



# School/City Liaison Committee Summary Minutes

\*\*\*FINAL\*\*\*



## School/City Liaison Committee Meeting Wednesday, November 28, 2007

8:15 AM to 9:30 AM  
Palo Alto Unified School District Office  
Conference Room A  
25 Churchill Avenue  
Palo Alto

In Attendance:

### City of Palo Alto

Bern Beecham, City of Palo Alto, Council Member  
Larry Klein, City of Palo Alto, Council Member  
Emily Harrison, City of Palo Alto  
Steve Emslie, City of Palo Alto

### Palo Alto Unified School District

Barb Mitchell, Board Member  
Mandy Lowell, Board Member  
Robert Golton, Chief Business Officer  
Cathy Mak, Chief Business Officer  
Pete Pearne, Palo Alto Unified School District

Handouts: All handouts can be viewed at 25 Churchill Ave.

Meeting convened at 8:15 a.m.

1. Oral Communications: None

**2. Approval of Minutes from October 24, 2007**

Ms. Mitchell moved to approve. Mr. Klein seconded. Minutes approved 2-0.

**3. Update on ABAG:**

Mr. Emslie said they have not received a response from ABAG on their appeal, but they have received a verbal staff response which has enabled them to prepare a draft letter which will go to the planning commission tonight and to City Council on December 10<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Emslie said they will build the case that the numbers are misstated and the growth projections of 26% over the planning period of 7 years far outstrips the growth we have experienced in the past which has been between 11% and 8% growth. The population projections are too high and haven't taken into consideration the land constraints.

Mr. Emslie said Mr. Golton and he have discussed putting together a letter for ABAG sometime early next year from the District in which they would also object to the numbers. Next year they will start the public process of the appeal. There will be hearings most likely in January with the ABAG Board in Oakland.

Mr. Golton asked what is the group's take on the District drafting a separate letter or is it possible for it to be a combination. Mr. Klein said they would prefer a separate letter from the District.

Ms. Lowell said she is in favor of a separate letter from the District because if the City raised 10 objections not all of them would get the same focus as one objection from the District would. Ms. Lowell said she would welcome any input from the City to the District on how best to write it and who should be signing it.

Mr. Beecham said he would recommend the District include the effect new housing would have on a basic aid district.

Ms. Lowell asked if they talked to neighboring cities that might have the same objections as the City's. Mr. Emslie said yes, there is a group that meets monthly and they share these issues.

Mr. Golton asked how the City of Menlo Park handles the numbers. Mr. Emslie said that Menlo Park is different because they are in San Mateo County and the County has decided to allocate the numbers within their region. They get a number from ABAG and the numbers are shared and shuffled around among them.

Mr. Golton asked how we do it. Mr. Emslie said Santa Clara County does it city by city. 99% of cities get their allocation from their local council government.

Mr. Beecham said in terms of what to include on the District letter to ABAG, he thinks the District should argue that the methodology is incorrect. The District needs to become familiar with the methodology because it would have to include reasons. Mr. Klein said he agreed with Mr. Beecham that where the District could most add value is focusing on the impact it will have on a basic aid district and also a district that is running out of land.

Mr. Emslie said one more thing that could be made clear in the District's letter is the fact that when new houses come to the City, there are impact fees that we can impose upon developers in terms of schools.

Ms. Mitchell said it sounds like there is strong consensus for the District to draft a separate letter. The suggestions include as Mr. Klein pointed out, sort of the mental image of the effect. Also, as we focus on the school impacts as a basic school district, we would touch on some of the areas that are not covered in the City's draft.

Ms. Mitchell asked, from a technical stand point, what is our deadline? Mr. Emslie said from what he has been hearing, the District has 5-6 months.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the District should aim for the same appeal deadline as the City. Mr. Emslie said yes, the City will share the date, it has not been set yet, but there is an ABAG public hearing in January.

#### **4. New Housing:**

Mr. Emslie said there are two projects that are in sales that are actually being occupied. One is Arbor Real (Horton project @ former Hyatt Ricky's) & the second one is the Warmington homes project down at East Meadow. Mr. Emslie said there are two projects side by side; each one of them is 75 units. The second project isn't far enough along where it is in sales and so we don't have any profiled data. Mr. Emslie said of the 181 houses at Arbor Real 170 of which are single family homes. Mr. Emslie said the buyer profile indicated that 85% of the buyers had children that would be attending Palo Alto Schools. Mr. Emslie said there is about one child per household at the middle school level and the reason they are coming is to go to Gunn.

