[ROLL CALL]

A. COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

1. **RESOLVED,** That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh approve the submission of a required District Improvement Plan to the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) in order to address the District’s Corrective Action II status during the 2007-2008 school year. Accordingly, this plan includes the Pittsburgh Public Schools’ priority 2007-2008 goals and strategies for addressing all matters required under the No Child Left Behind Act as delineated within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s Accountability Plan. The deadline for filing the District Improvement Plan with the PDE is November 16, 2007.

[Roll Call]

B. COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS / FINANCE

1. **RESOLVED,** That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh authorize its appropriate officers to exercise the right of first refusal on Units 1 and 2, 121 Ninth Street Condominium and to purchase the units for $1.4 million dollars.

**RESOLVED, FURTHER,** That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh authorize its appropriate officers to purchase Unit 9, 121 Ninth Street Condominium for $600,000 and eight parking spaces in connection therewith in the basement limited common area for $200,000, the amount per space as established when the condominium was created and renovated.

**RESOLVED, FINALLY,** That the Solicitor and other officers be authorized to prepare and execute all necessary agreements, including agreements of sale and closing documents in connection with these acquisitions.
2. **RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with DGGP Architecture for "on-call" architectural design services for the preliminary phase of the High School Reform projects within the District including but not limited to the provision of all necessary designs, specifications, construction bid documents, preparation of reports, cost estimates, feasibility studies, surveys, and related sub-consultant engineering/other services as required to design Pittsburgh Reizenstein High School Reform project. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 to December 31, 2009. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates and shall not exceed $150,000 in base fee and $50,000 in reimbursable expenses, for a total of $200,000, from account line 6300-357-4400-330. Based on the number of project(s) assigned and budget and designs developed, there will be a negotiated fee for the subsequent phases of the High School Reform project.

3. **RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with Foreman Group for "on-call" architectural design services for the preliminary phase of the High School Reform projects within the District including but not limited to the provision of all necessary designs, specifications, construction bid documents, preparation of reports, cost estimates, feasibility studies, surveys, and related sub-consultant engineering/other services as required to design Pittsburgh Frick High School Reform project. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 to December 31, 2009. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates and shall not exceed $150,000.00 in base fee and $50,000 in reimbursable expenses, for a total of $200,000, from account line 6300-357-4400-330. Based on the number of project(s) assigned and budget and designs developed, there will be a negotiated fee for the subsequent phases of the High School Reform project.

4. **RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with Graves Architects, Inc. for "on-call" architectural design services for the preliminary phase of the High School Reform projects within the District including but not limited to the provision of all necessary designs, specifications, construction bid documents, preparation of reports, cost estimates, feasibility studies, surveys, and related sub-consultant engineering/other services as required to design Pittsburgh Milliones High School Reform project. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 to December 31, 2009. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates and shall not exceed $150,000 in base fee and $50,000 in reimbursable expenses, for a total of $200,000, from account line 6300-357-4400-330. Based on the number of project(s) assigned and budget and designs developed, there will be a negotiated fee for the subsequent phases of the High School Reform project.

Designs submitted were evaluated by Facilities staff, High School Reform team and the Operations office.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with HHSDR Architects/Engineers for "on-call" architectural design services for the preliminary phase of the High School Reform projects within the District including but not limited to the provision of all necessary designs, specifications, construction bid documents, preparation of reports, cost estimates, feasibility studies, surveys, and related sub-consultant engineering/other services as required to design Pittsburgh Peabody High School Reform project. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 to December 31, 2009. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates and shall not exceed $150,000 in base fee and $50,000 in reimbursable expenses, for a total of $200,000, from account line 6300-357-4400-330. Based on the number of project(s) assigned and budget and designs developed, there will be a negotiated fee for the subsequent phases of the High School Reform project.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with MacLachlan Cornelius & Filoni for "on-call" architectural design services for the preliminary phase of the High School Reform projects within the District including but not limited to the provision of all necessary designs, specifications, construction bid documents, preparation of reports, cost estimates, feasibility studies, surveys, and related sub-consultant engineering/other services as required to design Pittsburgh CAPA High School Reform project. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 to December 31, 2009. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates and shall not exceed $150,000 in base fee and $50,000 in reimbursable expenses, for a total of $200,000, from account line 6300-357-4400-330. Based on the number of project(s) assigned and budget and designs developed, there will be a negotiated fee for the subsequent phases of the High School Reform project.

Designs submitted were evaluated by Facilities staff, High School Reform team and the Operations office.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with Chronicle Consulting, LLC and URS Corp. to provide all professional construction management services for the proposed construction work for the Pittsburgh Peabody High School Reform project. Services are not limited to, but include daily monitoring, construction coordination, review of construction documents, schedules, quality of construction, contractor requisitions, change orders, site safety and related services as may be required to complete project on schedule. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates submitted. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 through December 31, 2009. The total contract amount shall not exceed $250,000 from account line 6300-357-4400-330.

If the total project(s) cost exceeds $5,000,000, there will be a negotiated fee for the additional work services.
8. **RESOLVED,** That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with Management Engineering Corporation to provide all professional construction management services for the proposed construction work for the Pittsburgh Milliones High School Reform project. Services are not limited to, but include daily monitoring, construction coordination, review of construction documents, schedules, quality of construction, contractor requisitions, change orders, site safety and related services as may be required to complete project on schedule. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates submitted. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 through December 31, 2009. The total contract amount shall not exceed $250,000 from account line 6300-357-4400-330. If the total project(s) cost exceeds $5,000,000, there will be a negotiated fee for the additional work services.

9. **RESOLVED,** That the Board of Directors of the School District of Pittsburgh be authorized to enter into a contract with Foreman Program and Construction Management to provide all professional construction management services for the proposed construction work for the Pittsburgh Reizenstein High School Reform project. Services are not limited to, but include daily monitoring, construction coordination, review of construction documents, schedules, quality of construction, contractor requisitions, change orders, site safety and related services as may be required to complete project on schedule. The initial fee shall be based on the consultant's hourly rates submitted. The operating period shall be from November 15, 2007 through December 31, 2009. The total contract amount shall not exceed $250,000 from account line 6300-357-4400-330. If the total project(s) cost exceeds $5,000,000, there will be a negotiated fee for the additional work services.

[Roll Call]

**FINANCIAL MATTERS**

1. **Transfer of Funds (See Attachment A)**

[Roll Call]

**NEW BUSINESS**

[Roll Call]
BUSINESS / FINANCE COMMITTEE
November 14, 2007

TRANSFER OF FUNDS
GENERAL FUND

DIRECTORS:

It is recommended that the following transfer be approved:

From Major Object 800
  Appropriations for Contingencies
  $2,200,000
To Major Object 700
  Buildings
  $2,200,000

To fund the acquisition of additional building space for the CAPA Facility.

