35 acres.
The last large piece of publicly owned land in Palo Alto.
What will its future be?
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CCAC Minutes
**Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)**

**Action Notes**

**Meeting # 1**

June 13, 2012
Room G-4
(See attached map-G referred to as GAR)
6:00 PM

1. **Welcome**

2. **Self-introductions (1-2 minutes each)**

3. **Cubberley History and Background**
   - Steve Emslie of the City of Palo Alto gave a background information presentation on Cubberley including its history and past and present financial information
   - Emslie noted that a wide variety of groups currently occupy the facility including educational, cultural, early-childhood, artistic, health & wellness, and non-profit groups
   - Emslie noted the City of Palo Alto pays approximately $7.3M per year to PAUSD in both rent and for their Covenant Not to Develop. The City in turn receives approximately $2.5M per year in rental income from the various groups that occupy the facility. Expenses to operate the facility for the City total approximately $2.2M per year.
   - The Utility User’s Tax which was passed to aid schools in 1987 after several school sites had been closed and sold, currently brings about $10 million to the City.
   - Bob Golton of the PAUSD described PAUSD’s increasing enrollment and how the school population has grown 2% for nearly every year in the past 20 years

4. **Overview of Mission and Guiding Principles**
   - Emslie explained the background on how the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC) was formed and its relationship to the Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee (CPAC), a five member panel made-up of Palo Alto School Board and City Council members.
   - Emslie told the CCAC members that they were to operate under the constraints outlined in the Cubberley Guiding Principles document, drafted by the CPAC, but that the document leaves them a high degree of latitude
   - Golton thanked everyone for participating and said the two priorities for PAUSD are (1) the continuation of the revenue stream from the Lease and Covenant; and (2) the provision for sites to accommodate the increasing PAUSD enrollment
5. **Staff support**
   - Emslie introduced the staff who would be working on the project and let the group know they are a resource for assisting them in their decision making
   - Emslie also noted that with such a large group staff would first focus on responding to requests of the majority of the group before responding to individual requests

6. **Discussion of Meeting Logistics**
   - Co-Chairs and Emslie facilitated a discussion of questions, requests, and thoughts that the group had on meeting logistics/next steps
   - **CCAC Questions/Requests:**
     - Meetings should focus more on Q & A than staff presentations, thus, meeting packets should be out up to a week in advance so members can prepare on their own time (CMO)
     - Provide information on PAUSD enrolment projections and what schools will be needed in the future (PAUSD)
     - Provide “who, what, where, when, why, how” information on the different groups that use Cubberley (CSD)
     - Provide “who, what, where, when, why, how” information on all PAUSD shared facilities (PAUSD/CSD)
     - Provide walking tours of Cubberley (and other relevant sites) for CCAC members who would like to better orient themselves with the facility (CMO)
     - Provide a high-level presentation on City and PAUSD issues and questions regarding a lease extension (i.e. Why is the lease not being renewed without question) (CMO)
     - Provide information on other facilities in Palo Alto that provide similar services to Cubberley? (PAUSD/City)
     - Provide information on who the hourly renters of Cubberley are (CSD)
     - Provide hard copies of the Cubberley scenario maps (CMO)
     - Provide copies of the Cubberley Guiding Principles document (CMO)
     - Provide as much information as possible on the website regarding other similar community centers (CMO)
     - Provide information and/or a presentation on extraordinary information such as what the adjoining properties are, seismic requirements, etc. (PAUSD)
     - Provide information on the City/PAUSD field use agreement (currently for the middle school sites) (CSD/PAUSD)
     - Provide information on deferred maintenance needs at Cubberley from the City’s Public Works department (PW)

7. **Adjournment**
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 2

June 20, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
6:00 - 8:00 PM

1. **Welcome and Call to Order**

2. **Overview of high-level Cubberley issues, questions, and concerns**
   - An open-floor, Q & A session occurred around things that were still unclear to CCAC members.
   - Jim Schmidt, who was on the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC), conveyed to the CCAC that the IBRC recommended not to renew the lease.
   - Ann Dunkin, the Chief Technology Officer for the PAUSD, told the CCAC that an elementary school and a middle school will be needed in 8 years.
   - A number of questions were then asked...
   - Question: Can the City create pin maps of population 10 years out?
   - Question: What would joint use of the facility look like and what would the parameters be?
   - Question: What horizon is the CCAC evaluating needs for? 10 years, 20 years, 30 years?
   - Question: What are the uses, needs, and potential revenue opportunities at Cubberley?
   - Question: Does the Palo Alto City Council want to renew the lease?
   - Question for PAUSD: What long term proposals can be taken off of the table?
   - Question for CPAC: What is the timeframe for Cubberley recommendations?
   - Question for CPAC: What did the CPAC mean by “the site?” Is that the Cubberley lease area only? Does that include Greendell and 525 San Antonio Road?
   - Question for CPAC: Should the CCAC consider Cubberley in the context of the whole City or confine recommendations to the PAUSD lease and City owned areas only?
   - Question for CPAC: Is the CCAC planning for Cubberley to eventually be returned to school only uses or should on-going joint community/school use be considered?
• Question for CPAC: Should Cubberley be used by the City in a way that the PAUSD can take it back later?

3. Discussion of possible Subcommittee structure
- CCAC members had an open floor discussion on subcommittees including recommendations, opinions, and a vote on which grouping of subcommittees they preferred.
- Winning grouping
  - School District Needs
  - Community Needs
  - Finance
  - Facilities
- Losing grouping 1
  - Programs
  - Population Growth
  - Finance & Tradeoffs
  - Facilities
- Losing grouping 2
  - What We Want
  - What We Have
- The CCAC then agreed that all members should submit via email his or her preferences ranked one through four to Richard Hackmann by 3:00pm on Friday, June 22 for tabulation

4. Oral Communications
- None

5. Adjournment
1. **Welcome and call to order**

2. **Oral communications**
   - None

3. **Approval of June 13 and June 20 meeting action notes**
   - Approved

4. **Continuation of the overview of high-level Cubberley issues, questions, and concerns including draft questions for the Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee (see the attached revised list of CCAC high-level issues, questions, and concerns, pages 3-5)**
   - 1A – PAUSD can do them at a cost for the city on a 10 year horizon
   - 1B – PAUSD said the board will be meeting on this in the fall
     - Bern Beecham said to find out what the schools do not need not just when they will need certain things
     - Questions were asked about wanting detailed information on what the straight line projections show for when a new elementary, middle, and high school will be needed
     - What is the relationship between the growth of the schools and the growth of the city?
   - 2A – Facilities subcommittee should handle this
   - 2B - Staff should distribute Appendix H and the Executive Summary of the IBRC Final Report
   - 3A – Rob De Geus said to reference the sheet distributed last week on all of the different services that are offered at Cubberley
     - There are limited facilities elsewhere for where all of the functions at Cubberley could go
     - Could be creative and relocate stuff elsewhere but to think that we could relocate even half of what is here it would be tough
     - Susan Bailey asked what percentage of users are residents versus non-residents of the different uses at Cubberley
What would happen if this facility were no longer here? What would be lost, what would move, what don’t we know?
- Look at what hours of the day Cubberley facilities are used
- Beecham said look not only at the uses but also at the square footage and what might be able to be doubled up
- Pam Radin asked if there is a model of a facility like this elsewhere that can be studied

3B – Policy driven question for the PCAC
3C – Yes but there is still a need
3D – There has been progress but it’s hard to say what the true demand is because the demand is so high it cannot be fully accommodated
- Is the use and saturation point during afternoon and weekend hours, during the day, or at all times?
- What are the times when the fields are needed most?
- Currently kids have priority over adults and residents have priority over non-residents
- Efficiencies are being done where they can be such as the El Camino park renovation
- Get figures on resident versus non-resident percentages of use

3E – Gyms and dance studios are unique uses that come to mind
4A – This should be discussed in the School Needs and Community Needs subcommittees
- Steve Emslie said there are a wide variety of projections and implications with the ABAG numbers but those should be discussed in more detail

4B – Even without housing growth there is a household size growth which impacts schools
- City is seeing more people without necessarily housing growth

5A – Schools have an approximately $160M budget and taking away the $7M per year would have serious impacts (the loss of about 85 teachers)
5B – Utility users tax discussion including the implications of no longer paying the PAUSD payment
- Would stopping the PAUSD payment eliminate the tax?
- What are the odds it would be subject to a referendum if the PAUSD payment is stopped?

5C – What is the market value of the space at Cubberley if it were opened to the free market?
- Where would one have to go if he or she couldn’t get the rates he or she is currently getting at Cubberley? East Bay, San Jose, nowhere, etc.

6 – Question for the CPAC
7A – This will be addressed in future conversations
7b – TBD based on future decisions
7C – Theoretically possible but we would need to look into this much further
- Are there state policies we should be aware of?
Look at the Menlo Atherton theatre and what the shared nature of that facility has meant for other organizations

- 7D – Addressed by subcommittee
- 7E – Addressed by subcommittee
- 8A - Question for CPAC
- 8B – General policy question

5. Appointment of subcommittees and discussion of subcommittee process
   - Subcommittee assignments were distributed (see attached list, page 5)

6. Schedule next meeting
   - Doodle to be sent out

7. Adjournment

---

Cubberley Community Advisory Commission (CCAC)

Revised
High Level Issues and Questions

1. School Enrollment:
   A. What are PAUSD's projections for school facility needs short medium and long term (including and understanding of uncertainty and variability of assumptions)?

   B. What are the timeframes for an elementary, middle, and high school?

2. Capital Improvements and Finances:
   A. What capital expenses are required for Cubberley to remain status quo?

   B. What are the City's long term financial obligations for City-wide infrastructure maintenance?

3. Community Serving Uses:
   A. What are the community-serving uses unique to Cubberley? From child care to the arts, what are the alternatives (or not) for relocating and/or prioritizing those services if they aren't part of the Cubberley future?

   B. Should the CCAC assume joint City/PAUSD uses for the long-term?

   C. Are there programs and uses that are duplicated elsewhere in the City?
D. What are the playing fields needs and uses?

E. What are the facilities unique to Cubberley (example, the gym) and the future of the services related to those facilities if displaced from Cubberley?

4. **Population and Housing Growth:**
   A. What are the City’s population and housing growth based on ABAG housing mandates? Are there adequate Community facilities to accommodate projected

   B. How will the demographic profile of Palo Alto change? Will there be a change in community services provided?

5. **PAUSD Finances:**
   A. What would the impact of reducing City lease and covenant payments be to School programs and services?

   B. How can the City and PAUSD collaborate to ensure school finances are stable and the City can catch up with its infrastructure obligations?

   C. What is the market value of the subleases and what is the revenue potential?

6. **City Ownership and adjacent PAUSD properties:** What role if any would the City’s 8 acres and PAUSD’s Greendale and 525 San Antonio Sites have in resolving long term school and community service needs?

7. **Re-Use of Cubberley:**
   A. What could a potential re-use or re-construction of the Cubberley campus offer in the way of additional community center and school facilities?

   B. How could construction be phased to minimize disruption to schools or community services?

   C. Would it be possible to share school facilities when not in use by PAUSD?

   D. How will visual or other construction impacts be made compatible with the adjoining neighborhoods?

   E. How will site access from vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians be facilitated to reduce traffic and traffic related impacts on the surrounding community?
8. **General Policy**

A. Does the City want to renew the Cubberley lease with PAUSD?

B. What should the future of Cubberley be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subcommittee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cobb</td>
<td>CCAC Co-Chair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Lowell</td>
<td>CCAC Co-Chair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Reklis</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crystal</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Furman</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Samoff</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Vician</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Wilcox</td>
<td>Community Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Thom</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry August</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carilli</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Cono</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Ellson</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hetterly</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Schmidt</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanie Wheeler</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Allen</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bailey</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bein</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa Bouchard</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wilson</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern Beecham</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Kimmer</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Markevitch</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Radin</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Stevens</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Tanaka</td>
<td>School Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 4

July 11, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
6:00 - 8:00 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   a. None

3. Approval of June 27 meeting action notes
   a. Approved

4. Presentation by Cubberley site plan architects
   a. No formal study of the site has been done
      i. The study that was done was theoretical and was not based on formal policy direction
   b. The previously generated Cubberley site plans looked at capacity issues and what could fit on the site, again, it was a theoretical study
   c. Perceived needs were determined by talking to a limited group of individuals, it was not an all-encompassing evaluation as the current process is
   d. There are many things at Cubberley that still need to be evaluated further which is why the CPAC and CCAC were formed
   e. The main objective in the architects original exercise was to see how many square feet of space they could put on the lot while still having all of the necessary parking and open space needed for the schools and community facilities
   f. City/school joint use of facilities is the current trend around the country
   g. By having facilities for both city and school uses located on a single site you gain benefits for each of them that you would not have otherwise
   h. Middle school and high schools have different athletic field uses but the field dimensions do not change so the same land area is necessary regardless of whether a middle school or high school is built
i. There are a lot of problems with moving the elementary school based on the flow of children to the site and the necessary circulation to get to an elementary school
j. Question: Are shared facilities considered a security threat by PAUSD?
k. The different site plan options generated by the architects looked at scenarios that ranged from few shared facilities to many shared facilities and what the impacts of that are in terms of site planning

5. **Brief subcommittee status reports**
   a. The School Needs subcommittee had questions for the PAUSD demographer
   b. Request: Put subcommittee meetings on the website
   c. Request: Put a note on the website that if someone plans on attending a subcommittee meeting and is not a part of that subcommittee that he or she should call the subcommittee chair and let him or her know that he or she is coming
   d. The Community Needs subcommittee is looking at services city wide and seeing where services might be able to be located elsewhere

6. **Schedule next meeting(s)**
   a. Wednesday, July 25
   b. Wednesday, August 8
   c. Wednesday, August 22

7. **Adjournment**
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 5

July 25, 2012

Cubberley Community Center

4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303

Room H-1

6:00 - 8:00 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of July 11th meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Discussion of 7/19/12 Policy Advisory Committee responses to questions from CCAC

   i. The CCAC should assume that the short-term of the scope is the renewal periods, the medium term will be when the need arises for a middle/high school, and the long-term will be the useful life of new structures.
   
   ii. The CCAC should consider in the short-term some form of lease renewal but not be constrained by it, in the medium-term assume a need for at least one additional school on the site but in a manner that makes it so community needs can still be served there, and in the long-term understand that new buildings will be needed (if they are not constructed sooner). The CCAC should focus their efforts on the short, medium, and long term using a 50/40/10 ratio.

   • The CPAC advised the CCAC that they should take a 50/40/10 approach to their Cubberley recommendation meaning that the focus of the CCAC’s work should be 50% on the near-term needs, 40% on the middle-term needs, and 10% on the long-term needs.