Mr. Emslie said the overall estimate of the 156 homes has the potential of 200 students to be added. There is one other project next to Warmington that is now being built by Summerhill Homes and when that comes on, we will have similar outreach. There is also the Sandhill project that is still one year away from having buyers.

Ms. Mitchell asked if there is a means that you could help secure for us a written count of that data? Mr. Emslie said that, they are a little reluctant but we can coerce them to provide us with the information.

Ms. Lowell said there is a written letter that says the primary factor that our home buyers have used is to attend PAUSD schools can be placed as an attachment.

Ms. Lowell said Lapkoff and Gobalet does not count a 4 yr old living in Palo Alto as a yield because they are not in our school until kindergarten.

Mr. Klein said the City could place a requirement on the developers that they collect certain data. (i.e. ask each of their buyers, who is going to live here, 4 yr. old, 8 yr. old?)

Ms. Lowell said work location could be included. Mr. Emslie said we can certainly do that.

## 5. PAUSD Enrollment Forecast from Lapkoff and Gobalet:

Mr. Golton passed out the Lapkoff & Gobalet enrollment report that was presented to the Board on November 13, 2007, report dated November 8, 2007. Mr. Golton said we have an enrollment for 2007-08, of 4974 K-5 students. Lapkoff & Gobalet have done a low, medium, and high projection going out to the 2012-2013 school year. We essentially ignore the low projections. Mr. Golton said we budget between the medium and high projections. If our enrollment goes up to the medium projection, we can accommodate that with the Garland site. Mr. Golton said another site available is the Greendell site. The full use of Greendell will be returned to the District in 2010. We have already given notice to our Garland tenants and that location will be available in 2010. The next site after that is the Fremont Hills site. The only issue is it is in Los Altos Hills. The next site from that is the Cubberly site which will become available in 2014. As far as our Middle schools are concerned, we are building into our bond the potential of adding 200 students to our two middle schools. That would take our middle schools Jordan and JLS 1100 each; Terman will remain at 700 total 2900 this is high projection. Mr. Golton said as it relates to the High schools the medium projection is growth of 400 and high projection is 4299 we are building into our bond the ability of increasing our capacity and we have the ability to accommodate these projections five years out. The Lapkoff and Gobalet report does not reflect additional developments.

Ms. Lowell asked Mr. Golton when you say we can accommodate these projections; you are saying we can conceive of ways of doing it? He replied, not without budget constraints. Mr. Golton said taking back Garland would cost the District several million dollars a year. Ms. Lowell said it would also include going second story at some of our schools.

Ms. Lowell said the area surrounding the Ventura site (Fry's Electronics), the City has zoned it for housing and plans to build the type of housing that families could live in.

Ms. Lowell asked will the developer provide land for school districts. Mr. Emslie said we cannot, but it could be done on a voluntary basis.

Ms. Lowell asked when Fry's is slated to turn over the land for housing. The Fry's lease goes until 2014 and developer's expectations are that Fry's would stay the full term of their lease. They have essentially over time become more accustomed to the turnover of that for housing and the City Council recently told them no, we want staff to explore strategies for retaining the commercial base there. We are now doing some economic studies that look at the different scenarios that have that being retained as commercial and the possibility on housing and its use concept. Ms. Emslie said they are working with them on that now. The City is five years away from making a serious proposal.

Ms. Lowell asked how many of the 19 acres does the City anticipate to be housing? Mr. Emslie said given the current trends, the most likely scenario is that we can retain as much of the commercial on the ground floor.

Mr. Golton said the Ventura is on the Districts radar. The District has the ability to purchase it back at about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the market value price.

Ms. Mitchell said there will be no meeting in December, and we will be passing the baton back to the City beginning in January. Ms. Mitchell said there may be some interest on the ABAG timeline and there will be a District letter draft at least, more information on the hearings and the state of the City's draft.

**6. Future Meetings and Agenda Items:**

Sustainability

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 a.m.