Respectfully submitted,

Floyd McCrea
Chairperson
Business / Finance Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR OBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>APPROPRIATIONS</th>
<th>DATE OF TRANSFER</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF TRANSFER</th>
<th>ADJUSTED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Personal Services-Salaries</td>
<td>$198,512,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$198,512,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Personal Services-Employee Benefits</td>
<td>71,937,619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,937,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Purchased Prof. &amp; Tech. Services</td>
<td>80,102,551</td>
<td>01/24/2007</td>
<td>($3,200,000)</td>
<td>76,902,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Purchased Property Services</td>
<td>7,861,090</td>
<td>01/24/2007</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>11,061,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Other Purchased Services</td>
<td>77,146,526</td>
<td>02/20/2007</td>
<td>($77,151)</td>
<td>77,069,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>18,889,738</td>
<td>08/22/2007</td>
<td>($160,000)</td>
<td>18,649,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/24/2007</td>
<td>($80,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>4,667,639</td>
<td>08/22/2007</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>7,107,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/24/2007</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/14/2007</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Other Objects</td>
<td>35,452,009</td>
<td>11/14/2007</td>
<td>($2,200,000)</td>
<td>33,252,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Other Financing Uses</td>
<td>34,366,376</td>
<td>02/20/2007</td>
<td>$77,151</td>
<td>34,443,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. for Enc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$531,435,744</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$531,435,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ORIGINAL
MR. ISLER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to call the November 14th, 2007 special legislative meeting to order for the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

Would you all please rise so we may salute the flag?

(Pledge of allegiance.)

MR. ISLER: Thank you.

The first part of this meeting is a special legislative meeting.

As soon as we adjourn that, we will take a short break.

So we can realign ourselves before the agenda review.

Mr. Weiss, could we please have a roll call vote of those in attendance?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Brentley?

MR. BRENTLEY: Here.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Colaizzi?

(No response.)

MR. WEISS: Mr. Dowd?

MR. DOWD: Present.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Fink?
MRS. FINK: Here.

MR. WEISS: Mr. McCrea?

MR. McCREA: Here.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Romaniello?

MR. ROMANIELLO: Here.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Sumpter?

MR. SUMPTER: Present.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Isler?

MR. ISLER: Present.

Would you please note there are a number of items on the agenda this evening?

The first is committee on education report. It is the school district's submission of the district improvement plan of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Roosevelt, do you want to say anything about this item, sir?

MR. ROOSEVELT: We are fully prepared to answer any questions the board might have. And I think if there are questions, we are prepared to answer them.

MR. ISLER: It has been submitted to all board members.
Any questions, concerns or suggestions on committee on education report No. 1? The only item under education committee.

Mr. Brentley?

MR. BRENTLEY: A question on this item.

This is tied in to the high school reform?

Or parts of.

MR. ISLER: Dr. Lane.

DR. LANE: High school reform is listed as part of the district’s improvement plan.

However, the fact that it is listed in the plan does not either obligate or change any decision the board might make around high school reform.

The plan is flexible.

So at any point if there would be any changes the board would like to make, then that could be done.

And so as I said, voting on the plan does not obligate anything beyond that or do anything directly related to high school reform.

MR. BRENTLEY: There are parts --

DR. LANE: Correct.

There are parts of high school reform listed in the plan.

MR. BRENTLEY: My other question I guess is
to -- everyone is well aware of the public hearing yesterday. And one great suggestion that came out of the hearing was the possibility of approaching the state and asking for an extension in terms of time. So that when we submit a plan, it is tight. And it would have everything sent.

Have we considered that at all?

MR. ROOSEVELT: We have no reason to seek an extension to the plan.

It is the district's improvement plan. It is a full plan. It is ready. And it is timely and submitted to the state.

MR. BRENTLEY: But if there are items that are still in question, that are included in this item under committee of education, it would just seem like it would make a little bit more sense that we move together once those adjustments were made.

The one speaker said there was some excitement on the part of the state, if we were to consider or formally request an extension.

I am thinking as a board member, it would make a lot of sense, if we can not piecemeal things,
but kind of move together as one big unit.

So you say you have not explored that or you are not considering it?

MR. ROOSEVELT: Mr. Brentley, there is no reason -- some of the folks who testified last night made a connection between the issues around Schenley and the district improvement plan.

There is no connection.

And that was a misunderstanding.

An understandable one, because both are being taken in to some action, potentially by the board tonight.

But the district improvement plan will always be a moving document, as we will always be adding action items to what the district is doing and try to improve student performance.

But this district improvement plan is tight.

It is done.

It represents where the district is at this time and what the plans are for the future in terms of student achievement.

MR. BRENTLEY: It is unfortunate that we would not consider an extension.

We will leave it at that.
I am disappointed as a board member just learning of the concerns last night.

And if there is an opportunity to hold things, so that we are not caught almost the way we have been caught on other initiatives in this district, that here is an opportunity for us to slow the process, engage and include folks before we move forward.

I am disappointed we are not considering it.

And I would urge my colleagues, you were all there. You were all witness to concerns. Why start a fight, if you don't have to?

And so I would only encourage my board members we have to raise some of these concerns. We know what happens, when we move too fast.

We know what happens when we make changes and recommendations and when we leave the community out.

When we leave parents out.

When we leave all of the stakeholders out.

It becomes a costly ordeal to the taxpayers.
And I would encourage my colleagues, I am sure most of your votes and decisions have been made already.

But I want to raise those concerns. And I will not be able to support the item No. 1.

MR. ISLER: Are you finished, Mr. Brentley?

MR. BRENTLEY: Yes.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Weiss, please note Mrs. Colaizzi has arrived.

Mr. Taylor.

MR. WEISS: So noted.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

I also share some of the concerns about the haste of which this is proceeding.

My first question I have for the superintendent.

The community meeting that was held at Schenley this past I believe this past Thursday, were there architects and others in attendance? I know Mr. Lopez was there for high school reform.

Were there architects and people from our
facilities department at that meeting to answer questions?

MR. ROOSEVELT: I do not believe there were. But I am mystified by the connection that you gentlemen are drawing between that issue and the district improvement plan.

MR. TAYLOR: Sir, I am not talking about the district improvement plan.

I am speaking to --

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor, the item is district improvement plan.

That is what we are voting on. There is only one item.

We are voting on the committee on education report.

Al.

Starting at the beginning.

MR. TAYLOR: It is a finance concern.

MR. ISLER: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: The only question I have is there were concerns from people who do follow educational issues that they weren't completely satisfied, I think with a number of things and elements that were not a part of that plan.

Are you aware of some of the concerns of
some of the people in the education community, are you aware there were concerns?

MR. ROOSEVELT: Mr. Taylor, we haven't received, as far as I know -- if anybody on staff will disagree with me -- any concerns from anybody in any manner about the district improvement plan.

It would be a first impression to me.

MR. TAYLOR: Like I say, there were a couple speakers who referred to it last night.

Of course, this is a very important document.

And so I was just saying were you in any way concerned about some of the concerns that at least a couple speakers had about wanting to take a closer look at the district improvement plan that we are about to vote on this evening?

MR. ROOSEVELT: I apologize.

At the risk of repeating myself, I believe there was confusion last night on a couple speakers, because tonight the board is dealing with two issues. One is the district improvement plan.

The second is the hiring of some architects and construction managers on issues that do relate in some way to the Schenley matter.

But the district improvement plan in no way
relates to the Schenley matter.

So I think there was confusion on some speakers' parts.

Because they inferred that the decision that we are asking the board to make for high schools in coming months is somehow included in the district reform plan.

It is not.

MR. TAYLOR: I know Ms. Taylor spoke. She has worked actively with public education issues.

To me she was clear.

She did comment on the issues around Schenley.