   • Request: Confirm what the middle term of the 50/40/10 equation references. Is there an implication that a middle and/or high school will for sure be needed or is that conclusion still yet to be made?

   • Cobb said the timeline for the CCAC’s recommendations has changed. The due date is no longer July 2013, it is now February 2013.

   • Cobb and Beecham said the CCAC has responded to that due date by proposing that a “coarse grain” report be delivered in February 2013 and a “fine grain” (or final) report be delivered in the summer of 2013.
• Cobb said driving the need to get the recommendations completed by February 2013 is both the upcoming lease expiration and the potential of a bond measure.

• Question: What are the issues surrounding a joint City/PAUSD bond measure since they have different geographic boundaries? Can it be done as one ballot measure or does the City and PAUSD need separate, parallel measures? What would the passage requirement be?
  o The Finance Committee said they are looking into this issue

ii. The Greendell and 525 San Antonio sites should be considered as part of the CCAC scope, but will most likely be needed for an elementary school given their location.

ii. The Greendell and 525 San Antonio sites can be considered as part of the CCAC scope, but will most likely be needed for an elementary school given their location and remain unchanged.

• Staff/Cobb said the CPAC was theoretically open to the possibility of refiguring that site but based on the practical needs of an elementary school the CPAC couldn’t see any scenario where it could be moved from its current location.

iii. In Considering Relocation of Community/non-profit uses, the CCAC should not consider off-site locations

iii. In considering relocation of community/non-profit uses, the CCAC need not find off-site locations

• Beecham clarified, and staff agreed, that there was no edict from the CPAC that everything that is at Cubberley must stay at Cubberley. Rather he understood the CPAC as saying that anything that the CCAC determined should no longer be at Cubberley was not the CCAC’s responsibility to relocate. Relocation would ultimately be the responsibility of the City (and possibly the PAUSD).

• Cobb said the CCAC’s job is to figure out what services/needs should be at Cubberley noting that the CCAC represents so many different Cubberley stakeholders for just that reason.

• Some thought providing no recommendations for potential relocation sites might unnecessarily raise fears among the Cubberley tenants
  o Staff suggested a that if it is determined that a service should not be housed at Cubberley the CCAC suggest that it is relocated elsewhere in the City just not get into the details of where
  o Cobb believes there is a way to work around not raising those fears and encouraged creativity in the recommendations

• Beecham said the CPAC charged the CCAC with prioritizing the existing uses as one of its tasks
iv. It should be assumed that there will always be a need for both school and community uses on the site.

iv. It should be assumed that there will always be a need for both school and community uses on the site but that doesn’t mean at any single point in time the entire site will be used for both school and community uses on the site. That said, the CPAC is comfortable with the exploration of joint use.

- Staff said the role of the CCAC is to find creative uses for the site that meet the needs of both the City and PAUSD
- Beecham clarified that the CCAC should assume that there will always be a need for City and PAUSD use at the site but that doesn’t mean it has to reflect the arrangements currently at the Cubberley site
- Skelly clarified that if joint use does occur those facilities will be driven in part by the architectural standards that the PAUSD has to adhere by

v. The CCAC should assume that the City and PAUSD intend to renew the Cubberley lease, but that should not inhibit creativity.

v. The CCAC should assume that the City and PAUSD have a desire to keep something going at the Cubberley site but whether or not that is done through the renewal of the existing lease is still TBD.

- Beecham clarified saying that the Council would entertain a new lease arrangement and the PAUSD would entertain anything that maintains their revenue stream.

- Staff will notify the CCAC of when the next CPAC meeting is
- Beecham recommended staff further clarify and revise the summary provided to the CCAC of the most recent CPAC meeting and staff agreed
- Cobb also commented in response to a question that he believes the CCAC interim and final reports should be written by the CCAC members not staff, and others agreed

5. Subcommittee reports (Formerly agenda item #6)

- Subcommittee Chairs were invited to attend the Co-Chair’s planning meetings held the Monday prior to CCAC meetings
- Subcommittee Chairs to email staff their subcommittee meeting minutes so they can be posted to the web
- School Needs Subcommittee
  - PAUSD presented data on school projections/needs
  - The short term data was great but it became clear that the School Needs Subcommittee needs to find out from the CCAC what information the CCAC needs from them
- Facilities Subcommittee
  - Developing their approach for facility needs around “what if” scenarios
  - Identified six categories of facilities relevant to Cubberley
    1. School
2. Community
3. Joint use
4. Recreation
5. Site support (parking, pedestrian ways, etc.)
6. Child care
   o Discussed exploration of the Sobrato non-profit model in San Jose, Milpitas, and Redwood City
   o Also looking at a portion of the site as possibly revenue generating
• Finance Subcommittee
   o Planning to show revenue opportunities
   o First exploring the history of revenue flow, bonds, timelines, and other financing mechanisms currently being considered to understand possibilities
   o Will study other communities' joint-use examples from a financial perspective to determine how they work
   o Will valuate private revenue generation options
   o Will explore new lease scenario possibilities
   o Will explore a joint powers district
• Community Needs Subcommittee
   o Four questions will drive their subcommittee's process
     1. What programs/services are currently offered at Cubberley and who is using them (age, residency, etc.)?
     2. Are these programs/services provided elsewhere in town?
     3. Is there a demand for more of these programs/services?
     4. What other community needs exist that are not currently offered? How will population growth impact these program/service needs?
   o Will also evaluate the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan amendment that addresses future community needs

6. Discussion of Subcommittee timeline and milestones (Formerly agenda item #5)
   • CPAC has condensed the timeline for when they would like a recommendation from the CCAC so staff asked the subcommittees to keep that in mind when working on their deliverables
   • Beecham proposed that each subcommittee have their intended deliverables prepared by the CCAC meeting on August 8th
   • CCAC then discussed the final report and what it entails
     o The 50/40/10 approach was identified as a significant policy constraint given to them by the CPAC
       • Many felt the long-term needs are more important and that the long-term should drive the short-term but that is not how it stands now based on the CPAC policy direction given
   • Beecham noted the CCAC needs to understand what is needed in the long-term so the City Council and PAUSD can make a lease decision in the short-term
• Cobb would like to take what has been discussed at this meeting back to the CPAC and see what can be agreed upon
• Cobb proposed that at the August 8th CCAC meeting that CCAC milestones are discussed including proposals from each subcommittee about when they can complete their assignments
• CCAC members reiterated frustrations with the time constraints given to them by the CPAC
• Cobb reiterated his vision that the CCAC give the CPAC an interim report in February 2013 and then continue working until they can finish a more detailed, final report
• A discussion then ensued on what the subcommittees had worked on so far and thoughts people had on each of them
• Schmidt said that the work of the Finance Subcommittee made him a little uneasy because he felt it’s one thing to take a scenario and assign cost estimates to it but it’s another thing to say having estimated it to cost x dollars here is the way we propose to pay for it – those are very different things
• Beecham said regarding the Finance Subcommittee that he would like the subcommittee to as much as possible put themselves in the shoes of the PAUSD and City Council and consider their current financial situation when making recommendations so any recommended proposal has the best chance of working
• Member said when thinking about the lease and a possible renewal the CCAC should consider what lease variations are out there that might work for all involved parties aside from the lease that currently exists
• Member asked what the total square foot cost of any improvements would be beyond just the construction cost (example: loss of revenue during construction, etc.)
• It was reiterated that the current Cubberley site plans are only intended to aid the CCAC in their thinking, the CCAC is not limited by those site plans
• Request: Have Cobb create a draft project timeline for the CCAC final report and present it at a future meeting
• Cobb suggested that the Community Needs Subcommittee should be the one to do an initial evaluation of what services are currently at Cubberley and which should stay and which might be located elsewhere
• Shared facilities require staff so it must be determined who will staff any shared facilities that are recommended
• School Needs Subcommittee wants to know if PAUSD can dedicate any land at this point to certain school uses or if all of the land needs to remain flexible to a variety of different possible school uses
• School Needs and Community Needs subcommittees should identify needs they both have that could be served through shared facilities
7. **Schedule next meeting(s)**
   - Once the school year starts a Doodle poll will be done of the CCAC to determine the optimum meeting date and time factoring in school year commitments
   - Next meetings
     - August 8
     - August 22

8. **Adjournment**
1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   - None

3. Approval of July 25 meeting action notes
   - Approved

4. High-level discussion of City and PAUSD finances

City Finances Discussion
   - City of Palo Alto Administrative Services Director Lalo Perez presented on City of Palo Alto finances (SEE ATTACHED PRESENTATION)
   - Perez explained a large component of structural budget issues is salaries and benefits. Those are being addressed in major ways through reforms in labor contracts but more work is needed
   - City avoids the use of reserves for budget gaps
   - City has been very lucky to have maintained high property tax rates through the Great Recession but there was a sales tax did dip from approx. $22M/year to as low as $18M/year and only now in FY 2013 is it projected to be back near that $22M/year mark
   - Perez then explained the impact of the growing pension and medical liabilities and the efforts to increase employee contributions

PAUSD Finances Discussion
   - PAUSD Chief Business Official Cathy Mak presented on PAUSD finances (SEE ATTACHED PRESENTATION)
   - PAUSD is facing many of the same issues as the City
   - PAUSD is facing a potential approx. $5M budget deficit for the coming fiscal year
   - State funding for PAUSD has dramatically decreased since FY 2009 going from $17M/year to less than $6M/year
• PAUSD has been averaging about 2%/year enrollment growth

5. Subcommittee reports on milestones and deliverables

Facilities
• Presented four deliverables and dates:
  1. Doing a detailed analysis of the types of facilities at Cubberley and their uses including a matrix outlining types of Cubberley facilities, their condition, and use by September 20
  2. Determining various scenarios for the Cubberley site when facilities are added and the challenges posed by various scenarios including joint use. Will evaluate possible scenarios for Cubberley site in the short, medium, and long-term, including joint uses, by October 15
  3. Evaluating a facility rebuild vs. remodel including wide-ranging estimated costs of maintaining the status quo, remodeling the facility, or rebuilding it by November 15
  4. Thinking differently about how the site can be used including “outside the box alternatives” by December 1

School Needs
• Presented seven deliverables and dates:
  1. Listing all PAUSD properties and their relevant characteristics/limitations by September 22
  2. Identifying the types of shared facilities PAUSD would need/be interested in by October 6
  3. Obtaining critical assumptions regarding demographics, ABAG projections, City response to ABAG projections, etc. by October 13
  4. Wants to know the total acreage at Cubberley that PAUSD likely will use for future school use by October 13
  5. Wants to know the total acreage at Cubberley for which PAUSD can give rights to for by October 20
  6. Wants to know the terms for turnover of City-built facilities to PAUSD at lease termination by November 3
  7. Wants PAUSD policy decisions on will a school facility be built on Stanford lands, what a new high school at Cubberley would look like, what should be expected on a 20-30 year time horizon, any possible changes in student density at each level, and desired limitations on the City’s use of its 8 acres by November 10

Finance
• Evaluating the terms of the current Cubberley lease and covenant not to develop
• Examining potential funding mechanisms that could be used to construct new facilities on the Cubberley site
• Doing extensive research of existing joint use facilities in other communities including how they came about and how they are governed
• Evaluating whether a joint-powers agreement can fund and manage the site

Community Needs
• Would like to form a Joint Use sub-subcommittee
• Creating a table of current Cubberley users and what they are paying
• Looking at potential new users and services based on other communities and what services have been requested there that are not currently provided at Cubberley
• Doing a community survey through the neighborhood associations to see what services residents want
• Evaluating future users and how the space can be maximized
• Evaluating resident vs. non-resident use
• Evaluating what services have wait lists
• Looking at the geographic location (and balance) of Cubberley users
• Looking at increasing cross cultural experiences at Cubberley and how increased community connections can be fostered at the site

6. Discussion of the CCAC Final Report schedule and timeline
• Cobb said at the next CPAC meeting that the CCAC final report due date will be finalized
• Cobb explained the expectations for the CCAC final report and what will be required to get it done on time

7. Future meetings
• Cobb said the CCAC will continue meeting every other week

8. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 7

August 22, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
6:00 - 8:00 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications

3. Approval of the August 8 meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Introduction and Q & A with CCAC architect John Northway
   • Northway talked about the importance of understanding the problem first and working on the solution only after the problem is thoroughly understood
   • Northway explained that if this ever goes to a bond measure being able to clearly explain what the problem is, what the solution should be, and why will be very important
   • Northway wants the subcommittees to bring back what their “problem” is to the next meeting to start forming a picture of the larger problem
   • Northway said to focus on Cubberley and not to worry too much about the larger problems of the City since the CCAC was asked to limit their recommendations to the site

5. City of Palo Alto and PAUSD Capital Budget Presentation
   • Phil Bobel of the City of Palo Alto Public Works Department presented a Power Point on the capital budget (SEE ATTACHED)
   • Bobel explained the background of the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC) recommendations and the subsequent Council discussion of those recommendations
   • He explained how Cubberley is and isn’t accounted for currently in the budget planning process.
   • Bobel explained that up-keep of Cubberley in a limited manner is included in the budget process but not funding for long-term rebuilding.
- Bobel explained that most of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) expenditures in slide 8 of the attached Power Point are in the next ten years even though it reflects a 25 year horizon
- Bobel noted that he believes the cost estimates for maintaining the facility over the next 25 years is thin beyond 10 years and would likely need additional funding
- Bob Golton of the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) presented a Power Point on the PAUSD capital budget (SEE ATTACHED)
- Golton presented on the status of current capital projects under way and the funds allocated for them
- Golton said that voter approved bond funds for PAUSD use have already been allocated to the individual school sites even if the projects have not yet been identified
- Approximately $33 M of funds have been reserved for construction to accommodate PAUSD growth

6. Review of the discussion at the August 21 PAUSD Board meeting of the Cubberley related Board enclosure
- Mandy Lowell explained that the PAUSD is interested in looking for a fourth middle school site that could or could not be at Cubberley (SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT)
- A big issue is that PAUSD wants flexibility and the City (and some of the community) wants certainty
  - The City and PAUSD are also at different phases of their bond interests
- Question: Is there an impediment to building a City only facility on the City's 8 acres?
- A major part of the problem is the lack of clarity

7. Discussion of the CCAC Final Report schedule and timeline
- Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie reported out on the status of the Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee (CPAC) timeline
- Emslie said that the CPAC wants the CCAC input in part to decide if Cubberley should be included in a city bond measure for infrastructure needs
- Emslie reported that the CCAC Final Report must be done by February 28, 2012
- The CPAC is interested in the foreseeable school uses, community uses, range of priorities, and joint use scenarios at Cubberley
- Frustrations about the timeline of the process were expressed again by CCAC members
8. Future meetings
   a. Discussion of expected future subcommittee reports
   - Emslie mentioned that the CCAC Co-Chairs would like one or two subcommittees presenting updates at each meeting

9. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 8

September 5, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • George Browning spoke
     o CCAC members should make sure to read what the IBRC wrote about Cubberley
     o The City should be clearer about what is expected of the artists who rent space at Cubberley including how they exhibit and how their rented space is used

3. Approval of the August 22 meeting action notes
   • Approved with the change of 2012 to 2013 on page two of the draft

4. Introduction by CCAC Architect John Northway
   • Thinks the work of the CCAC is going well and commends everyone for their work so far
   • Wants everyone to keep working toward defining “the problem” and believes progress on this front has been made

5. Presentation by the School Needs Subcommittee followed by a group discussion and questions
   • School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham lead the presentation
     o Beecham reiterated the School Needs Subcommittee deliverables
     o Presented preliminary conclusions
     o SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT
     o Beecham presented the spreadsheet that shows the acreage per student at all of the PAUSD schools
       ▪ Showed significant variance
       ▪ High schools were about 45 acres on average vs. full Cubberley site is 35 acres
Presented what happened at the September 4, 2012 PAUSD Board meeting including the PAUSD Cubberley interests

- Co-Chair Lowell added that the School Board purposefully left things open ended to allow the CCAC to do its work
- A number of clarifying questions were asked on PAUSD positions
- PAUSD Superintendent Kevin Skelly then presented clarifying information
  - Need for a middle school could arise by 2020
  - PAUSD is evaluating all options for land use and recognizes one story options are not the future
  - A lot of questions were asked about what was driving the school boards position and Skelly communicated that it is based on a long history of enrollment growth and Board positions
- Problem stated: maximum flexibility limits what you can do on the site
- Problem stated: the sometimes conflicting wants and needs of all parties involved with the Cubberley site

6. Response by the Finance, Facilities, and Community Needs Subcommittee Chairs to the School Needs Subcommittee presentation
- Finance Subcommittee mentioned a few problems:
  - Both the City and PAUSD are dealing with budget problems
  - PAUSD wants to keep the $7 M payment from the City and the City feels it needs some or all of it for other expenses
- A number of “problem” statements about Cubberley were then made:
  - Prioritization is difficult
  - Determining what uses the City should subsidize on the site is difficult
  - Using existing facilities is cheap but does not allow as much potential density
  - CPAC direction to focus only on the Cubberley site does not allow for other site consideration
  - Uncertainty around the question “if an important community use is at Cubberley and this site becomes unavailable will the use be able to continue elsewhere”
  - Maintaining maximum flexibility for PAUSD at the site significantly impacts what the City can do with the site including a potential bond measure
  - PAUSD wants to keep the $7 M in rental revenue but the City budget issues make that payment difficult
  - Community acceptance of a bond measure for Cubberley is questionable
  - The City rushing to 2014 bond measure may force an eight acre community center bond measure without PAUSD
    - Would PAUSD/the community support that?
  - Joint bond for a joint-use facility would need to be built to State Architect’s standards and would be more expensive
There may be effects on operating budgets if changes are made to programming uses

- Needs for the site may shift over time
- PAUSD and community needs are growing in parallel
- How the uses at Cubberley should be determined is difficult

• A number of facts were also raised in the course of discussion:
  - Maintenance need is $33M to “keep dry” in the short-term
  - Additionally, currently unbudgeted funds are needed for maintenance in the mid-term at the site

7. Future meetings

8. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 9

September 19, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Theater
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the September 5 meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Finance Subcommittee presentation, definition of problem, and discussion
   • Presentation given by CCAC Finance Subcommittee Chair Lanie Wheeler
   • SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT PRESENTATION
   • Wheeler went over what the main problems from a financial perspective are that the group should try and solve
   • Wheeler noted the high number of changes that have occurred since the lease and covenant not to develop were originally signed and recognized similar changes were likely to continue occurring
   • Wheeler noted the implications that the uncertainty of this site has on operations, maintenance, sit planning, etc.
   • From a financial perspective, anything done on the site independently by the City or PAUSD impacts the other due to the fact that possible uses done in tandem are much different than independent site use
   • Site improvement funding undertaken in tandem has different geographic boundaries and voting requirements to be aware of
   • Question: Is the City set on a 2014 ballot measure?
   • Councilmember Schmidt noted there are shorter term needs the City is trying to address and has targeted 2014 as the time to do that but with a consultant being hired many different project package scenarios will be considered
   • Finance subcommittee will consider unconventional funding avenues but will leave most of the political viability discussions to the CCAC as a whole
   • Question: Will the Finance subcommittee write down political viability questions that arise in the course of their discussions for discussion by the CCAC as a whole?
• Question: Will there be reluctance from North Palo Alto to fund Cubberley renovations in South Palo Alto?

5. Community Needs Subcommittee definition of problem, staff update on Cubberley tenants survey, and discussion
• Presentation given by CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis
  • SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT PRESENTATION
  • Reklis went over the main problems facing their subcommittee including overall problems and short-, medium-, and long-term problems
  • Discussed the needs that all of the different users at the facility have
  • Recognized that joint use will necessitate change
  • Reklis noted that Cubberley uses have ebbed-and-flowed in the past and consideration of building a facility that can do so in the future should be given
  • Consideration will also be given to needs that might have no relocation alternative and those that are conducive to joint use versus those that are not
  • Community Services Division Manager Rob De Geus then updated the CCAC on the Cubberley survey of tenants
  • De Geus said staff had received 40 of the 70 surveys back
  • Said they have a three tier approach to results:
    • All users
    • Users by category
      • Example: dance studios or artists
    • Individual users
  • Said of the 40 survey responses received so far 50 percent of users share space
  • Many users need specialized facilities
  • Facilities are in use from as early as 6:00 AM to as late as 11:00 PM
  • 25 percent of respondents said they would go out of business without space at Cubberley and many others said they would have to leave Palo Alto
  • Question: Can professional help on the surveying be obtained?

6. School Needs Subcommittee definition of problem and discussion
• Discussion on this subject delayed until later in the meeting

7. Discussion of inter-subcommittee communication
• CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb led a brief discussion on inter-subcommittee communication
• Request: Make sure that all reports are shared with the entire committee
• Subcommittees agreed to reach out to one another when an opportunity to collaborate presents itself or is necessitated
8. Discussion of potential joint use sites to visit and the process for visiting
   • Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie said that based on joint use facility interest staff will put tours together of joint-use facilities but asked that CCAC members work through staff to help with coordination
   • Emslie said staff welcomes suggestions for those site tours
   • Request: A presentation from Emeryville on their proposed joint use facility

6A. School Needs Subcommittee definition of problem and discussion
   • Presentation given by CCAC School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham
   • Said the subcommittee is looking at how PAUSD may want the eight acres used in the future and how they may be affected by them
   • Looking at a possible development pattern for the Cubberley site as the school starts building out projects
   • Question: How does ABAG affect projections?
   • Beecham reiterated that the subcommittee doesn’t have a reason to use anything different than the PAUSD 2% enrollment growth projection
   • Beecham said the School Needs Subcommittee is also looking at non-traditional site uses including having specific facilities for art, science, etc. located at Cubberley that students from both PALY and Gunn could use

9. Future meetings
   • Staff will send a Doodle to the CCAC to find an alternative meeting day for the currently scheduled October 31st meeting
   • CCAC architectural consultant John Northway said he was very excited about the opportunity here and that he thought it was time to start concluding work on the problem identification step of the process and start working on the solutions step
   • Discussion occurred of how to organize the group based on a final report that will contain alternatives but no decisions were made
   • Cobb and Emslie proposed a community forum in October/November to solicit input from all segments of the community on what their vision for the future of Cubberley is

10. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 10

October 3, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications

3. Approval of the September 19 meeting action notes
   • Unanimously approved

4. Discussion of Cubberley forum & volunteer identification
   a. Scheduled for November 8, 2012 at 7:00 PM
   • Co-Chair Mandy Lowell said staff will prepare an advertisement for the CCAC members that they can distribute to the groups they represent
   • Lowell asked for day of volunteers to sign-up and a clipboard was passed around. The volunteers who signed-up to assist are:
     - Pam Radin (help with question asking)
     - Bern Beecham
     - Diane Reklis
     - Claire Kirner (can help from 7:30 PM on)
     - Sheri Furman (help plan the presentation)
     - Steve Emslie (staff)
     - Rob de Geus (staff)
     - Tommy Fehrenbach (staff)
   • Co-Chair Mike Cobb recommended purchasing advertising in newspapers but Lowell didn’t agree so that is still TBD
   • It was communicated that the forum would be at Cubberley but it had not been determined where at Cubberley
   • A discussion then ensued on where at Cubberley the forum should be held and whether it would be a large presentation or smaller breakout groups
   • Members also brainstormed ideas about the content of what would be discussed
   • Beecham suggested the CCAC present the problem statements and the do Q & A and see what people think they need to know
• Staff was directed to see if the Cubberley Theater or Pavilion was free that day
• The CCAC concluded that further discussion needs to occur about what exactly will be presented/discussed at the forum and that a program for the evening would have to be established so the objective of the event can be communicated to residents
• The CCAC voted to have the first meeting in the Cubberley Theater so staff was directed to reserve that room for November 8
• Community Services staff member Rob de Geus expressed concerns about the theater idea so he will look into other locations to have the meeting at
• Staff was also directed to make sure all CCAC meetings are on the City calendar and to have Jim Keene incorporate the CCAC meetings in his City Manager’s comments at Council meetings

5. Presentation by the Community Needs Subcommittee
6. CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis, with the assistance of Community Needs Subcommittee member Sheri Furman, gave the presentation
• SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT
• Reklis said a lot of people think South Palo Alto is already getting a new community center with the construction of Mitchell Park Library
• Reklis communicated that this is a much smaller facility in scale and operation when compared to Cubberley and would not come close to meeting the needs of Cubberley
• Reklis then discussed the unique community facilities that are already in place
• Cobb noted that Cubberley is the only major community center in Palo Alto and that this group needs to define community center as part of their evaluation process so they can work around that definition
• Reklis discussed community centers in other communities and some of the services they provide
• Furman then described the matrix of public and private service offerings they are creating including the providers
• Furman then described their evaluation of the community users at Cubberley based on the staff survey results of Cubberley tenants
• CCAC member Penny Ellson then described the one year Sunnyvale study that was done to gauge community needs
• Staff noted that a comprehensive needs analysis of Palo Alto would take more time than the CCAC has but a board brush analysis was agreed upon
• de Geus noted that the staff survey written responses were not as detailed as hoped so he and staff are doing follow-up calls with individual users
• Beecham asked the CCAC the question, “What do we need to have to make an informed recommendation by February 28?”
• Lowell wants to know what can be done in x amount of square feet
• Reklis expanded on potential new uses or services at Cubberley
7. Presentation by the Facilities Subcommittee
   • CCAC Facilities Subcommittee member Brian Carilli presented
   • SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT
   • He said since he was limited on time he would not read through the slides and would instead show a map he created of where community services are located in Palo Alto and the tremendous opportunity/value this site presents
   • Carilli reiterated his feeling that this group really needs to think big about what can be done on the site
   • He referenced his professional experience in site planning and said that a better understanding of what should be/is going to be built on the site is still needed
   • In response to some questions Carilli expressed his feeling that using the existing site as-is in the manner the PAUSD has suggested they would consider is very short sited and not a good use of the land
   • The group discussed the level of detail that the CCAC should get into and what is appropriate and what isn’t but no consensus on that was reached
   • Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie then spoke and tried to clarify a few points:
     o He said Carilli was getting into a level of detail he didn’t have to in order for the CCAC to generate recommendations that will help inform the discussion that is going to occur between the City and the PAUSD on what to do with the site
     o He also said if the group feels they need staff to do needs assessment work that the City does not currently have staff to do that but consultants could be hired to assist with that process on a case-by-case basis
   • Ellson said before she goes she wants the CCAC to look at the short, medium, and long term recommendations the CCAC Facilities Subcommittee has in their Power Point presentation and that although they were not read through at the meeting those recommendations, not the site planning, represented the majority of the Subcommittee’s work
   • Emslie then spoke and tried to clarify a few more points:
     o He noted that when the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC) made their recommendations for the Municipal Services Center (MSC) they created as one of their deliverables a scope of study that could be used by a consultant for a study of the site in the future but didn’t try to do the study themselves
     o He also noted when the IBRC discussed Cubberley they made broad recommendations about the site not specific recommendations for what should happen with the infrastructure there
○ He reiterated his recommendation to let go of some of the detail and keep the analysis at a higher level

• Carilli then reiterated his feeling that until the CCAC defines what should be built on the site it is impossible to organize the site
• It was agreed upon that some level of site uncertainty needs to be accepted as a part of this process

8. Discussion and brainstorming of subcommittee next steps
• Not discussed due to time constraints

9. Future meetings
• The next CCAC meeting is October 17

10. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 11

October 17, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Theater
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • George Browning of Palo Alto spoke

3. Approval of the October 3 meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Discussion and brainstorming of recommendations and alternatives for the short term (5 years)
   • The CCAC randomly divided into three groups and came up with the following answers to the questions below:

Exercise For October 17 Cubberley Community Advisory Committee

Development of Short Term (5 years, 2015-2019) Issues—Small Group Discussions

At the October 17, 2012 meeting, the CCAC Steering Committee suggests that we have a discussion focused on the short term issues associated with Cubberley’s future. The Steering Committee proposes starting with the short term issues inasmuch as much of the data and background necessary to consider meaningful recommendations, alternatives and comments have substantially been presented by the Subcommittees. Future CCAC discussions will address medium and long term issues after all Subcommittee deliverables are available to the full CCAC.

The proposed format is for the CCAC to break up into 3 random groups insuring that each group has at least one representative from each Subcommittee. The discussion should take about 30 minutes followed by a 5 minutes presentation from each group to the CCAC. Comments, questions, recommendations and alternatives and will be recorded and available
to the full CCAC for our on-going discussion and as input for the development of the draft committee report.

The following questions are provided to frame the short term issues to facilitate conversation and brainstorming:

1. Should the City Renew its lease with PAUSD for an additional 5 years?
   a. If the City were to renew its lease, under what conditions? How would a revised covenant address on-going needs?
   b. What are recommendations for changes to tenants and rents?
   c. Should PAUSD and the City share in maintaining Cubberley?
   d. How should the lease be structured to maintain maximum flexibility for the future uses of Cubberley?
2. Is it feasible to include a community facility on the City’s 8 acres in the 2014 Bond measure? Is this a community need?
3. What actions or planning activities should PAUSD and the City undertake during the next 5 years to advance the determination of the best possible future of Cubberley, and build a consensus for that future?

