a sixth grade glass to test the signage to find rooms within five minutes.*

*Dr. Stark did not second the motion, but requested a substitute motion that ADM propose better signage for the building, legible and usable by the general public and from sixth grade on up.*

*Mr. Barcon confirmed signage is included in the scope of work.*

*The motion was seconded by Ms. Meza. Dr. Stark modified her motion to say “exterior and interior”, and Ms. Meza accepted the modification.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

- 4. Receive and discuss Preliminary Budget for Emerson Court Renovation – ADM presented a plan to bring a final to the board on August 11, 2011. The preliminary budget is over budget by about \$2,439,000. Reducing the overage by delaying non-critical HVAC projects until more bond is available, apply rebates from APS, value engineer the projects, savings on other projects addresses the estimated overages, especially with potential rebates not yet received. Specifically, the value engineering \$165,000 by reusing existing mechanical pit. Discussion on increasing insulation showed that insulating exterior masonry walls with drywall will save significant utility costs, leaving interior walls that have exposed brick to maintain the historical style.*
- 5. Receive and Discuss Moving Timelines and Locations (proposed July 18, 2011) – Moving dates and times and phases will not initiate any additional purchase orders and Phase 1A&B can be implemented in mid-July. Phase 2 & 3 are contingent on construction schedule implementation.*

*Ms. Bliss requested information to explain why we are renovating the building several times and on the website so parents and teachers can understand that the funding for this is clear and necessary and cannot be used for salaries or supplies.*

*Mr. Barcon thanked and appreciated the board for their input.*

**B. Approval of Consent Agenda**

1. Request for Approval or Ratification of Employment of Administrative, Certified and Support Staff
2. Request for Approval or Ratification of Employee Contract/Work Agreement Adjustments for Changes in Position
3. Request for Approval of Separation of Employment, Resignations and Retirements  
*Ms. Bliss moved for approval of the Consent Agenda and Dr. Stark seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion unanimously and the Consent Agenda was passed.*

**C. Community Communications**

None

**D. Adjournment**

The board meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Dr. Ruth Ann Marston  
Governing Board President

RAM/evm