She was very clear about concerns around the district improvement plan and the haste some things omitted from the district plan.

So I think she was very clear.

MR. ROOSEVELT: I heard nothing on that.

I did hear there was confusion on her part of the Schenley piece being a part of the plan.

Mr. Taylor, this plan has not been produced in any haste at all.

It has been worked on for a long period of time.

And it is now due to the state.
It is actually why we needed to call this special meeting tonight. Because though we could ask for an extension, we have absolutely no reason to ask for an extension. And it is now due to the state. And it is something that needs to be approved by the board before submission.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Dowd.

MR. DOWD: If we could, Dr. Lane, just a little clarity for all of us.

What is the purpose of the district improvement plan?

What is the process here? Why are we doing this?

I think we need clarity around that.

It is a regular procedural process for this administration.

Is it not?

DR. LANE: That's correct.

Because the district is in corrective action.

We are required to file this plan.
MR. DOWD: Corrective action means what?

DR. LANE: It means we are not meeting our requirements under No Child Left Behind.

The plan itself is a description of the steps the district intends to take in order to better meet achievement needs of students in Pittsburgh Public Schools.

It is an annual plan that we file.

The bulk of the plan is describing a lot of the Excellence for All agenda, reform agenda that the community is already familiar with.

We have to take the step of analyzing data. And looking at the root causes of the lack of student achievement.

And then delineate what our strategies will be to address those.

That is basically what the plan is about.

MR. DOWD: Is this something -- this is the first time we filed this report?

DR. LANE: No. It is not. It is an annual plan.

MR. DOWD: This is something we do on a regular ongoing basis.

This is a compliance document. Is that correct?
DR. LANE: Well, compliance -- to keep us in compliance, yes.

But also the intent is that it also helps shape our work for the coming year around student achievement.

MR. DOWD: Great. And it is again based on foundation documents like the Excellence for All plan, which the board has voted.

And many other pieces that we have been working on over the last several years.

As far as student achievement as foundation documents.

DR. LANE: That's correct.

MR. DOWD: Thank you.

MR. ISLER: Any other questions or concerns?

Mr. Brentley.

MR. BRENTELEY: Yes.

Dr. Lane in the plan, you mentioned there were parts in the plan that talked about high school reform.

Can you briefly talk about what is mentioned in there that is part of the high school reform?

DR. LANE: Mr. Brentley, because -- I was
looking through, on page 17 of 67, there is a reference to high school reform. And there are other references throughout the document to high school reform. But in terms of specific things that will be done as a part of high school reform, that is not necessarily a part of this plan. And additionally, as I stated before, at any time, if changes are made to our reform agenda or the actions around anything we are doing, then we at any time can change our plan. And there is no problem at all. We did contact the Department of Education about that. And they did let us know, that no, this would not be a reason to not submit. Because we have the flexibility, it is not something the board locks themselves in to.

MR. BRENTLEY: Can you tell me, Doctor, does it have any mention as to some of the changes around Schenley school at all?

DR. LANE: Yes.

It does.

What I am saying, that still does not lock the board in.
MR. BRENTLEY: Does it mention also the changes with the mainstream students going to the Reizenstein school? I mean, the Milliones and the IB going to Reizenstein?

And the six to 12 recommendation?

DR. LANE: Yes.

That is in there.

MR. BRENTLEY: Let me just say, and I appreciate your response.

And not necessarily to you, but to you, Mark, can you see where it is a little misleading to the public to include that in any document, that we are voting on, that is going to govern this board or to be used to govern this board in its improvement, when a lot of these issues are still unanswered? It clearly gives the indication that there is an attempt to backdoor this whole high school reform.

That is a little misleading.

And that is why there were a lot of concerns last night. We also have to be very careful not to underestimate our parent community out there.

They are very well read.
They are active.
Love the district.
And they also do their research as well.
That is where the confusion comes in.
Because if you are including it here, then it is misleading to the public.
It is suggesting a portion of this is moving forward without going through the proper channels.
That is where the problem is.
Do you understand that, Mark?
MR. ROOSEVELT: I do understand there would be confusion around that.
But as Dr. Lane said, this does not obligate the board in any way or manner. This contains, we believe Dr. Lane is looking for them now, references to it.
And we are trying to find them now as to exactly how they are articulated.
MR. BRENTLEY: Okay.
Then what we should do, if that is not a problem, then it shouldn't be a problem just to remove them before we vote on this document today.
It makes sense for us to do that, to also continue to gain the trust of this community, that we
are open.

We are willing to listen to some of their recommendations.

So I am willing to wait, if you can find anything that makes a reference to the high school reform.

And remove it before we vote.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Brentley, this is a legislative meeting, sir.

And if you want to do something like that --

MR. BRENTLEY: I would like to make a motion any item in the plan we are scheduled to vote on, which is under the committee on education, A, No. 1, we are asking that it would be removed completely from the document before we are able to vote.

That is a motion.

MR. ISLER: Is there a second?

(No response.)

MR. ISLER: Motion is not accepted. There is no second to the motion.

Any other questions or concerns?

Mr. Weiss, could we have roll call, please, on the committee on education report?
MR. WEISS: Mr. Brentley.
MR. BRENTLEY: No.
MR. WEISS: Mrs. Colaizzi.
MS. COLAIZZI: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. Dowd.
MR. DOWD: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mrs. Fink.
MS. FINK: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. McCrea.
MR. McCREA: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. Romaniello.
MR. ROMANIELLO: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. Sumpter.
MR. SUMPTER: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Mr. Isler.
MR. ISLER: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Motion carries.
MR. ISLER: Thank you.
Move to committee on business and finance.
The item here on No. 1 is to purchase additional space for CAPA in the building downtown.
Mr. Weiss, if you want to add anything as I go on, if you would follow me, sir, I would greatly
1 appreciate it.
2 is the architects on call with Pittsburgh Reizenstein high school reform project.
3 is for architects on call for the Pittsburgh Frick high school reform project.
4 No. 4 is architects on call for the Pittsburgh Milliones high school reform.
5 is architects and engineers on call for the Pittsburgh Peabody high school reform project.
6 No. 6 is architects on call for the Pittsburgh CAPA high school reform project.
7 No. 7 is for construction management services for the Pittsburgh Peabody high school reform project.
8 No. 8 is construction management and engineering services for the Pittsburgh Milliones high school reform project.
9 And No. 9 is construction management services for the Pittsburgh Reizenstein high school project.
10 Are there any questions from the board on any of these items?
11 Mr. Taylor.
12 MR. TAYLOR: Back to my original question about intent at the community reform held this past
Thursday.

Were there architects and facilities people from the district in attendance to answer questions about the condition of the building and the superintendent's recommendation?

MR. FELLERS: There were no staff, that I am aware of, that were there to answer questions like that.

Mr. Patil is a parent of a student at the school. But he was not there to answer questions.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Roosevelt, the question I have to ask is do you believe the school community students who are affected by that program have been fully informed, to your satisfaction, about why your recommendation was made to close the facility in June due to health and safety concerns?

Do you think again the school community students, to your satisfaction have been fully informed as to why you made this recommendation to the board?

MR. ROOSEVELT: No.

And I think this has been an extremely, as the board well knows, difficult and challenging situation that we are in.