---

- **Group 1**
  - **Question 1**
    - Renew a lease for 5 years
  - **Question 1B**
    - Transfer, in some process, the city’s 8 acres to the school district (Voted Yes 6-0)
    - Remove covenant not to develop and renegotiate $2M (Voted Yes 6-0)
    - Share maintenance costs and planning (Voted Yes 6-0)
    - Find a way for more child care at Cubberley and other PAUSD sites (Voted No 5-1)
    - Include access to and/or preserve other PAUSD fields and gym space (Voted Yes 4-2)
    - City to offer leases to tenants for same 5 years (Voted No 5-1)
  - **Question 2**
    - No, not feasible (Voted No 1-5)
  - **Question 3**
    - Develop MOU defining joint use of site

- **Group 2**
  - **Question 1**
    - Yes, city has lots of uses, school has few in short term
    - Lease doesn’t have continued utility in present form
    - Considerable issues in relation to all city infrastructure challenges (IBRC reference) but was only looked at from financial point of view
    - Is 5 year lease the right amount of time?
      - Foothill 3 years...
• Does current covenant lock 5 years?
  o Could be amended on mutual agreement
• **Question 1A**
  • Need to start with existing lease, delete what doesn’t work
  • Maintenance issues in short term
  • Under what conditions would it be renewed?
  • Term equal to 3 or 5 years? Or related to departure of Foothill?
  • What does city get for covenant not to develop?
  • Has become meaningless in current time
  • Could amend lease to eliminate/change to other city benefit
  • New covenant could make sense in today’s time
  • Possibility of school district assuming responses for some of the immediate capital improvements (some are on school owned buildings)
  • School District could make commitments to build full size fields or multi-use available to city on new builds outside Cubberley (possible shared uses)
  • Reasonably accessible joint-use sites (price, availability)
  • Use ‘joint-use’ thinking above specific to Cubberley – shift maintenance and upkeep to School District
  • Classrooms for programs, fields, irrigation, etc.
  • Childcare: make an agreement to expand at other sites to offset city’s investment at Cubberley
• **Question 1B**
  • Serious reevaluation on tenants
  • Who is chosen and how
  • Charge
  • Serious gap that could be improved
  • Maximize availability/profit
  • Less subsidy
  • More property manager mindset
  • Better utilization of resource
  • Do it gradually
  • Maybe different way stop use space
• **Question 1C**
  • Yes
  • Zoning may be prohibitive
  • Departure of Foothill may be opportunity for new tenants to generate money

• Rents should cover maintenance for facility (day-to-day and capital/deferred)
  o Should be cost neutral
  o Corrective, ongoing, preventative?
  o Timing/plan is-at
• **Question 1D**
  • What could you put into 5 year lease that could bind ‘flexibility’?
  • What form should the lease renewal take to maximize opportunities?
• Lease isn’t problem, common vision by School District and city needs to be decided and executed
• Could covenant be used to shape the vision?
  o Timeline for concrete planning
  o MOU to ‘use 5 years productively
  o Continue discussions as decisions become clearer
  o Otherwise, loss of valuable time
  o Is resolving worth it?
  o Should we wait?
  o Some flexibility there now, could keep status quo
• Question 2
• No to a 2014 bond measure
  o It is a community need
  o Need to know competing needs for bond measure
  o Could be desirable to keep something for 8 acres on 2014 bond
  o School has more support for bond
    ▪ Can go to voters with less detail on projects
    ▪ City needs more detail
• Doing bond for just 8 acres might be problematic in public perception/uncertainty
• Could we, through lease/covenant build in obligations to come to affirmative agreement on some plan and force parties to agree?
  o If city goes ahead with plan to develop 8 acres on its own, it may not be best plan for City/PAUSD/both
    ▪ Don’t want to confine to city vs. school on acreage
• Question 3
• Sit down in good faith and talk about what School District and City have in common
  o Professional proctoring
  o Come with specifics
  o Could build common use spaces in the interim
  o Neither party currently has money – need votes
  o Could go to voters together
• Possible (Finance committee)
  o ‘Educational purposes’ is broadly defined (55% bond)
• Go through tenants and answer questions regarding here vs. somewhere else
• Big question is does city and school district want to work together?
• Put together the data/decision makers can have good factual basis for discussions
• Fully informed for proper judgment
• Craft affirmative action obligation for each arty
• If enrollment continues to increase, discussion about alternative timetable

• Group 3
• Question 1
• Keep open? Status Quo
  o Planning will take 5 years and incremental periods to allow for planning
  o Strive to honor tenant business plans
• **Question 1A**
  Commitment from school district and city to work cooperatively to plan all 35 acres, the whole site:
  - District to share funding for planning
  - Hard to expect school district to design school
  - Clarify maintenance issues
  - Quality conditions/ for subsequent terms or extensions
  - Lease renewals/and period extensions (3-5 years/10 years?)
  - Is the 8 acres in the right place (land configuration)?
  - What 8 acres would meet community needs?
  - Don’t lock into something we would regret

• **Question 1B**
  Uses need to reflect inter-generational, multi-cultural needs (cultures = people)
  - Implement city bike plan for better access to Cubberley
  - With new tenants, the tenants to share responsibility for improving the room/facility (refinishing dance floor for example)
  - Tenants to chip in special assessment for improvements (like homeowner assessment or fee around the facility)
  - New tenants pay higher rates
  - No grandfather clause for low rates
  - We should look at criteria for all renters – just like there is for selection of artists

• **Question 1C**
  Costs – Should be shared, but how?
  - By square footage
  - Tenant fees to be covered by tenants
  - If school district is sharing maintenance, it should be eased into

• **Question 1D**
  Tenants need some sense of certainty (lease)
  - Initial lease 3-5 years and at least one year increments thereafter
  - Year to year lease and tough for renters/tenants
  - Need to have a clear long-term overall plan so that we don’t prolong the campus uncertainty – within 2 years
  - Need to consider a ‘new model’ for what the future high school may look like – Not same old model
  - School design to reflect ‘modern’ teaching design and flexibility as much as possible

• **Question 2**
  - Multiple sources of site assessment – the more analysis/perspectives the better
  - Access to other high school fields need to be part of the whole deal (not to develop)
  - Include gyms, pools, and child care space
  - Bond for 8 acres? Too soon in 2016?
    - Goal for 2014 should be complete redevelopment plan
    - Go for comprehensive bond just for Cubberley
    - 2016 may be affected by Presidential election cycle
    - Don’t’ wrap Cubberley with sewer infrastructure bond
    - Bond measures for “make-shift” community center facility won’t pass – do it right
    - Joint use programs take 5-10 years to do right
• **Question 3**
  • Alternate transportation strategies (bike, bus, shuttle, pedestrian)
  • Maintenance of building should be built in x timeframe?
  • Consider grants for these special ethno studies
  • Design must be flexible – adaptive to changing needs
• **Question 4**
  • Use the time before the bond to do adequate planning and thoughtful design
  • Something will be built in x years, but it needs to be done right (condition of lease joint funded)
  • Use of full site – including San Antonio should be planned before anything built (Elementary school needs to fit in well, don’t box in options)
  • Needs to be a real strategy/mechanism for broad community input on designs – not just committee
  • The design team must include ethnographic specialist instead of ‘standard’ architects to understand the problem
  • Need to have ‘observational planners’
  • Full cultural assessment to meet all cultural needs
  • The design needs to be unique to our community/needs
  • Regardless of design costs – do it right. Don’t scrimp

5. Discussion of Cubberley forum
   a. Thursday, November 8, 2012 at 7:00 PM at the Cubberley Theater
   • Time was changed to 7:30 PM

6. Future meetings
   a. Next CCAC meeting will be October 30th or November 1st

7. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 12

October 30, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications

3. Approval of the October 17 meeting action notes
   • Approved with minor revisions incorporated

4. Update on the October 18 CPAC meeting
   • City of Palo Alto Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie gave a brief update of the meeting
   • Emslie communicated that the CPAC had requested things such as:
     o CCAC should rewrite their problem statements
     o City revenue measure in 2014 is considering lots of different things and is not focused on Cubberley but the City does want there to be resolution on what the future of Cubberley will be by that time
     o City wants clear direction on whether or not they should renew the lease and what they might construct
     o City wants CCAC to prioritize what services should be provided at Cubberley
     o Supportive of the community forum
     o Think of it as an opportunity not a problem
     o Think of it as highest and best use for Cubberley

5. Presentation on joint use facilities
   • Presentation made by CCAC Finance Subcommittee member Susan Bailey
   • SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT
   • Bailey presented three joint use facilities
   • She looked for common threads and lessons learned from all of the projects
1. **Emeryville Center for Community Life**
   - Approximately 7.6 acre/115,100 SF facility
   - Cost = $80 M
   - Has been in plan since 2003
   - Now in their third MOU but are starting site work soon
   - The repeated MOUs are the result of the redesign efforts
   - Facility includes K-12 education facilities for 750 students, multipurpose rooms, administration space, a school and community library, a community pool, and more
   - Project is being driven by the Superintendent and Mayor together

2. **Wadsworth Community Campus**
   - Approximately 65 acres/450,000 SF facility
   - Cost = $105 M
   - Facility includes a new high school for 1,629 students, recreation facility, senior center, indoor and outdoor pools, and a public library. A middle school is not included in the cost but is already on site

3. **Livermore Facility**
   - Modernizing seven of 20 schools and doing community enhancements as a part of three projects
   - Facilities include new schools, a youth community center, and new community library
   - Driven by the superintendent of the school district
   - Had to get special legislation for the joint use library to be built
   - They passed it by doing one election that combined multiple community needs
   - Bailey then mentioned a study of seven steps to effective joint-use partnerships. They include:
     1. Identify a local need that a joint use partnership might address
     2. Identify essential joint use partners
     3. Develop a positive, trusting relationship with partners
     4. Build political support
     5. Build a joint use partnership within the context of the local community
     6. Formalize the partnership with an MOU
     7. Foster ongoing communication and monitor the progress and impact

A number of questions and comments then occurred:
- Comment: Jim Schmidt mentioned that the documents for the MOU of the San Jose library are available online
- Request: Bailey was asked to provide her full list of joint-use facilities
- Question: Clarify what amount of a building has to be used by schools and how the sale and passage of the bonds would work if done at the 55% voter approval threshold
6. Discussion of the Cubberley forum including the public outreach plan
   a. Thursday, November 8, 2012 at 7:30 PM at the Cubberley Theater
   - Emslie gave an overview of what could be expected
   - The forum will start with a 15-20 minute presentation including the Cubberley 101 presentation by staff followed by a presentation of the CCAC problem statements by CCAC architect John Northway
   - Written questions will then be taken and answered first to be followed by oral communications
   - Sheri Furman asked staff to explain at the forum what is different about Cubberley Community Center when compared to Mitchell Park Library & Community Center and Lucie Stern Community Center
   - CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb said that ads for the event will be going out in the papers
   - Cobb also asked all CCAC members to send the ad out to the organizations they are a part of
   - PAUSD staff member Robert Golton said PAUSD will send the ad to all of the parents as well
   - Cobb said he will also do a press release for the event
   - Cobb said add a paragraph on your own about why this is important to the specific group you represent when you send the ad out
   - A passive information table will be set-up at the event
   - CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis is going to provide a one page handout on what’s special about Cubberley that her Subcommittee created
   - Cobb said to let City of Palo Alto staff member Richard Hackmann know if you would like to help with the forum

7. Future meetings
   - Lowell said if you have agenda items you want to see at a future meeting let the Co-Chairs know

8. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 13

November 14, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • Lisa Hendrickson from Avenidas spoke on behalf of a number of health and wellness groups who provide services in the community and their desire to build a state-of-the-art community center on the Cubberley site
   • An unidentified member of Good Neighbor Montessori spoke in support of keeping a Montessori at the Cubberley site

3. Approval of the October 30 meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Debrief of the Cubberley Community Forum
   • Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie gave an update on what happened at the forum
   • CCAC member Sheri Furman said the CCAC would need a future community forum to discuss site options
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb said the CCAC needs at least one follow-up forum that both presents site options and reaches out to a broader audience
   • CCAC member Rachel Samoff said that non-residents using the Cubberley site is not a bad thing
   • CCAC member Penny Ellson said she wished that possibilities of the site were presented at the forum in terms of what can be done with that amount of acreage
   • CCAC member Jennifer Hetterly said that she wished the forum had been a little more thought provoking
5. Further discussion of the October 17 breakout group brainstorming on Cubberley short-term scenarios

- CCAC Co-Chair Mandy Lowell asked people to discuss the October 17 breakout group conclusions but also brought up the medium and long-term scenarios so people were aware of what some of the proposals are.
- Samoff mentioned a decision making process where the City and PAUSD work on the long-term solution during the short-term while also having a discussion about how they will share maintenance costs.
- CCAC member Susan Bailey said the Finance Committee has discussed recalculating the annual lease payments to align with the Utility Users Tax revenue trend rather than the Consumer Price Index trend and because the current lease includes things having to do with Palo Alto Community Childcare (PACC) increase the amount of space leased to PACC on elementary school sites and increase their lease payments.
- Furman said that if there is another five year lease there needs to be an agreed upon design use, CCAC member Brian Carilli agreed.
- Carilli again advocated joint use with the City maintaining a major presence at the site.
- Lowell said the scenarios indicate what was discussed not what will be decided upon.
- Bailey asked if the PAUSD can get beyond its statements that it needs the whole site and discuss joint-use or if they will be hung up on that.
- Carilli said that both the City and PAUSD work for the citizens and this citizen advisory committee should say joint-use must work.
- Cobb mentioned that some services might not have a home if joint-use occurs and what can be kept at Cubberley and what can’t should be studied.
- The topic came up that an assessment of what is at Cubberley still has not been finalized but a report has been put together that’s a jumping off point for a larger community needs assessment.
- It was concluded that more information is needed about what is at Cubberley such as who the renters are including long-term hourly users.
- CCAC member Bern Beecham said he thought the long-term site needs at Cubberley are too uncertain at this time to create a plan for site redevelopment nor does the CCAC have the information necessary to raise the political support for such an undertaking.
- It was requested that at the next CCAC meeting a presentation is done by Rob De Geus of Community Services on what is currently at Cubberley.
- Beecham said that until one of these buildings is taken down we do not need more space because we have enough space and on top of that Foothill Community College is leaving meaning the site meaning 20% more space will soon be available for lease to new renters.
- Beecham asked to outline a process by which the community can evaluate its community service needs.
• Hetterley asked to have all conclusions for the five-year scenario listed together

6. Outline of the medium-term and long-term potential Cubberley site scenarios and requested input
• The following five medium and long-term scenarios were discussed...
  1. Cubberley used for a comprehensive high school in the future using all 35 acres.
  2. Cubberley used for a non-comprehensive high school in the future using no more than 27 acres.
  3. City retains 8 acres (possibly in a different location on the site than currently assigned) and the PAUSD retains 27 acres with each determining their respective uses.
  4. The entire Cubberley site becomes a joint use facility.
  5. No decision about a high school is made and there is no high school use on the site for a 20-25 year time period.
• CCAC member Jerry August asked to change number two from “non-comprehensive high school” to “high school use”
• Lowell said that staff will be sending out a CCAC briefing book before Thanksgiving break containing further information on what each of the subcommittees has concluded and information discussing pros and cons of each of the five scenarios
• CCAC member Ken Allen said we should change from reactive to proactive in our process

7. Future meetings

8. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 14

November 28, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • A unidentified member of the public asked the CCAC how they can make recommendations about the future use of the site when they do not yet know the future of education

3. Approval of the November 14 meeting action notes
   • Approval postponed at the request of staff until the December 12th meeting

   • Prior to a discussion of the CCAC Action Plan Matrix City of Palo Alto Community Services staff member Rob De Geus made a presentation on Cubberley tenants and long-term users
     o SEE DE GUES’S ATTACHED PRESENTATION
   • Following De Gues’s presentation a number of clarifying questions were asked by CCAC members

5. Presentation on the ground rules for the CCAC member small group discussions of the CCAC Action Plan Matrix
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mandy Lowell communicated that the group is to breakout into small groups and brainstorm thoughts and ideas about the CCAC Action Plan Matrix. All ideas were to be captured by the scribe of each small group and not filtered at this time
6. CCAC member small group discussions of the CCAC Action Plan Matrix including the brainstorming of issues, questions, and concerns
   • Issues, questions, and concerns raised by small group participants are captured in red with the original text in black
     o SEE ATTACHED SUMMARIES

7. Report out on the CCAC member small group discussions of the CCAC Action Plan Matrix
   • Each group presented the statements that were made during their brainstorming sessions as captured in the attached summaries

8. Future meetings
   • Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie said that due to the Christmas holiday the CCAC will be meeting December 12th & 19th instead of December 12th & 26th
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb and CCAC member Brian Carilli said that the December 12th meeting would be held at Stanford to give the group an idea of what can be built on eight and a half acres
   • Cobb said that at the a December 19th meeting the group should be prepared to take votes on some major issues concerning their ultimate recommendations

9. Adjournment
Dear CCAC, PAUSD and City of Palo Alto Representatives,

The dance studios at Cubberley Community Center were asked to submit a description of our value to the Palo Alto community. Dance Connection is currently both a lease and hourly rental tenant, and we hope to remain in our current location in L5 and K5 (former lease) as well as L6 (hourly) as long as possible.

Here are some features which highlight the uniqueness of Dance Connection in the Palo Alto Community:

- **History:** Dance Connection has been a tenant at Cubberley since 1988 -- (the "oldest" dance school still remaining at Cubberley) on an hourly rental basis, and a lease tenant since 1995. We assumed a second leased space in 2005, and are hoping for a third room if one becomes available. We are renting space hourly in L6 for the maximum number of weekday rental hours, and also rent space 3 afternoons per week from Zohar, and 5 afternoons per week at Reach Fitness Center in downtown Palo Alto. Our wish would be to have a space, even a shared space at Cubberley instead of renting elsewhere.

- **Who do we serve?** 99% of our students are the youth in our community, ages 3 to 18 with a vast majority from Palo Alto.

- **What do we offer?** Dance instruction for regular classes and workshops. We bring in professional dancers and choreographers to work with our students on a regular basis. Performing opportunities for all dance students in a formal theatre. Competitive and non-competitive dance teams to perform for all community events and participate in instructional dance conventions as well as attend professional performances and events.

  1. Our DCDT (Dance Connection Dance Teams) include children who want to dance without competing. Anyone can join this dance club and be involved in extra community performances and events.
  2. Ballet Company serves our youth who love ballet. Professional choreographers visit Palo Alto to create choreography for our dancers to perform both classical and modern works.
  3. The DCPC (Dance Connection Performing Company) is a competitive, highly skilled group of serious dancers who dedicate their time to dancing. Palo Alto Dance Connection has been a top award winner at regional competitions with some students attending nationals. This is the SYTYCD (So You Think You Can Dance) of our Palo Alto Community. Though we appreciate the talent, the award that our teachers and parents most appreciate winning is the "best studio" award for friendly, polite, and respectful dancers.

- **Community Events:** Dance Connection has always been actively involved in our local community events including:
  1. May Fete Parade
  2. City of Palo Alto Toys for Kids program with an annual benefit performance from the start of DC until 2002 with Dance Connection as a large provider of new toys for our local youth including East Palo Alto and East Menlo Park as well as Palo Alto.
3. Annual Breast Cancer Benefit which has been co-sponsored by the City of Palo Alto. This will be our 11th annual benefit at the Cubberley Theatre in 2013 with all proceeds to benefit a breast cancer organization such as SF Komen for the Cure. The City has donated the theatre rental for the performance, and Dance Connection pays the theatre technical staffing and all other expenses.

4. We are holding our 14th Annual Nutcracker Ballet at the Spangenberg Theatre. Local talent and homegrown community involvement at its finest where parents and children can perform together. Please join us!

5. Annual Winter Showcase performance for M Company in San Jose to benefit a cancer organization or other medical foundation.

6. Donations to all local schools and community organizations for several years. Dance Connection provides Nutcracker and other performance tickets (Cinderella, Coppelia, and Sleeping Beauty Ballets) or Summer Dance Camp scholarships to our local youth and community. DC also offers scholarships to students in financial need.

7. Los Altos Festival of Lights Parade

8. Any other community event. We performed at the California Avenue Farmer's Market Blossom Birth Halloween Carnival recently. A Halloween themed performance which even included Nutcracker variations in pointe shoes on the "street" stage! Next month, we will perform some Nutcracker pieces at the Fairmont Hotel for the Christmas in the Park Breakfast with Santa. When we are asked to perform for the community, we are there!

9. Nutcracker PJ Story Time: Each year, we have a story time the Friday night before our Nutcracker performance. Free to children ages 4-8 at our studio with children wearing their pajamas to learn about the Nutcracker Ballet and see some of the characters dance and visit with them.

- **Director/Founder:** Cindy Ginanni, a third generation Palo Alto resident. My grandfather, Eugene Raffarin was the chef to Lucie Stern. We are honored to live in the home purchased by Aunt Lucie for my grandparents, who came from France. My husband, Mark is a teacher at Jordan Middle School along with our oldest son, Joe. Our daughter-in-law teaches at Terman Middle School. Our youngest son manages a local restaurant, and our daughter is an artist who lives in Steamboat Springs, CO. Growing up, our children enjoyed the benefits our community has to offer--including education, recreation, and arts. We hope to pass this along to the future of the Palo Alto children.

- **Goals:** Palo Alto Dance Connection hopes to remain at Cubberley, and our plan is to stay until we are "kicked out." We will be happy with a 5 year lease, ecstatic with a 10 year lease, and even glad to remain month to month. Sharing space with a PAUSD or private school or a community center fits our youth-oriented values, and we welcome the opportunity to plan for the future in a positive way.

Thank you for the time you dedicate in your efforts to promote the good of the community for everyone.

Sincerely,

*Cindy Ginanni*
1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the November 14 and November 28 meeting action notes
   • Approved as amended

4. Presentation by the CCAC Facilities Subcommittee
   • CCAC Facilities Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Hetterly presented a Power Point on how colocation might work from a space perspective (ATTACHED)
   • Hetterly explained that with a redesigned site that maximizes potential efficiencies the square footage of the site can be greatly increased and, in their opinion, can meet the needs of both the City and PAUSD
   • Hetterly communicated this message by showing both current maps of the site and pie charts that show the break-down of how land at Cubberley is currently being used
   • Hetterly reiterated her subcommittee’s support for underground parking

5. Presentation by the CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee
   • CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis presented a Power Point on the demands, services, and needs of Cubberley and its users (ATTACHED)
   • Reklis noted that demand for services will increase at all age levels as the population of Palo Alto grows
   • She does not believe that it is within the scope of the committee to determine who should be tenants and instead recommends a community services needs study done by a professional
   • Believes current programs can be maintained while allowing flexibility for future City and PAUSD site needs

   • A discussion on these two presentations by the CCAC members then occurred
   • CCAC member Brian Carilli commented that the Cubberley site, as currently designed, is extremely inefficient and with rebuilt structures could drastically increase the capacity of the site
• CCAC members agreed that other options for PAUSD school design should be explored because the land costs of Palo Alto have changed the ability of the PAUSD to construct structures in the way they have historically.
• CCAC member John Markevitch commented that just because larger structures can be built an understanding of the impact of those efficiencies should be known on the student quality of life.
• CCAC members then discussed preferences and ideas they had for a rebuilt Cubberley site specifically related to how the school structure itself might be built.
• CCAC members then discussed the impacts that action or inaction would have on the status quo and the costs associated with such action or inaction.
• Question: Can construction be done in stages?
• The CCAC then continued their discussion of the site specially around operational efficiencies such as bicycle and pedestrian access for local residents.

6. Tour of the Y2E2 building
   • The CCAC went on a tour of the building

7. Future meetings
   • The next CCAC meeting was set for December 19th at 5:30 PM at Cubberley

8. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 16

December 19, 2012
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • Palo Alto Adult School Principal Kara Rosenberg spoke and recommended that the group ensure facilities are maintained that can support high quality programs that are broadly appealing and have sufficient parking and lighting.

3. Discussion and voting on initial Cubberley policy proposals
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb introduced the topics that will be discussed and asked the group to keep the conversations at a high-level as much as possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCAC Members Present for Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Ellson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern Beecham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Furman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Tanaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hetterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanie Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Kirner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carilli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Reklis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Samoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The CCAC started by discussing which of the five medium-term and long-term scenarios they should recommend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>The entire Cubberley site becomes a joint / shared City / PAUSD use facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario B | The City retains 8 acres and the PAUSD retains 27 acres with each cooperatively determining their respective uses. (In this scenario, the location of the 8 acres on the site may be changed if mutually agreed).
---|---
Scenario C | The City pursues planning for and use of its 8 acres independent of the PAUSD plans/uses for their 27 acres.
Scenario D | No decision is made about the medium-term use of the Cubberley site by the PAUSD, with the assumption that there will be no high school use for a 15 – 25 year time period (status quo). The PAUSD decision regarding the use of the site for a high school will be made at some future time, but not immediately.
Scenario E | The entire 35 acre site will eventually be returned to PAUSD uses.

- Scenarios D and E were removed from the CCAC’s list of recommended scenarios
- Members expressed strong support for Scenario A but made note of potential difficulties with it and recognized that another scenario might have to be eventually selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is the strong recommendation of the CCAC to recommend Scenario A</td>
<td>17-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The CCAC then discussed how to phrase a number of subsequent recommendations they felt should be made now that Scenario A had been selected as their recommended alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City and PAUSD should renegotiate a [lease extension] option with additional conditions</td>
<td>17-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CCAC member Greg Tanaka arrived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current covenant not to develop should be removed from a Cubberley lease extension</td>
<td>18-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The CCAC acknowledged that addressing different issues independently affords them greater flexibility in their recommendations and helps to clarify their position on each issue
A long discussion then ensued about pros and cons of a five-year lease versus a 10-year lease.

It was understood that it is likely major renovations on the full site would not take place for at least 10 years but many members expressed an interest in recommending a shorter lease because they felt it would encourage the City Council and School Board to act faster.

The CCAC then discussed what the best milestones would be in a revised lease to ensure that the City and PAUS proceeded with an expedited site planning process.

CCAC Co-Chair Mandy Lowell arrived.

CCAC member Jim Schmidt left.

Capital expenses in the first five years of the lease extension should be shared.

A site master plan needs to be developed in the first five years [of any lease extension].

In the first five years [of any lease extension] there should be a community needs assessment with professional support.

The CCAC should recommend a five year lease extension that is automatically extended to ten years if certain milestones are met.
• The CCAC recognized that the 10-3-5 vote on the lease extension term described above was not sufficient for their final report and would need to be revisited

4. Future meetings
• City of Palo Alto Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie and Cobb informed the CCAC that they should be prepared to meet weekly until the end of February following New Years

5. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 17

January 9, 2013
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Room H-1
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the December 12 and December 19 meeting action notes
   • Approved

4. Continued discussion and voting on initial Cubberley policy proposals
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb introduced the topics that will be discussed and asked the CCAC to work towards getting through as many policy recommendation votes as possible. He reminded the CCAC that there did not appear to be a consensus recommendation from the last meeting on whether the CCAC should recommend a five or a ten-year lease and his hope is that they would be able to reach a consensus on that issue tonight.

   • It was discussed that an MOU should guide the creation of a master plan for the site and that ultimately the MOU might go through multiple iterations but there needs to be an initial agreement to get the process started. It’s important an MOU come before a master plan is created.
   • It was agreed that a community needs assessment should also be developed at the same time as the master plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a condition of any lease extension or renewal, an MOU shall be developed within one year of its execution that determines how a community needs assessment and master plan will be developed within five years.</td>
<td>19-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ken Allen arrived
- The CCAC discussed the role that expanded joint-use of existing facilities should have in a lease extension and it was agreed upon that this is important for the City and PAUSD to explore because it is reflective of their willingness to work together which is important to the CCAC.
- It was then discussed and agreed upon that this is a general, free-standing recommendation that is not intended to be included in a lease extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City and PAUSD shall explore the possibility of expanding City/PAUSD joint-use agreement models including the expansion of joint-use at City and PAUSD facilities.</td>
<td>20-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It was discussed that improvements to Cubberley shall be identified that can serve most, if not all, current and potential site uses but funding and implementation methods do not have to be identified within the one-year horizon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a condition of any lease extension or renewal, within one year of its execution near term improvements to Cubberley shall be identified that can serve most, if not all, current and potential site uses (example: restrooms for playing fields).</td>
<td>20-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It was conveyed that there is currently a review process in place that is used by the City for who gets space when it becomes available at Cubberley.
- It was clarified that the group is OK with things being terms of the lease that have not yet been completed (example: a mandate to enter into a MOU can be in a lease even if the referenced MOU has not been drafted).
- It was clarified that some of these recommendations are recommended as conditions of agreements not agreements themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any new leasing of the space should be done so in the context of the developing MOU, community needs assessment, and revised master plan.</td>
<td>20-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It was generally agreed that funding site improvements at Cubberley is not compatible with a 2014 bond measure because of time constraints and general uncertainties surrounding the project.
• It was proposed that some near-term Cubberley needs be considered for inclusion in a 2014 bond measure; however, it was ultimately agreed upon that logistically that would not work because bonds can only pay for “bricks and mortar,” not analysis, and at this time further analysis is what’s needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A long-term master plan for Cubberley should not be part of a 2014 ballot measure.</td>
<td>20-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The CCAC discussed the pros and cons of a five-year versus a ten-year lease but once again the group was not able to reach a consensus on which alternative they should recommend.
• For the sake of future conversations a straw vote was taken of the CCAC of which alternative they favor and the results are presented below but not all CCAC members present voted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Straw Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 year lease</td>
<td>8 In favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year lease</td>
<td>9 In Favor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Update and discussion regarding the next CCAC Community Forum
• It was stated that the next CCAC forum would be Thursday, January 24th at 7:30 PM in the Cubberley Theater.