As the board knows, and as we did relate it
to the public, it was only about eight weeks ago that
issues were brought to our attention that made it in
my opinion impossible for us to conclude otherwise
that students should not be in that building in
September of 2008.

We do not anticipate that message, that
reality.
And so during this time, I am apologetic,
even though I am not quite sure what I could have done
about it.

That process has not been as full as it
could have been and should have been.
And that is both true.
We have given the short timeline, made some
initial steps to both especially talk to students,
faculty and parents and others.
But given the nature of construction
projects in the school district.
And given the fact, again, we concluded, as
you well know, that it would be imprudent to open the
building with students in it next year, our No. 1
objective had to be to provide safe facilities for
these students.
And we wanted to do so in a manner that was
in keeping with our academic objectives.
And we have done that in the best way possible.

It has definitely made communications more of a challenge than we would like.

No question about that.

For that I can do nothing but apologize and say we will be moving to enter in to dialogue around all of the issues around the move, that we possibly can.

Next week we will be sharing all of the materials with folks we have in terms of the assessments of the building and the problem with the delamination of the plaster.

And the potential costs of any remediation that might -- the board might want to consider.

But again, we felt our core obligation to our students meant that we needed to present the board a plan for their safe keeping in the year ahead.

And yes, Mr. Taylor, you are right, that has been both quicker and with less communication than in any other situation we would have liked.

I would like to ask the president. I did have a small presentation to update and encapsulate for the board, if he would like me to present it.

MR. ISLER: Fine.
Please go ahead.

MR. ROOSEVELT: It is very short.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Roosevelt, if you can, just please try to speak in to the mike.

MR. ROOSEVELT: I am sorry.

Was I not?

MR. ISLER: You are turning sideways.

MR. ROOSEVELT: I apologize.

I apologize.

I have a lousy and nonending cold.

And it probably makes it harder to hear.

The recommendations we presented to the public and to the board over the last ten days, we very strongly believe in, for creating a new learning community for our students.

There is a significant body of research we believe supports the creation of 6-12 learning communities, much of which we presented to the board and public.

And much more of which will be presented in the weeks to come.

As you know, and as Mr. Taylor's question suggests, we did indeed make adjustments to our planning, because of the accelerated deterioration of the Schenley facility, as well as the item in front of
the board to purchase the extra space downtown at the CAPA building.

I want to know most importantly, the community input we have had time to encompass, and especially speaking with our students, has encouraged us to provide one change tonight, that we will be apprising the board of now, which is we do believe that the current Schenley students should be moved intact to Reizenstein and allowed to graduate together.

Perhaps this will help show the board. It is an adjustment. But it keeps the core of the plan intact.

In 2008-2009 the 10, 11th, 12th graders from Schenley would move to Reizenstein. They would graduate with Schenley diplomas. Students seem to feel extremely strongly about this. It seems to matter to them a great deal. And we believe that we can accommodate that desire on their part within the academic goals of the plan.

In that same year, therefore, Frick would add a 9th grade to its program at the Frick Building. The robotics program would open at Peabody.
with 9th grade.

And the Milliones partnership would open instead of as a 6 to 12 immediately, would open as a 6 to 9 school to expand each year to become a 6-12.

In '09-'10, the former Schenley students would continue to progress through and to graduate together, those who would become 12th graders.

In that year, we would move to the creation of the IB world program at Reizenstein by moving the Frick program there.

This time now with 6th through 10th graders.

Peabody robotics would continue to grow one grade at a time.

University prep partnership would grow again one year at a time.

And the science and technology academy -- science and technology school would open as a 6-9 at Frick.

And the CAPA program immediately add the 6th to 9th grade cohort. 6th through 8th grade cohort really downtown.

Again, the phased in approach allows us to move forward with our new 6-12 learning communities.

It also allows us to accommodate the
Schenley students in their very strong desire to graduate together and to receive Schenley diplomas.

The Frick students are able to prepare for transition to IB world at Reizenstein in '09-'10.

And it gives us time with the folks at the University of Pittsburgh to open our partnership in a more sequenced manner at Milliones.

It ultimately achieves the goal that we have, which is to open these focus learning communities and increase -- dramatically increase high school choice for our students.

So if that helps, I hope it does. If it does not, if it leaves questions open, I am certainly prepared, as our other folks on the staff, to answer them.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present that.

MR. ISLER: I want to be clear on this. We are not voting on any of this this evening.

MR. ROOSEVELT: That's correct.

But I do think the knowledge of it informs the votes that you are being asked to make, in terms of the hiring of architects.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Roosevelt. The
discussion is really on business and finance items. 1 through 9 that are before us this evening.

And I think we have to confine our discussion to those items.

Mr. Brentley.

MR. BRENTLEY: Yes, Mr. President, first, with all due respect, I want to make -- clarify something.

I don't think it is fair to attempt to limit discussion.

If the items are related, every board member should have his or her right to talk about that.

I think it sets a very, very strange precedent for the president to attempt to limit the discussion.

They are related.

Okay?

And regardless of what we are hearing around this table or what is told by this administration, they are related.

Okay?

So I am hoping that you would just remove that and not attempt to limit anyone's concerns
raising -- or their questions.
It is just not a good thing to say.
MR. ISLER: Mr. Brentley, I made a suggestion.
That is all I made, sir.
A suggestion.
You make them all the time.
I get to make them.
Do you want the floor, Mr. Brentley?
MR. BRENTLEY: Yes.
And I am sharing with you --
MR. ISLER: I made a suggestion.
Please get to the business of the meeting.
MR. BRENTLEY: This is a sensitive issue.
And if it takes us two or three hours to discuss it and to represent our constituents, we should be allowed to.
You should not attempt to frame the discussion or to lock board members in to a particular corner on discussing this.
That is all I am saying.
MR. ISLER: Mr. Brentley, I have complete confidence in my fellow board members that I cannot lock them in to a corner.
I made a suggestion. This is a business
item here.
You have the floor, sir.
You may continue with your discussion.
But I do trust that my board members never feel locked in to a corner by anything I say, sir.
MR. BRENTLEY: I appreciate that,
Mr. President.
It is not often a president frames a discussion. You don't do that.
These are taxpayers' dollars.
MR. ISLER: Thank you for your opinion.
Every issue we make here is an important issue on behalf of the children and the taxpayers. I don't need to be reminded of that.
MR. BRENTLEY: Then you should remove your statement.
MR. ISLER: I will not remove my statement.
You may move on.
MR. BRENTLEY: I didn't think you would.
It is misleading.
And to suggest that coming from the president, that these items are not related in which they are, we are voting.
We are moving moneys.
And they are related.

It is unfortunate you would not share that and be honest with the public.

MR. ISLER: Do you want to make a motion, sir, on something? Please go ahead.

Mrs. Fink.

MS. FINK: I just wanted to make the comment that what we are looking at here, I think is a preferable way to do things.

I really, as much as I love historic Pittsburgh and historic buildings, I really think we are doing the children a disservice to leave them in the Schenley building for another year.

And by moving the children -- moving the student body intact to Reizenstein, I think solves two problems.

It gives these young people an opportunity to finish the programs that they have become accustomed to.

And it also does it safely for them.

Because whether there are students or adults in the building, what I have seen of the presentations by the facility issue here, it is way beyond asbestos.