6. Future meetings
• The next CCAC meeting is Wednesday, January 16th at 5:30 PM

7. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

DRAFT Action Notes

Meeting # 18

January 16, 2013
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Theater
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the January 9 meeting action notes
   • Approved as amended

4. Continued discussion and voting on initial Cubberley policy proposals
   • CCAC Co-Chair Mandy Lowell introduced the agenda item and led the continued discussion on this item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCAC Members Present for Voting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bailey</td>
<td>Jennifer Hetterly</td>
<td>Jean Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern Beecham</td>
<td>Claire Kirner</td>
<td>Anne Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa Bouchard</td>
<td>Mandy Lowell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carilli</td>
<td>Diane Reklis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cobb</td>
<td>Rachel Samoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crystal</td>
<td>Jim Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Ellson</td>
<td>Lanie Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Group decided that talking about a five-year versus a ten-year lease cannot be a stand alone discussion and must be done in the context of the parameters that would be associated with either lease alternative
• CCAC School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham suggested that the group discuss what they want the lease to accomplish instead of just the length of the term (since that seems to be causing the group trouble)
• City of Palo Alto Community Services Division Manager Rob de Geus said it would take at least one to two years for a community needs assessment to be completed
• The group then had a discussion of the benefits of a ten-year lease and the opportunities that would present
• It was communicated that currently City Manager Jim Keene has the authority to enter into up-to a five-year leases at Cubberley without City Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Straw Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend a 10-year lease with a reopener clause at year 5 if certain criteria are not met</td>
<td>6-10-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Straw Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend a 5-year lease with an additional 5-year option that is executed with mutual consent</td>
<td>10-6-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Throughout the course of the conversation recommendations came up that were generally agreed upon with no discussion necessary. Those items are captured in the list below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of Consensus with a 5-Year or 10-Year Lease</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria must be established that forces policymakers to make real progress on Cubberley within the first five years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A MOU and site master must be a part of any lease extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with Cubberley rental policies, income should be maximized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for maintenance or redevelopment needs to be determined within the first five years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Lessa Bouchard left
• Penny Ellson left
• A discussion then occurred around site governance and the fact that drafting and entering into all of the referenced agreements (MOU, site master plan, etc.) will require a policy making structure to be in place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City and PAUSD should further investigate alternative forms of governance and determine a governance structure for joint use of Cubberley</td>
<td>14-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Rachel Samoff left
• The group then had a discussion of whether or not moving forward with joint-use excludes the City from building a facility on its 8-acres before the PAUSD builds something
• Then a number of comments were made that the City moving forward with construction on its own 8-acres is not what is intended by recommending joint-use and that the full 35-acre site should be developed in unison
• Jim Schmidt left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phased construction should occur consistent with the MOU and site master plan to minimize disruption to existing users</td>
<td>11-0-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Update and discussion regarding the next CCAC Community Forum
   • Information about the next CCAC forum on January 24th was provided

6. Future meeting
   • Next CCAC meeting is Wednesday, January 30th

7. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

DRAFT Action Notes

Meeting # 19

January 30, 2013
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Theater
5:30-7:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   - None

3. Approval of the January 16 meeting action notes
   - Approved

4. Community Needs Subcommittee presentation on how to select future Cubberley tenants when space becomes available
   - Presentation was made by Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis
   - SEE ATTACHED POWER POINT
   - CCAC members had a conversation about the pros and cons of this methodology
   - CCAC member Penny Ellson asked if the presented selection criteria would be helpful to policymakers.
   - Multiple CCAC members asked if it would be possible to really quantify all tenants in this way
   - CCAC members recognized that the process for selecting new tenants was difficult but did not believe that the presented methodology would be that easy to implement and had concerns about being able to accurately quantify the applicants in the manner presented
5. Continued discussion and voting on initial Cubberley policy proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCAC Members Present for Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern Beecham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carilli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cobb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Susan Bailey left
- Question # 1 Discussed: Should the CCAC recommend the inclusion of the next five years of deferred maintenance costs in a 2014 bond measure?
- Group discussed pros and cons of going out for such funds and whether or not it should be limited to the first five years
- Based on the direction of the conversation by the group, Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie proposed wording the following recommendation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CCAC recommends the City Council include in a 2014 bond measure the flexibility to include capital improvements necessary to maintain building life for 10 years at Cubberley</td>
<td>18-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lessa Bouchard left
- Question # 2 Discussed: Given the flattening and potential decline in UUT revenues, should the new lease continue to include an automatic CPI inflator?
- CCAC members decided not to vote on this
- Question # 3 Discussed: In the new lease, should PAUSD contribute to the cost of ongoing maintenance and routine repairs?
- CCAC members decided not to vote on this
- Question # 4 Discussed: There have been $18 M of capital improvements which have been identified to extend the life of the buildings for 25 years ($10 M on PAUSD owned buildings; $8 M on City owned buildings). Funding for these improvements has not been identified. Should the costs be shared between the City and PAUSD?
- By way of the vote on Question # 1 the CCAC decided there will not be a vote on Question # 4
- Question # 5 Discussed: What should the CCAC recommend occur in the event that the City and PAUSD are not able to successfully accomplish the task that will be outlined for them to complete in the first five years of a lease extension?
- CCAC members decided not to make a recommendation on this
• CCAC members then had a discussion about a recommendation made on December 19, 2012 that ended in a 10-3-5 vote and how by changing the categorization of the vote they would be able to more accurately reflect the tone of the conversation that night. From that conversation they came up with the following recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change the recommendation made on December 19, 2012 that reads “The CCAC should recommend a five year lease extension that is automatically extended to ten years if certain milestones are met” from a recommendation to a straw vote</td>
<td>17-0-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• It was also requested and agreed upon that the dates of any policy recommendation votes should be added to any record of them.

6. Discussion of the CCAC final report outline
• Finance Subcommittee reported they are on their second to last draft
• School Needs subcommittee reported they are almost done with their report
• Finance Subcommittee reported they are basically done with their report but might need to clean it up slightly
• Community Needs Subcommittee is down to the final revisions of their report

7. Discussion of how the CCAC will present its final report and findings
• Co-Chair Mike Cobb reported his plan for presenting the CCAC’s findings, the main element of which is holding a joint, public meeting in early March with the City Council and School Board at Cubberley
• The CCAC was agreeable to this and staff will poll the policymakers for that joint session

8. Future meetings
• Next meeting is Wednesday, February 13, 2013 at 5:30 PM

9. Adjournment
1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   - None

3. Approval of the January 30 meeting action notes
   - Approved

4. Update and discussion on the February 7, 2013 CPAC meeting
   - Co-Chair Mike Cobb conveyed the message that he felt he received from Mayor Scharff that the CCAC’s recommendations don’t seem to be specific enough
   - School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham brought up the concern that some members of the CPAC expressed that the CCAC’s current recommendations seem to be “kicking the can down the road”
   - Finance Subcommittee Chair Lanie Wheeler conveyed that the three City Council members of the CPAC expressed some concern that the CCAC was not making a recommendation of what the City should do with their eight acres on its own in the event that joint-use doesn’t work out
   - Co-Chair Mandy Lowell conveyed that the CPAC might need clarification on the term joint-use and what is meant by that.
     - Does the CCAC really mean integrated use or do they mean joint-use?
   - Beecham also conveyed the message that some members of the CPAC want to use citizen volunteers and not consultants to do the next round of work the CCAC is recommending
     - Cobb noted that because of this the CCAC needs to make the case for what professionals bring to the table

5. Presentation and discussion of the Facilities Subcommittee and School Needs Subcommittee draft final reports
Beecham started by going through the draft School Needs Subcommittee final report.

Beecham noted his group did not try to dispute the projections of the PAUSD demographer.

Beecham noted the uncertainty surrounding ABAG and how it could impact both school enrollment and the overall City population.

Beecham reiterated the main drivers of enrollment increases are the economy and housing growth along with the sustained quality of the PAUSD schools.

- As long as those stay somewhat stable over time the projections are fine for the most part.

Beecham is happy to take input on how he can clarify any recommendations the School Needs Subcommittee is making and why.

Facilities Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Hetterly then went through the draft Facilities Subcommittee final report.

The CCAC went over again the issues that have arisen with joint-use and the implications they have related to future facilities and a joint-use master plan.

CCAC decided not to make changes to the report as drafted and keep the recommendations general in nature as they currently are.

CCAC member Brian Carilli reminded the CCAC that five years is a long time in a lot of instances but not in long term, joint-use planning such as this.

6. Presentation and discussion of what is meant by joint-use
   - CCAC clarified that their vision is for true joint-use of the buildings with PAUSD and the rest of the community using the same buildings at different times.
   - Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie reiterated the comments he had heard about people being concerned with the general public using buildings with school students so what joint-use specifically means needs to be clarified.

7. Discussion of next steps and the final report review process
   - Joint City Council/PAUSD forum where the CCAC will present their findings will be scheduled for early to mid-March.
     - The final report will be distributed one week in advance.

8. Future meetings
   - Next meeting: Wednesday, February 20

9. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

Action Notes

Meeting # 21

February 20, 2013
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Cubberley Theater
5:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the February 13 meeting action notes
   • Approved as amended to clarify CCAC School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham’s statement on ABAG changes

4. Presentation and discussion of the Finance Subcommittee and Community Needs Subcommittee draft final reports
   • CCAC Finance Subcommittee Chair Lanie Wheeler presented the draft Finance Subcommittee final report
   • Wheeler gave an overview of their draft final report and the major recommendations in it
   • Wheeler answered questions about their draft recommendation 4.3: “One Time Re-Development of Cubberley” and how that process would go
   • CCAC members clarified that a clear figure on what it will cost to construct a joint-use facility would be helpful at this time, and will be necessary in the future, but currently one does not exists so only ranges of what those costs might be should be presented
   • CCAC Finance Subcommittee member Susan Bailey and Wheeler explained how a joint-use facility could be bonded through a vote that only requires the 55% vote threshold (versus the two-thirds vote threshold) if it is done through the PAUSD
   • CCAC Finance Subcommittee member Anne Wilson in response to CCAC member concerns agreed to add line items to draft recommendation 4.3: “One Time Re-Development of Cubberley” to clarify the costs associated with a Cubberley joint-use rebuild
   • CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Chair Diane Reklis presented the draft Community Needs Subcommittee final report
• CCAC members had a discussion on the proposed community needs assessment and how both the City and the PAUSD would be involved in that
• CCAC members concluded that the City and PAUSD should work on the community needs assessment cooperatively from the beginning
• CCAC members also agreed that professionals were needed for the community needs assessment and the site programing they are recommending
  o CCAC members agreed they are not qualified to do, or capable of doing, these tasks themselves as the CPAC has suggested because of the magnitude of the scope of work
• Community Needs Subcommittee reminded the CCAC that the City and PAUSD have worked together for a while at school sites by having City childcare on elementary school sites

5. Discussion of next steps
• CCAC final report is due to the printer on Friday, March 8
• CCAC final report will be distributed on Wednesday, March 13
• CCAC final report forum is likely to be Wednesday, March 20

6. Future meetings
• Next meeting will be Thursday, February 28th instead of Wednesday, February 27th because the State of the City speech is February 27th
  o The meeting will start at 5:30 PM and will not have an end time to ensure are necessary issues are resolved

7. Adjournment
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC)

DRAFT Action Notes
(Will stay draft as these are the action notes from the last meeting so they can't be approved)

Meeting # 22

February 28, 2013
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Cubberley Theater
5:30 PM

1. Welcome and call to order

2. Oral communications
   • None

3. Approval of the February 20 meeting action notes

4. Presentation and discussion of the draft CCAC Final Report Problems & Solutions summary document
   • CCAC discussed a number of edits they wanted made to the CCAC Problems & Solutions summary document
     o CCAC decided to call it the Opportunities & Solutions document in the final report instead of the CCAC Problems & Solutions summary document
   • CCAC member PennyEllson requested there be a history of Cubberley up front that lays out a lot of the big picture issues and facts that are the basis for the CCAC's conclusions
   • City of Palo Alto Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie recommended an expanded history based on what is currently described in the document
   • Ellson also requested a greater emphasis on site accessibility occur in the document
   • CCAC School Needs Subcommittee Chair Bern Beecham suggested that who owns which acres at Cubberley should be clarified in the document
   • CCAC member Brian Carilli reiterated “the owners are the public”
   • CCAC Facilities Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Hetterly raised the issue of when the property will be taken back under School District control versus when a new high school will open
• Beecham stated he felt there was a bias in the document towards the City in the tone of what was written and the editor should work to change that
  o The group agreed a bias was not intended
• CCAC agreed to strengthen the point that what is needed is the best solution for the community as a whole not for just the City or the School District
• CCAC continued talking through each page of the draft CCAC Final Report Problems & Solutions summary document making changes as they went
• Beecham stated that $7 M would be equally painful a loss for the School District as it would be for the City
• Prior to the end of the meeting Hetterly moved, seconded by Ellson, that the City should not relinquish ownership of its 8 acres on the Cubberley site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCAC Members Present for Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern Beecham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carilli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crystal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City should not relinquish ownership of its 8 acres</td>
<td>13-4-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion of next steps
• CCAC decided they did not need to meet again
• CCAC agreed that all edits could be incorporated by the report editor
  CCAC Co-Chair Mike Cobb

6. Future meetings
• None

7. Adjournment
Cubberley Master Plan
CUBBERLEY CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN

JANUARY 30, 1991

Changes have been made to the original document to reflect City Council actions taken at their May 6, 1991 meeting. Copies of the City Council Meeting Minutes and the Alternate Field Design layout have been included in the Appendix. Specific revisions make reference to the eight points of the main motion, four findings and three conditions which begin on page 65-162 of the May 6, 1991 City Council Meeting Minutes. See the Appendix, page 55.

Changes in text and references are designated with a screened background. Changes in graphics are outlined with a dashed border.
This report is organized in five distinct sections and each page of each section is identified by symbol in the upper right hand corner for reference purposes.

**Background:** This section briefly summarizes the lease of the Cubberley site by the City of Palo Alto, project objectives for the proposed Community Center and a description of the public input process.

**Existing Conditions:** This section describes the existing site location, buildings, parking and circulation, athletic fields and landscaping. In addition, existing tenants and their locations as of June 30, 1990 are noted.

**Master Plan:** This section sets forth a vision of what the Cubberley site could become in the future. A building program is described based on the Neighborhood Concept. Individual projects are also described with associated construction costs.

**Recommended Implementation:** This section makes recommendations as to which projects in the Master Plan will be initially implemented and describes proposed location of tenants.

**Appendix:** The Appendix contains supporting documentation for the report including sample questionnaires distributed to the public and their summaries, existing and proposed tenant schedules, analyses of off-street parking requirements and estimates of probable construction cost.
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BACKGROUND

CUBBERLEY LEASE

In 1987, it was proposed that the City of Palo Alto lease surplus school sites from the Palo Alto Unified School District. Such a lease was to accomplish two goals: to preserve in public hands the open space and buildings of the surplus school sites and to help alleviate the School District's financial problems. In November 1987, a comprehensive financial package for a utility users' tax was placed on the ballot and was approved by a majority of the voters. It was anticipated that the tax revenues would be used for a variety of purposes including repair of sidewalks, street improvements and lease payments to the School District. With funds provided for by the utility users' tax, a lease was signed allowing the City of Palo Alto to take over operations of Jordan School and Jane Lathrop Stanford School sites. In May 1988, the Palo Alto Unified School District determined that it would reoccupy these two sites and would substitute the Cubberley High School site in the lease. In January 1990, the City of Palo Alto assumed occupancy of the Cubberley High School site located at 4000 Middlefield Road in Palo Alto.

To proceed with the City's anticipated occupancy of the Cubberley High School site, it was necessary to perform a site condition survey as required under the terms of the lease. CSS Associates Architects was authorized in June 1989 to conduct the required survey of the Cubberley site. The report, Site Condition Survey of Ellwood P. Cubberley High School completed in September 1989, evaluated the general condition of existing buildings and related systems but did not evaluate landscaping, athletic fields or the parking lots in any depth.

The survey covered the following areas:

- General condition of the buildings from physical and cosmetic standpoints.
- Analysis of mechanical and electrical systems.
- Safety and fire code conformance.
- Architectural barrier code conformance.

- Swimming pool and related equipment.
- Statement regarding seismic conditions, fire sprinklers and sound barriers for future reference.
- The status of asbestos containment and control.

The improvements identified by CSS Associates Architects in these seven areas were divided by building into three categories: (1) code, (2) condition and (3) interior repair. Code improvements included fire and life safety and handicapped access deficiencies. Condition improvements included maintenance items required to make the facility's mechanical and electrical systems function properly and reliably. Such improvements included reroofing, exterior painting, insulation and door replacement. Interior repairs encompassed painting, replacement of ceiling tiles, floor finishes, replacement or renovation of interior equipment and fixtures.

The condition assessment by CSS Associates Architects was the first step in the planning process. Following the completion of the this study, the City of Palo Alto contracted with Spencer Associates, Architects & Planners to prepare a Master Plan for the Cubberley site. The following report summarizes an eight month public input and design process and recommendations for the development of the Cubberley site.
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this project is to develop an attractive and well-functioning community center at the Cubberley site that meets a broad range of public needs.

This objective is being achieved by the development of this Master Plan consisting of the following phases:

1. Programming Phase: Spencer Associates and staff members of the City of Palo Alto have conducted a series of workshops to identify, review and refine community program needs. This has involved members of community music, art, and dance groups, athletic field users, neighborhood representatives, current tenants and hourly users, Foothill College Staff and City Staff.

2. Draft Master Plan Phase: Based upon the program needs, several conceptual site plans have been developed. These have been reviewed and refined through the community workshop process.

3. Final Master Plan Phase: In this stage the Draft Master Plan has been refined and a detailed cost estimate has been prepared.

Following the Palo Alto City Council approval of the Cubberley Master Plan, a consultant will be retained to prepare preliminary design documents for both buildings and site development based on the broad concepts presented in the Master Plan. The Master Plan is intended to present conceptual guidelines in the development of the Cubberley site. It is expected that changes will occur as the Master Plan is implemented.

Following this, construction documents will be prepared, which will finalize the details of buildings and site design and tenant locations. Finally, projects will be put out to bid as funding is available, general contractors will be selected and construction of the projects will progress.

PUBLIC INPUT

As a first step in the process, a program for the use of the Cubberley site was developed. Information for determining the program was collected from the public at several times through several different means. A series of site use objectives were then developed which list and discuss the preferred uses of the Cubberley site. The Master Plan was developed in response to these objectives. The result is a plan which allocates space and funding to provide for optimum benefit to the community as a whole.

Throughout the public input process, the public response was generally positive. The neighbors, current users and potential users of Cubberley were supportive of the objectives the City of Palo Alto had for the site and as a group were pleased to be involved in the process of shaping the future of Cubberley. The community had concerns about preserving the track, trees and open space and limiting the amount of space reserved for parking lots.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

A series of six meetings were held, each of which was publicized in the Times Tribune and the Palo Alto Weekly. Neighbors and current tenants of the facility were notified by mail of the meetings.

Meeting 1

The first meeting was composed of four separate, smaller meetings, held on February 6 and 7, 1990, with different potential user groups: the arts, neighbors, existing long term tenants, and hourly users (including athletics, ballroom dance groups, and musical and theatrical groups). During the first meeting, the public was briefed on the process and were encouraged to "dream" about the potential uses and vision of Cubberley High School. 104 people attended this first series of meetings.

At the end of the meetings, the following major points were confirmed:
• The neighborhood and current and future users are supportive of the City’s objectives for the Cubberley site.
• Sustained public demand and support continues for current site uses, including Athletics, Childcare, Education (primarily Foothill College), Music and Theater Performance, Non-Profit/Community Work, and various Recreational Activities (most notably, Social Dance and aerobics programs).
• Demand for new site uses of Dance and Visual Art is high.
• Current parking of 715 spaces is insufficient.
• Athletic fields should be maximized.
• Aesthetics of the site need improvement.

Meeting 2

On March 13, the second public meeting was held and over 125 people were in attendance. At that meeting, the community reviewed the design concepts, including a series of "dream alternatives", that were prepared in response to the proposed improvement and service ideas that were provided by the community at the first public meeting. From this meeting, the following major points were concluded:

• Additional parking must be provided, even if this requires a parking structure. However, the 1300 spaces estimated to be required by code seemed excessive. The community asked staff to investigate methods to reduce the impact of this requirement on the site. Suggested alternatives included shuttles, use of the neighboring shopping center lot, and improved efficiency of existing lots. Parking, however provided, should be close to structures.
• Similar site uses should be grouped together on the site in programmatic neighborhoods.
• Athletic fields must be maximized and should not be sacrificed to accommodate additional parking.
• A swimming pool would be a wonderful addition.
• Landscaping should be brought into the building area, if economically feasible.

• Additional structure should be provided for expansion.
• Two story structures are acceptable.
• Building improvement and expansion should be a higher priority than landscaping and parking structures.

Following the March 13 meeting, an initial discussion was held to focus on potential costs. The previous dream concepts were roughly estimated to be in the range of $10 to $25 million. Reviewing the potential revenues available from the Utility Users Tax over the initial ten year period, it was determined that a figure of $9 million should be used as a guideline for creating a design. (This $9 million includes approximately $3 million of code and condition work, as recommended in the study by CSS Associates Architects.) Based on this concept, it was decided that a parking structure and several other proposed structures would be prohibitively expensive. In response to this, a new plan was prepared that primarily involved remodeling and expanding the existing structures.

Meeting 3

This remodeling plan was presented at the Standing Committee for Arts and Culture Annual Forum on March 31, 1990 and at a community meeting at Cubberley on April 3, 1990. At the April 3, 1990 meeting, the design concepts were examined and a number of questions were raised concerning parking, trees, landscaping, and space allocation. Following are the major points raised by those in attendance:

• With 1074 parking spaces proposed, on site parking should be further reduced. People should be discouraged from bringing their cars. Alternative off site parking options should be pursued.
• The basic design and use patterns for the structures were well received.
• Athletic fields should be maximized.
• Relocate the proposed site for the tennis courts.
Meeting 4

Following the third meeting, the proposed plan was modified to respond to the community's concerns. This revised plan was presented to the community for final review on Thursday, April 26, 1990. More than 200 people were in attendance, with the majority attending for the first time. Since the prior meeting, a group of people became upset that the traditional 440 yard running track was being replaced with a perimeter running/par course and attended the meeting to save the track. With a petition with over 600 signatures in hand, they demanded a commitment to change the plan that very evening. The alternative presented that evening which recommended the removal of the track had been developed by staff to more efficiently use the athletic fields and create some additional playing fields that are needed to meet the ever-increasing demand for such space. A commitment was made to modify the plan to include the track and delete the perimeter running/par course. This group also wanted the bleachers retained and City Staff stated that this was subject to safety analysis. The demands for retaining the track dominated the meeting; there were no other recommended changes except those required by the reconfigured athletic fields.

Meeting 5

A fifth public meeting was held on Wednesday, June 20, 1990 to inform the public of the intention of City Staff to proceed to the Planning Commission, Architectural Review Board, and the Palo Alto City Council with two plans instead of the anticipated one. Plan A reflects the plan originally presented to the public on April 26. Plan B reflects the comments of April 26 in its retention of the 440 yard track.

A portion of those attending voiced their support of Plan B. It was also suggested that Cubberley be left intact and that the site should be used without any renovations.

Based on this community response and further analysis of the alternatives, a modified Plan B with the retention of the track was selected as the most appropriate for Palo Alto. This plan is the basis for this proposed Master Plan.

Meeting 6

A sixth and final public meeting was held on September 11, 1990 to inform the public of the time schedule and present the proposed Master Plan and Implementation Plan.

QUESTIONNAIRES

In conjunction with public meetings, the public was encouraged to respond in writing. After the first public meeting, 51 responded to the lengthy questionnaire, and 56 responded to the abbreviated questionnaire placed in the Palo Alto Weekly. Over the course of the process, over 250 written responses were received, including many thoughtful and lengthy letters. A high percentage of responses and requests for space came from the Ballroom Dance Groups, Educational Group, Visual Artists, and Fine Art Dancers. The responses from the questionnaires reinforced the information gathered during the public meetings. A summary of responses was prepared by Palo Alto City Staff and is included in the appendix with samples of each of the questionnaires.
EXISTING CONDITIONS
SITE LOCATION

The Cubberley site is located at 4000 Middlefield Road in Palo Alto. It is bounded by Middlefield Road, a busy arterial, and a residential neighborhood to the north; the Charleston Shopping Center, single family residences and Charleston Road to the west; Nelson Drive and the Greenmeadow neighborhood to the south; and the Greendell Elementary School, single family residences and San Antonio Road to the east.

Vehicular access to the site is located at three points along Middlefield Road with the primary entry at the intersection of Middlefield Road and Montrose Avenue. Although two gated entries exist off of Nelson Drive on the south side of the site, these are used for emergency access only. No vehicular access to the site is possible along the east and west boundaries.
SITE DESCRIPTION

The Cubberley site is comprised of 1,545,030 square feet (35.45 acres), divided as follows:

BUILDINGS

The Cubberley site presently has 22 buildings with a collective area of 181,969 square feet. Buildings include 3 gymnasiums (Pavilion, Gyms A and B), a theater and music building (M), a multi-purpose building (MP), an administrative building (I), and 15 classroom buildings (A, B, C, D, E, F, FH, H, J, K, L, P, S, T, U, V), including some workshops and art labs. Many of the classroom buildings have been modified to accommodate the needs of present tenants.

PARKING AND CIRCULATION

Existing off-street parking comprises approximately 325,000 square feet of paved areas providing 715 parking spaces. Parking areas are situated on the east, south and west sides of the buildings. Street parking is permitted on Middlefield Road on the north side of the site and on Nelson bordering the south side of the site to support the use of the athletic fields. In addition, automobiles park informally among the trees bordering the west side of the site and the Charleston Shopping Center parking lot is utilized by visitors during peak hours of activity.

An analysis of the City of Palo Alto's "Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations" included in the Appendix indicates that a total of 1,178 parking spaces are required based on the existing use of the site. An analysis of actual parking needs at peak hours of activity (see Parking and Circulation, page 20) is less but still causes congestion during weekday evening hours.

The existing site is accessed by automobiles from entry driveways located at the northeast and northwest corners of the site. Vehicular circulation is generally one-way around the east, south and west sides of the buildings. This is due to two restricted points of circulation which include a one-way road on the south side of the Pavilion connecting front and rear parking lots and a one-way road located between the south side of Buildings J, K, and L and the existing tennis courts. Both areas have created hazardous situations for pedestrian and vehicular circulation.

ATHLETIC FIELDS

Occupying 694,500 square feet, the athletic fields are located on the south end of the Cubberley site, bordering Nelson Drive. Playing fields include two softball diamonds (one recently converted from a baseball diamond (4)) and overlapping soccer fields. A 440 yard running track (2) with accompanying bleachers and an infield used for soccer (9) and rugby is located on the east end of the fields. Six tennis courts (3) are located behind Buildings J and K. A par course with exercise stations is located at the perimeter of the athletic fields. The softball and soccer fields are used for numerous formal and informal games by both youth and adult leagues. The track, in need of repair, is used by individuals in the neighborhood and for one Foothill walking class. The tennis courts are also used by neighbors, the Palo Alto Tennis Club, and Foothill classes.

LANDSCAPING

Spread throughout the Cubberley site, landscaping covers 167,500 square feet. The majority of the landscape is mixed with structures and pedestrian circulation. Although originally designed for planting, the areas between the structures are primarily covered with asphalt paving and support small to medium sized trees. The landscaped areas bordering Middlefield Road on the north side of the buildings are planted with grass. The areas to the east of Buildings S and T and to the west of Building K have been fenced off and converted to play areas for the Childcare programs in those buildings.
**TENANTS**

Since the Palo Alto Unified School District terminated its use of Cubberley as a high school, the site has been used for multiple purposes. Current site uses include the following:

- Athletic Programs
- Childcare
- Conference/Hourly Rental
- Educational Activities
- Music & Theater Rehearsal/Performance
- Non-Profit Community Organizations
- Recreation

As of January 1, 1990, three types of tenants used the Cubberley site. The Palo Alto Unified School District rented 42,722 SF, primarily in Buildings D, E, F, FH, H, L and U, which it vacated on June 30, 1990 in accordance with the lease agreement between the School District and the City of Palo Alto.