It deals with ventilation.
And I don't think in good conscience, we can allow adults or students to stay in that building for another year. So this seems to certainly resolve the immediate problems that we are looking at. I applaud the superintendent for presenting this.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mrs. Fink.

MR. SUMPTER: Thank you, Mr. Isler.

With regard to the resolutions that are before us, the concern I have is regarding the start dated for all of these architects. What assurances do we have that work is -- when work is going to commence, are we going to have a chance of voting on that or controlling that? And to me it would be more appropriate if we could hold off on that, at least until the next legislative meeting, which is in December, I believe December 19th, to authorize this action. Would that create any undue consequences to that action?

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Sumpter.

Mr. Fellers.

MR. FELLERS: Yes, Mr. Sumpter.
The outline that we shared with the board at the business and finance committee meeting in terms of how we propose to fast track these projects did require that the architects come on board early and start their work.

What we have done is given you a slimmed down contract that we would come back and ask for further authority down the road.

But allow us at least latitude to begin the plan so we have a reasonable timeline to get the projects designed, bid and delivered for the '08-'09 school year.

We are very, very tight on this schedule. And yes, one month would make a difference in terms of our ability to guarantee completion and the schools being ready for the '08-'09 school year.

MR. ISLER: You have the floor,

MR. SUMPTER: Thank you, Mr. Fellers. That implies work could commence as of November 15th without fully voting on the exact plan we are going to accept.

Why would you have architects work on an action that may be reversed at some later point in time?
MR. FELLERS: There is an awful lot of fact gathering and preliminary work that that team would have to do before they start actually doing the designing.

A lot of that will be interacting with our team.

And there will be an opportunity to develop that baseline, start moving forward.

But in a way that will allow them to adapt, if there are changes to those facilities.

Remember, we have to do a design for the full project, which will be over in some cases two and some cases a three year period.

But we need to be ready for those things to happen, the need to happen for this coming September of '08.

To not get them moving now, just doesn't allow this to happen. It is work that just needs to happen.

And we need to speculate on this work to assure that the project could be done.

To hold them back, they will not have the work completed for the school year.

So I don't think there is a real choice there, if we want a quality facility for our students
to move in to.

MR. SUMPTER: It just makes me think that if you are saying they can make changes at some later point in time, which would be going back to the drawing board, it would be the same as if they were delayed one month and had the actual plans to work on from that point forward.

It is the concern of not putting the cart before the horse and not being locked in and not being in position of wasting any dollars from this point forward.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Sumpter.

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: There has been some changes made to the original proposal.

I got a little taken aback by that presentation.

As of '08, the move of the Spartan program is not going to go to Milliones now?

MR. ROOSEVELT: That's correct, Mr. Taylor. The one change, it has a few ripples.

But the one real change is that in listening to our students, who after all are our ultimate constituents, it seemed of great importance to them they graduate with each other in their class.
as Schenley students.

And we were able to figure out a way to accommodate that while still moving forward with our academic objectives.

It will mean the IB world school would open one year later in its end form than it would have otherwise.

And it will mean that Milliones will be phased in over time.

There are advantages and disadvantages to that.

I think in the Milliones situation, there is some significant advantages.

And we did speak to our potential partners at University of Pittsburgh about that today.

And they were quite pleased with that.

So it is an adjustment.

It is an adjustment, because we heard something from the students, that we believe deserved to be honored.

MR. TAYLOR: First, I want to thank you for your candor earlier about the public not being and students and parents not being fully informed as to why this decision has been made.

And I really want to try to be as
constructive as I can be here as possible.

The change that you presented were the first that this board and the public has seen.

I appreciate that you are listening and attempting to make a difficult situation as easy as possible.

I think it would be highly irresponsible for this board to go forward tonight with this proposal, simply based on the fact that we don't know what this proposal is.

And I do think, as we go forward, and we continue to listen to people, I do think that there will be other adjustments, that I think can be made and should be made.

I wanted to ask our solicitor as to why these -- I understand the timelines as Mr. Fellers laid out.

But I am concerned as to why these resolutions to hire architects and construction manager must take place this evening as opposed to two weeks from tonight or three weeks from tonight or a month from tonight.

Why must they be voted on this evening?

And if there are deadlines or mandates, why can those deadlines or mandates not be waived, if we
say this is an emergency or health and safety
situation?

MR. WEISS: The need to do this this
evening is driven by the need to have facilities ready
for the '08-'09 school year.

There are two principal issues with that.

First of all is the need to get permanent
approval at the city level.

Second is the need to get departmental
approval as Department of Education from the building
division.

Those things are to some degree out of our
control.

But we will try to deal with them as best
we can.

The schedule that the board was presented
and I have reviewed is very tight, because of the
bidding requirements.

It is clear that the department will not
treat these types of projects as emergencies.

They have a very strict -- the definition
of that, and these projects don't meet that.

So the answer is that the deadline, if you
will, is dictated by the need to have these ready for
the fall.
And every week is important. So facilities staff have indicated they need as much time as they can. And that is why it has been presented the way it has, with essentially a week or two being very important.

MR. TAYLOR: I am saying again, if it was a need to seek waivers for emergencies, particularly with the city, there has to be things you have to go through with the city, it is within their discretion to move this up on their agenda in which to do some things. And also the state.

Would that not be within their discretion to move things up, if it is seen as a health or safety emergency?

MR. WEISS: Well, as far as the city is concerned, the city has its own processes. We are attempting to work with them as best we can. With these projects. The state process is dictated by regulations dealing with Plan Con. They are not subject to waiver. And these projects will not be treated as emergencies.
The state has a very limited definition of that. And these don't meet it. There is consultation with the department. And we have received the response that I expected, which is you have to bid these in the normal fashion.

So again, the time issue is one dictated by the fact that these facilities are needed for the fall of '08.

MR. TAYLOR: Also, Mr. Fellers, I have to ask, there are things we do -- again, this is a very, very important thing we are talking about this evening.

And there are things again, because there are a lot of people who are watching this situation. So there are things that have to be put on the public record.

I do have to ask you this evening. If this is delayed for just two weeks, will it prevent us from being able to successfully, if the board approves the proposals that the superintendent has raised, if this is delayed two weeks, will it prevent us from being able to meet those goals in September of 2008?
MR. FELLERS: I really can't say that, because you are asking me to really look in to a crystal ball.

That is just not something that I will be able to do.

What I can tell you, though, if we wait two weeks, I can't guarantee you that we can complete these projects.

Our only chance to complete these projects is now.

We have shrunk this timeline as tight as we believe it can be shrunk, given the existing constraints that I have outlined earlier and the solicitor just covered in terms of the city and state approval process.

So the answer is if you want us to deliver these projects, they need to go tonight. You can vote later on.

But then there is no guarantee the schools will be ready for the start of the '08-'09 school year.

MR. TAYLOR: I certainly do understand your answer. I think the point needs to be made clear. Because I do very much understand your answer, and how
you answered it is that it could be delayed this
evening, and we could still meet those goals.

But as you said, you can't guarantee us
that those goals will be met by 2008.

I think again the reason why this must be
put on hold this evening, if the board is to do its
duty to the city and to the students and to taxpayers,
is one that we must make people aware.

Mrs. Fink very strongly believes that this
is a safety situation, which means it should be very
easy for us to explain that to the parents and
students.

And they can be on board with this planning
process of what needs to be -- what needs to happen,
what changes that need to be made.

They can be on board with us.

That is the way that it should be.

It should be parents and us all as a city
working through this very difficult situation.

But as you know, there are a lot of people
that have called in to question whether the situation
is as dire and as expensive as it has been stated.

I think it is our responsibility as a board
to very much inform the public and our parents about
this situation.
And again, if we are correct, then they will accept -- because everyone is going to put the safety of their children above everything else. And they will accept, and we can join as partners. That hasn't occurred. I think we should slow down to make sure that that does occur. I think we do have a small window, which we have time to do that. My other concerns about this proposal is the cost of it. I do think -- with changes I am not sure what exactly is the cost. And exactly -- I assume since we are voting, we are continuing on with the same cost that we had. Which is 14, close to 15 million dollars at Reizenstein. And close to 15 million dollars to create the science and technology program at Frick.

MR. DOWD: Point of order. Are we voting --

MR. ISLER: We are not.

MR. TAYLOR: Those are the architects.
They will be drawing up the plans.

MR. DOWD: Point of order, what is the dollar figure on these?

MR. TAYLOR: Those were the dollar figures that were handed out to us at the meeting last. That it would be 15 million dollars for the Schenley moving.

MR. DOWD: Point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Like I said, I assume the changes would cost the same, because we still have the same architects working on the same projects. There is no change in that. So Mrs. Colaizzi is telling me I should ask, is there any changes to the amount that had been proposed that we saw a week or so ago, proposed for Reizenstein and for Frick?

MR. ISLER: Yes.

MR. ROOSEVELT: No, Mr. Taylor. The adjustments made in this would not affect those.

MR. DOWD: Point of order.

I just want to be absolutely clear. So that I am not confused. This evening we are not voting on 14 million dollars worth of expenditures.
I just want to be clear.

This evening we are simply voting, if I did my math correctly, approximately 3.95 million dollars, most of which is not to exceed.

These are not flat expenditures.

These are not to exceed expenditures with the exception I believe of the purchase of the CAPA building.

Is that correct?

I just want to be clear.

MS. COLAIZZI: Yes.

MR. DOWD: So we are not voting this evening on 14 million dollars.

That is not happening.

Is that correct?

MR. ISLER: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: No, Mr. Dowd.

We are not voting on the proposed 15 million at Reizenstein and 15 million at Frick.

Clearly, as we have been told by the administration, that this gets us on the path towards the changes and towards that eventual spending of 30 million dollars that I am referring to.

So I don't think anybody would deny that part.
This starts us on that path. So I think it is legitimate to bring that up. If there are some board members who say, "Look, there can be cheaper alternatives to that 30 million dollars that has been proposed by the administration." I think now is a legitimate time to bring that up. And so I do believe that there are some alternatives to what has been proposed for Reizenstein and for Frick. And I do think we need to take time to encourage the administration to seek alternatives to that. If we assume that everything that has been presented to us is correct and the cost at Schenley is correct, then I do think that we need to work to move Schenley intact, as the superintendent has agreed with this evening. But I think that that can be done, whether it is to an existing high school that is very low on population, i.e., Peabody. And again, I do think there are some other factors that could be cheaper.
I think, again, I want to talk about another subject, as we talked about, the Frick school turning in to science and technology and 15 million dollars being put in to that.

As we talk about the passion people have for Schenley high school, and I certainly do understand that passion, there is certainly a passion we have in the East End for Westinghouse high school. And it is a school that has suffered over the years.

It has suffered from neglect from this school board and from present and previous administrations.

We have had programs like the business and finance programs and others, who have not been supportive.

We had a Homewood Montessori program we wanted to strengthen.

I certainly agreed with that and voted in support of strengthening the Montessori program, now Pittsburgh Montessori.

We hired a consultant to come in to work to strengthen that program.

But where has been the support for a school like Westinghouse, where if we strengthen those
programs, we most likely could have attracted more
students in to them.

Since we have not done that, we are now
stuck in Westinghouse with a very small population.

Though the school district and this board had voted to
put in tens of millions of dollars to rehabilitate
that building and to make it again the nicest high
school facility in the country -- I mean in the city.

So when it comes to doing a science and
technology academy, this board is on the road to
spending 15 million dollars to create space and to
create science and technology laboratories that
already exist at Westinghouse high school.

So I ask the question, why would you spend
15 million dollars to create space, when you can
easily accommodate a science and technology at
Westinghouse high school?

We have already shown we have a strong good
program, i.e., the high school for performing arts
located in the Homewood community for many years.

People will come to it.

Those are the things that I think should be
put on the table.

I also think what should be put on the
table is the concern we talked about in the East End
now for close to two years.

As many board members are familiar with the East End plan, which we have called for the utilization of Reizenstein middle school, former middle school at Reizenstein building for the students of the East End.

But it doesn't seem like that has jumped to the agenda to accommodate those students.

Yes. We know we have 8th graders, who are in buildings that were never designed for students that age.

We know we have 8th graders, who have to have a lunch every day, that is a lunch we give to our first graders, because we do not have the facilities to give them a full and complete lunch.

We know they have very small gymnasiums. That they can't even change clothes with locker rooms that other people have.

There is no swimming facilities for any student in the East End, who is under the age of 14.

We know they have no playgrounds to play in or to run in.

So they stand around at their recess periods, when they go outside, because there is simply no place at Belmar former elementary school and
Cressen elementary school for them to run or play or play ball.

So we knows those are inequities.

We know a school facility does impact on student achievement.

Yet those have not been addressed.

I think those should be in the equation as we talk about these programs and these expenditures.

I do think if this board gave consideration to the students of the East End, which we have not for quite a while, then maybe the proposals on the table may look differently.

That is why I think we should take time to look at those and include a lot of students who have been left out of these current plans.

Particularly students of the East End and also students of the Hill District, I think, have been an afterthought through this whole process.

So I think it is the responsibility of this board to look at cost.

And to tell the superintendent we need to look more comprehensively.

We need to include more students.

We need to be as cost effective as possible.
To vote to allow this to go forward this evening, as I said many times with this board, I believe to be an indication of our responsibilities to all our students and taxpayers of the city. I will be voting no on the proposal this evening.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Sumpter.

MR. SUMPTER: Thank you, Mr. Isler. I think last night is an indication that if we get our community engaged within the school district, that we can at least hold the district accountable and do things that benefit students. The question I have is whether or not those who did testify last night at the hearing was a representative sample of the Schenley student body. I do recall the identification of those students that did testify. I didn't hear from other students in the school. In a sense, they were basically IB students that came out. It was not a large number. But they were there. I applaud the administration for at least
listening and hearing. And perhaps share the concern of those students.

And not talking negatively about the plan, but just that if that is the case, then we need more engagement from our community overall to help us through these tumultuous times of change and reform.

At this time I would like to make a motion that we table this item for on or before the next legislative meeting.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor, please, you don't have the floor.

MR. SUMPTER: The tabling would be of the retention of the architects only.

MR. ISLER: Items 2 through 8, Mr. Sumpter?

MR. SUMPTER: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Second.

MR. ISLER: 2 through 9, I mean.

MR. TAYLOR: Second.

MR. ISLER: A motion on the floor to table items 2 through 9.

Mr. Weiss, roll call, please.

MR. BRENTLEY: Could we have clarification, please?

MR. ISLER: Yes.
MR. BRENTLEY: Mr. Weiss, with this 2 through 9, so the section B, those three items there. This is all connected.

Is that correct?

MR. WEISS: B1 would remain.

The rest of them would --

MR. ISLER: Eight items.

The remaining eight items.

MR. WEISS: The board would still be voting ultimately on B1, which is the CAPA matter.

But the motion to table is items 2 through 9.

MR. BRENTLEY: Okay.

Am I permitted to ask questions?

MS. COLAIZZI: No.

MR. BRENTLEY: I am asking the solicitor.

MR. WEISS: No debate on the motion to table.

So either table it and no more discussion, or you don't table it and discuss it.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Brentley.

MR. WEISS: No.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Colaizzi?

MS. COLAIZZI: No.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Dowd.
MR. DOWD: No.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Fink.

MS. FINK: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. McCrea.

MR. McCREA: No.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Romaniello.

MR. ROMANIELLO: No.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Sumpter.

MR. SUMPTER: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes vote is to table?

MR. WEISS: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: No.

MR. WEISS: Motion to table is defeated three to six.

MR. ISLER: Any other questions?

Mr. Romaniello.

MR. ROMANIELLO: Thank you, Mr. President.

A couple of things I would like to -- first of all, I would like to commend the superintendent and the administration for the new plan.

I guess you listened.

And for whatever reasons.
But if somebody would show up on our doorstep with 64 million dollars plus and hand it to you, there still would be two or three years that Schenley would not be open.

Am I correct?

MR. ROOSEVELT: I think the estimates we have run between two and three years it would cost from the beginning of the process to the end.

And that is with those students out of the building. Were such a good natured wealthy person to appear.

MR. ROMANIELLO: Bill Gates.

I think we need to move forward on this for a couple of reasons.

And one is as I stated before, I know this is not an easy thing.

I know it is heart wrenching.

I am sure this is no more heart wrenching than it was when we closed Fifth Avenue, South high school, a few of my colleagues went there. We closed South high school.

It is never easy.

And we have closed other schools.

But there comes a time when you have to think with your head and not your heart.
Because we don't have the money to do the things that people would love us to do. We would love to keep a building open. But nobody is coming up with an idea of where we will get the money. And that is one of the biggest problems. You just can't fluff -- you can't fluff that part over. We don't have the money to fix the building in the safe manner. As I stated before, if something would happen, there would be some catastrophe, something would happen in the building. There would be a roof leak. Somebody would do something in the building. They would punch a hole in the wall. Things like that. We don't know what kind of problems that could lead to. And what kind of serious danger it could put our students in. Yes, right now for the rest of the school year supposedly it is safe. But if something happens to change that, we
can't keep living on that.

The other thing I would like to ask, if anybody wants to do it, because God knows I could use the exercise.

I would be willing to walk to ten homes in each of my colleagues' districts, knock on their doors and ask them, "Would you be willing for your taxes to go up in order to pay for the repair of Schenley high school?"

We can't tax any more.

We can't keep going to the taxpayers. We are at the end of the financial rope.

So while it is going to be a heart wrenching thing, and I think actually, the new plan that the superintendent has put out actually helps with a lot of that, where the students would be able to graduate as a class.

That takes care of some of that part of the heart wrenching part of it.

But again, this is a district.

It is not just one neighborhood.

And the people of this district are taxed to the limit.

They don't want us in their pockets any more.
So we really don't have a choice. We must move forward on this. We must do what is fiscally prudent. And what is safe for the students. It will hurt. But you just have to go on with it. Thank you.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Romaniello. Mr. Brentley.

MR. BRENTLEY: Yes.

I just wanted to just ask a question on No. B1. The 1.4 million dollars for the two floors, three floors of the building for Rogers CAPA. That is the total figure?

MR. WEISS: No. B1 calls for 1.4 million dollars for floors 1 and 2. 600,000 dollars for floor 9. And 200,000 dollars for eight parking spaces. So the total is 2.2 million.

MR. BRENTLEY: How do we come to those numbers? Or how did we determine it is time to buy?
MR. WEISS: If I may, the owner of floors 1 and 2 had an offer to purchase them.

Under our documents in this transaction, we have what is called a right of first refusal, which means he gets an offer to purchase.

We have the right to buy it on those terms.

The 9th floor is approximately two-thirds of the appraised value we received a couple of years ago.

This floor is appraised at about a million dollars.

And the parking spaces are what the value was, when the building was built.

So we are confident that this is a sensible transaction from the point of view of value.

And that is why we are recommending it.

MR. BRENTLEY: Thank you, very much.

Mark, I wanted to ask a couple questions to you concerning the changes in the Hill District.

Have you taken in to consideration just in the Hill District alone some of the things that have happened or that have been caused by this board, the closing of the Miller school, closing of the Milliones school.

Then reopening of Milliones school.
Then there will be the Milliones Rogers school. Now it is going to be this university program.

Have you given any consideration to the importance of stability in this particular community?

Yes. It is an African-American community. Yes. It is a community we are supposed to be working hard to target in terms of closing the racial achievement gap.

Have you given any consideration as to how and why we seem to target most of our changes in or near the African-American communities?

MR. ROOSEVELT: Mr. Brentley, we obviously do not believe that these changes are not in the interest of these students.

We believe what we are bringing to the Milliones building is an extremely exciting program. We also believe it was important to maintain a high school presence in the Hill. And this does that with the loss of Schenley, if that is indeed how it goes, the Milliones building will represent the high school presence on the Hill. We believe maintaining that was very important.

We are also very cognizant, we think the
central piece of work, as we have expressed previously in this particular series, is the Milliones project.

That is why we have taken one of our truly wonderful potential partnerships, that with University of Pittsburgh, and placed it in that building.

And we think it will offer a really terrific opportunity.

We hope it will become a school choice. So it will not just attract Hill District residents to it but other residents, other folks from other parts of the district.

MR. BRENTLEY: In this case, Mark, the concern is experimental.

We have no track record.

We know nothing about its success.

And once again, it places that community in a situation where they know not their future.

Also, the importance of the Rogers going in to Milliones in the beginning was to at least bring a magnet school to that community.

Now there is no magnet school in that community.

MR. ROOSEVELT: This will be a magnet school in a sense.

It will be a choice school.
And again, I think it is really misleading to characterize it as an experiment. This is a wonderful opportunity. The University of Pittsburgh has had a partnership with Falk school, which I believe is a private school, for a very long time.

This represents a potential, because again it is not signed, sealed and delivered. But the potential for our students to reap the benefits of a partnership with University of Pittsburgh, which we will indeed endeavor for them to do.

But again, we take this partnership extremely seriously. We take the school extremely seriously.

We look at it as one of the potential bright lights in the whole plan.

MR. BRENTLEY: The change you just shared with us, where now the Schenley Spartans will move with the IB program to Reizenstein. That change has happened in the last 24 hours?

MR. ROOSEVELT: Yes, sir. Again, you are not voting on that tonight.

But what we did, it was an attempt to allow
the folks who are now at Schenley to graduate as
Schenley students with their classmates.

MR. BRENTLEY: Well, once again, I am still
confused as to how we can just make these changes.
Mark, I shared with you my concerns.
I am still getting calls about the right
sizing plan.
In my opinion, what we continue to see is
crisis, crisis.

Got to do it.
Got to move fast.
Fast.
Fast.

Well, we were told that two years ago with
the right sizing plan.
We now know a year and a half, two years
later, that in that right sizing plan, we closed four
successful African-American schools.
Those students' scores were here.
We forced hundreds of kids to go back and
to start over again.
And that is unfair.
That is what happens, when we move too fast
without getting everyone to buy in.
It is just amazing to me.
Because we can sit here, and we can get the presentations.

Questions are asked. But it is still amazing. These are taxpayers' dollars. And still to date we have not had any one organization to come here and to critically analyze its impact.

And so it is amazing this administration continues to get a complete pass.

We will hear a year later that "Oops, we shouldn't have made that change. We found out more students have dropped out. It is not working. It is not working."

And I am sure the votes have already been lined up.

I tell you, in my opinion, this is borderline -- this is borderline child abuse.

No one should have to adjust to the way that we are putting out this program here today.

In the Hill District, some of these kids, this will represent two, maybe three changes in two years.

It makes no sense.

MR. ISLER: Thank you, Mr. Brentley.
Mrs. Colaizzi.

MS. COLAIZZI: Thank you, Mr. President.

I do have a few comments after last night's public hearing.

And I was a little disturbed as I sat there.

And I heard some of the things that were said to us.

And I got a little bit upset.

Mr. Roosevelt, could you indulge me for a moment?

And tell me for the record, when exactly was the high school reform committee put together?

A date is basically what I am looking for.

MR. ROOSEVELT: You are stretching my limit.

I would say July of a year and a half ago.

July therefore of 2006, I believe.

MS. COLAIZZI: Thank you.

Really, what I was trying to get at is that we have been working on it for a while.

And we have been working on it.

And the point I was trying to make was there has been a time period that this has been going on.
And there has been input. There has been a lot of people that have been involved. And I wanted to put that on the record. This has been an ongoing process with a great deal of input with many people. From many walks of life. And just because maybe one or two people with ideas that did not make it to this stage, does not mean that they have not been taken seriously with their considerations.

Schenley has been an issue for two years. It has been a dilemma for this school board. It has been a great tax issue. It is something that this government entity has had at least tried to deal with in different ways. We had put a committee together to deal with it. And it didn't come up with very much. We have been called liars. We have been called liars in the past. South Vo Tech is the perfect example of that. And here we are still sitting with south Vo Tech.
And it is not selling. It is not going anywhere. The building isn't worth very much. Here we are sitting on it.

I am sorry, Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: Mrs. Colaizzi, the only thing I am trying to get across.

There are two board members that have to leave.

One has to get to work. They would like to be part of the vote.

Mr. Weiss, roll call vote, please.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Brentley.

MR. BRENTLEY: No.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Colaizzi.

MS. COLAIZZI: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Dowd.

MR. DOWD: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Fink.

MS. FINK: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. McCrea.

MR. McCREA: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Romaniello.

MR. ROMANIELLO: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Sumpter.

MR. SUMPTER: Yes on item B1.
No on items B2 through 9.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Motion carries.

MR. ISLER: Mrs. Colaizzi, continue, please.

Mr. Dowd, do you have anything to say?

MR. DOWD: No.

MS. COLAIZZI: You allowed those two to talk more than us.

MR. ISLER: I apologize, Mrs. Colaizzi.

MR. DOWD: I have a hard time restraining myself here.

I do think that -- I have a lot of things to say, actually.

And I think that -- I am sorry?

MR. ISLER: I was reminded we have one more vote.

Go ahead, please.

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: This is a sad moment for the Pittsburgh Board of Education we are witnessing right here.
It is disorganized.
We have passed something.
If I did not ask the question about where is the 30 million dollars, this board would have passed a resolution with no idea whether there is a change in cost.
Whether it went up or down.
MR. DOWD: Mr. Taylor, it is a resolution passed.
MR. TAYLOR: This is a sad moment.
MR. DOWD: Point of order. Is there a motion on the floor? Is there a motion on the floor? MR. TAYLOR: He recognized you to speak. MR. DOWD: What is the motion we are discussing?
MR. TAYLOR: He recognized you to speak. As I said, it is a sad moment. MR. DOWD: Which motion are we discussing as a board?
MR. TAYLOR: Make it a circus.
MR. DOWD: Are we talking about transfer of funds piece?
Point of order.
MR. TAYLOR: This is a sad moment.
To close this school when the superintendent admitted the public and students have not been informed is what we are doing.

It is the school board --

MR. DOWD: Take control of the meeting, Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: I don't blame the superintendent, this board --

MR. DOWD: Point of order.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor --

MR. TAYLOR: Anything he wants to do without questioning and oversight, and to go ahead and pass this resolution, when he presented new items, that you had never seen before, and you voted for it sight unseen.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: This board ought to be ashamed.

You are abdicating your responsibilities.

MR. DOWD: Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: This school board is a rubber
Now you are cutting off the microphone.

MR. DOWD: Which motion is on the floor?

Point of order.

MR. ISLER: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: You recognized me.

You absolutely did.

MR. DOWD: Point of order.

MR. ISLER: I thought you had a comment about the resolution we are about to talk about.

MR. DOWD: Which resolution?

MR. TAYLOR: I can't read your mind.

You recognized me as you recognized Mr. Dowd.

And he recognized me.

I disagreed with it.

I am criticizing the board on which you are president of.

Instead of discussing it. It is shameful.

You would never have allowed any other superintendent, I won't mention John Thompson.

You would not allow any other superintendent to sit here and to allow something like this --

MR. ISLER: You cannot prejudge people.
MR. TAYLOR: -- to be put on the table at a legislative meeting.

As I mentioned to you, we don't put new items on the table.

I mean a presentation.

MR. ISLER: You are out of line.

MR. TAYLOR: We have never seen this before.

And the board voted on it sight unseen.

Didn't know the cost.

MR. ISLER: We did not -- Mr. Taylor.

Your fellow board members -- Mr. Taylor.

Your fellow board members would like to continue the meeting.

We did not vote on anything --

MR. TAYLOR: That is not the point.

You should have known before we even went down any road with high school reform.

Shameful moment, Mr. Isler.

You ought to be ashamed most of all,

Mr. President.

MR. BRENTLEY: I second that motion.

MR. ISLER: Maybe you want to vote on it.

MR. BRENTLEY: It is disgraceful.

MR. DOWD: Which motion is on the floor?
MR. ISLER: Now voting on transfer of funds for the general fund.

Any questions?

Mr. Weiss, roll call vote.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Brentley.

MR. BRENTLEY: No.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Colaizzi.

MS. COLAIZZI: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Dowd.

MR. DOWD: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mrs. Fink.

MS. FINK: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. McCrea.

(No response.)

MR. ISLER: He is gone.

MR. WEISS: I didn't see that.

Sorry.

Mr. Romaniello.

MR. ROMANIELLO: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Sumpter.

MR. SUMPTER: Yes.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Isler.

MR. ISLER: Yes.
MR. WEISS: Motion carries.

MR. DOWD: Motion to adjourn.

MS. COLAIZZI: Second.

MR. ISLER: Meeting adjourned.

I apologize to the public for the outburst of the board members.

---

(Thereupon, at 7:25 p.m., the Special Legislative Meeting was concluded.)
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