An additional nine long term tenants, listed below, continue to occupy 62,103 square feet of the building area. The City of Palo Alto has agreed to honor the existing leases of these tenants through the end of June 30, 1992, at which time they will be up for renewal.

The remainder of the site, 76,164 square feet, is rented on a non-exclusive, hourly basis to various user groups. A detailed accounting of existing tenant and uses can be found in the Appendix which lists uses by building and by hour seven days a week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Term Tenant</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foothill College(^1)</td>
<td>A,B,C,I,J,P</td>
<td>39,327 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Preschool</td>
<td>S; T1</td>
<td>8,772 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Law Revision</td>
<td>D1,2; E2</td>
<td>2,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Preparatory School</td>
<td>F4; H2,3</td>
<td>2,532 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Rescue</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1,700 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Child Center</td>
<td>K5,6,7</td>
<td>2,640 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Center</td>
<td>K3,4, 4a</td>
<td>3,120 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Traffic Safety Inst.</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>792 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua Kuang Reading Room</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>720 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,103 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Foothill College leases the Pavilion, Gym A and the Weight Room on a regular basis Monday through Thursday for its athletic programs. These spaces, however, are not accounted for as educational facilities in long term leases and are listed as athletic programs under hourly leases.
MASTER PLAN
SITE PLAN

The Master Plan Site Plan is designed to create a community center out of an existing high school site through appropriate space allocation, campus organization, renovation and construction of facilities and aesthetic improvements. The space allocation and campus organization recommended in this plan are designed to accommodate the needs of the public and create the feeling of community. The recommended facility renovation and construction will reflect the public needs and serve to transform high school facilities into useful community facilities. Coupled with aesthetic improvements, the renovated and new facilities will create a lighter, more friendly environment that will serve as a cultural, educational and social center for the citizens of Palo Alto.

PROGRAM: THE NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPT

During the public input process, numerous requests were received for space rental at Cubberley on both hourly and long term bases. The majority of responses were requests for continuance of existing programs with the two new additions being fine arts dance and visual art. With the goal of creating a community center at Cubberley, a program was adopted that would accommodate many the requested uses.

A unifying concept, Neighborhoods, was developed for Cubberley. Proposed users were grouped into Neighborhoods according to similarity of use and similarity of required facilities. It was further proposed and accepted by the public that the facilities required by a Neighborhood should be adjacent to one another and be architecturally unified. The resulting configuration of the Cubberley site would be clusters of activity spread throughout campus. This organization will promote the development of small communities of users within Cubberley. Furthermore, Cubberley will be more logically organized and will enable visitors to locate facilities with greater ease. The identified Neighborhoods and their related users as requested during the public input process are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Proposed Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Adult, SAY Basketball, Volleyball Leagues, Table Tennis Club, Weight Lifting, Little League, Willie McCovey, Babe Ruth, Pony League, Gym West, Bobby Sox Softball, Palo Alto Tennis Club, Jogging/Walking, Run Club, Bstrike Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>Syntax Children’s Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Meeting</td>
<td>Various on an hourly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Various on an hourly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubberley Administration &amp; Gallery/Cafe</td>
<td>Cubberley Administration, Food Service, Artist Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Individuals, Group Fine Art Dance instruction and rehearsal groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Foothill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music &amp; Theater</td>
<td>Theaterworks, Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra, Palo Alto Philharmonic Orchestra, Mid-Peninsula Recorder Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit/Community Organizations</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Ballroom Dancing, Square Dancing, Country Western Dance, Jazzercise, Senior Friendship Day and other special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This summary suggests the variety of user groups who are interested in using the facilities at Cubberley and it is not intended to exclude groups.
NEIGHBORHOODS
Following is the Master Plan Program which reflects space
expansion and allocation on the basis of requests and group
needs and the concept of Neighborhood clustering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>PAVILION</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GYM A,B</td>
<td>22,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIELD RESTROOM</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GYM II</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,678 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>9,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,301 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBBERLEY ADMINISTRATION &amp; GALLERY/CAFÉ</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCERS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,500 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6,638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>13,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,734 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOURLY MEETING FACILITIES</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-I</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,600 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC &amp; THEATER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEATER LOBBY</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L - BLACK BOX</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,932 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PROFIT/COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,696 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>EXPANDED MP</td>
<td>18,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,572 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,465 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>203,479 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MASTER PLAN DESCRIPTION

The Master Plan represents a vision for the development of the Cubberley site in the future. The Master Plan is composed of distinct building projects which can be implemented individually or in groups over time. Following is a description of each project and its associated construction cost at today’s costs. Total anticipated construction cost for all Master Plan projects is $18,230,000.

BUILDINGS

**Code Repairs**
$447,000

**Condition Repairs**
$2,483,000

To insure handicap accessibility, safety and reliable functioning of existing structures, all code and condition measures recommended by CSS Associates Architects and described on page 1 of this report will be undertaken for all buildings. If a building is to be demolished under this Master Plan, code and condition measures will not be undertaken. The recommended interior repairs will be undertaken as indicated under “Architectural Improvements.” If no major interior modifications are proposed, the interior repairs recommended by CSS Associates Architects are included.

**Building A/B**
$2,970,000

The high unit cost of renovating Buildings A and B (see CSS Associates Architects Cost Summary, Appendix) and the additional new building area required in the center of campus for program needs led to the decision to demolish Buildings A and B. In their place a new 2-story, 20,000 square foot Building A/B will be constructed which will provide space for a small cafe, much like Green’s at Fort Mason, a gallery for the exhibition of artists’ work and receptions, administrative offices for the City of Palo Alto’s Property Manager, classrooms and meeting rooms to be used on an hourly basis. The new building will enhance the central courtyard by providing a new facade on the west side of this space as well as promoting activity that will contribute a sense of liveliness to the courtyard. An interior courtyard will also be formed by this building and additions to Building C. This courtyard will be on axis with Building I and provide an internal focus for users of the buildings.

**Building C**
$558,000

In conjunction with the replacement of Buildings A and B, two 1-story classroom wings will be added to Building C for Foothill College. This 3,430 square foot addition will be placed on the ends of Building C forming an interior courtyard with Building A/B.

**Building FH**
$30,000

Located between Buildings F and H, Building FH will be demolished and replaced by an open courtyard space as described for Buildings D, E, and F.

**Buildings H, I, J, K, and P**
$372,000

These buildings, to be used by Foothill College, will remain unchanged except for minor exterior improvements and the code and condition renovations recommended in the report by CSS Associates Architects.

**Buildings H, I, J, K, and P**
$372,000

These buildings to be used by Foothill College (I, J, K, and P), non-profit/community organizations, and various user groups on an hourly basis (H) will remain unchanged except for minor exterior improvements and the code and condition renovations recommended in the CSS study.

**Building M and Acoustical Shell**
$415,000

The proposed addition of an outdoor stage, acoustical shell and seating area will provide facilities for concerts given by orchestral groups and small theatrical performances. The stage and shell will be constructed on the west side of Building M, which currently houses rooms for music rehearsal, and will orient to a small amphitheater in the central courtyard. It will be flanked by covered walkways on either side providing continuous covered circulation along the east side of the central courtyard.
Buildings D, E, F and U  

$993,000

Buildings E, F, and U comprising 15,465 square feet, will be renovated and subdivided into artists studios. Each studio will provide a simple environment for work that is well lit and ventilated. Interior and exterior finishes will be refurbished and new sinks and ventilation installed in each of the studios as required. The building cross section of Buildings E and F as well as Building D, which will be occupied by Foothill College, will be structurally changed to form a continuous sloping roof for greater interior ceiling height. As a result, the east wall of each building will be reconstructed with new clerestory glass. The north and south walls will be modified as required to accommodate the new roof shape. In addition, existing asphalt paving will be removed from the spaces between the buildings and landscaping installed. A screen wall will be constructed on the west side of each courtyard, adjacent to the covered walkway of the neighboring building, to provide increased privacy for the courtyards.

Building L  

$2,028,000

Building L will be renovated and expanded for 3 neighborhoods: Dance, Theater and Visual Art. The bulk of the building (16,500 square feet) will be assigned to a dancer's cooperative to provide dance programs including instruction, rehearsal and choreography. The subdivided building will provide the following spaces: teaching/rehearsal classrooms, teaching/choreography classrooms, observation area, office area, restrooms and storage. Raised hardwood floors will be installed over existing floor slabs in dance classrooms. The existing wing at the southwest end of Building L will be expanded to provide additional high bay space for a Black Box Theater (2,000 square feet) and studio space for visual artists (3,000 square feet).
Building MP $1,564,000

The existing Multi-purpose Building (MP) comprises 13,572 square feet and is rented on an hourly basis by such groups as jazzercise and square dancing clubs. The proposed expansion of 5,000 square feet will enable larger conferences and receptions to be held in this space as well as folk dancing, friendship dancing and Senior Friendship days. The stage and storage rooms to the west of the assembly area will be removed to enlarge the central space. The proposed expansion will be to the immediate south and open to the existing space. It will orient to the central courtyard and provide the opportunity for indoor/outdoor functions with the proposed development of the courtyard. In addition, the existing kitchen facilities in the MP will be renovated and converted to a demonstration kitchen and other existing spaces on the east side of the building reorganized to provide meeting and seminar rooms for small conference use.

Theater $395,000

The existing 325 seat theater has a small lobby (240 square feet) and no attached public restrooms. Proposed changes include enlarging the existing lobby by expanding it to the west in the area of the adjacent raised terrace providing 1,375 square feet of additional space. In addition, new public restrooms will be constructed on the south side of the theater which will be accessed from the lobby.

Gyms A and B $535,000

Gyms A and B, located on the south side of the central courtyard, will provide the fourth side of the central courtyard meeting area. The main entrance and north facade will be renovated to match the three new facades. To provide room for future expansion and additional parking, the east wing containing the girls locker room and boiler room will be demolished. The boys locker room, located on the east end of the building, will be renovated and converted into both men's and women's locker rooms. Upon construction of the proposed swimming pool, the south wall of the weight room, dance studio and locker room will be renovated and opened up more to the pool area.

Gymnasium Expansion $1,294,000

The exterior courtyard between the existing Pavilion and Gyms A and B will provide space for a new gymnasium comprising 9,000 square feet. The new facility will provide space for smaller athletic programs such as exercise classes, table tennis, gymnastics and volleyball. This addition will relieve the Multi-purpose Building for more social and conference activities and Gyms A and B and the Pavilion will be fully available for larger athletic programs such as basketball and volleyball. Existing locker room and shower facilities in Gyms A and B, located immediately to the south, will service the new Gymnasium.

Pavilion $83,000

To accommodate the construction of the new gymnasium close to existing athletic facilities, the locker and small lobby area of the Pavilion will be removed. The locker room and shower facilities to be renovated in Gyms A and B are sufficient in size to service all three athletic facilities.

Buildings S, T, and V $212,000

Childcare is presently located in Buildings K, S and T. Childcare activities will remain in Buildings S and T. Total area assigned to this use will be 14,301 square feet. Building V will be demolished to provide additional exterior play area for Childcare relocating this area from the south sides of the buildings. A new wall to enclose existing and new play areas will be constructed to the north of Buildings S, and T.
SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Landscape

Landscaping around the buildings will increase from the existing 167,500 square feet to 219,000 square feet as described in conjunction with changes to Buildings A, B, C, D, E, F, H, J, K, S, T and U and the central courtyard. The parking area to the south of Building I will be converted to landscape and will provide a welcoming entrance to the site.

The existing large, expansive parking lots will be subdivided by the addition of bosques of trees at the interior and perimeter. In addition, the public will be encouraged to "bring a tree" to promote the "greening of the Cubberley site".

Athletic Fields $898,000

The layout of the athletic fields will be reorganized to take maximum advantage of the 703,000 square feet of open space for such groups as Bobbysox, Little League, Babe Ruth League, AYSO, CYSA and Adult soccer, rugby teams and tennis for club and public play. The facilities will provide two softball fields, one baseball field, and four soccer fields (three adult and one junior size). The six tennis courts located to the south of Buildings K and L will be relocated to the southwest of the athletic fields. This location will serve two purposes: to remove the safety hazard presented by the narrow vehicular passage between the courts and buildings and to maximize field space by placing the courts in an area otherwise unusable by athletic fields. Another addition is the challenge course, otherwise known as a ropes course, which provides space and equipment for supervised group activities. On the northeast corner of the fields, close to Greendell Elementary School which is currently used for childcare, a nature playground will be placed among the redwood trees. This playground will serve local children and the children in childcare programs on the Cubberley site. Located centrally to the athletic fields, an 800 square foot facility will be constructed which will provide restrooms, athletic equipment storage and food sales. This stand will also provide a central location for garbage collection on the athletic fields. The existing 440 yard track will be left in place and reconditioned. The bleachers to the west of the track will be removed due to structural instability.

Central Courtyard $329,000

The existing courtyard formed by Buildings A, MP, M and Gymnasiums A and B will become the central focus of the new community center providing areas for public gathering, reception or individual reflection. The existing depressed courtyard will be filled level to adjacent walkways. A small amphitheater will be constructed adjacent to the new stage and acoustical shell on the west side of Building M to provide seating for outdoor concerts. A paved terrace to the east of proposed Building A/B will provide space for outdoor dining as an ancillary space to the new cafe/gallery and outdoor art exhibits. It is envisioned that a new paved terrace will also front the expanded Building MP and permit indoor/outdoor use of that facility for such functions as ballroom dancing. Lawn will be planted in the balance of the courtyard.
Landscape Structures  $206,000
In order to better identify and enhance the major entry to the site at Middlefield road and Montrose, new entry pylons will be constructed at either side of the existing driveway. The name and/or logo of the community center will be displayed on these structures. In addition, a six foot high cement plaster wall will be constructed to the north side of the community center buildings. It will serve to enclose exterior play areas for childcare facilities located in Buildings S and T and help to unify the appearance of the community center buildings from Middlefield Road.

Covered Walkways  $313,000
The existing low, oppressive roof structures over the covered walkways will be removed in order to create a freer and more uplifting atmosphere. The existing supporting steel columns will remain and converted to lighting standards or decorative elements along the major paths or circulation.

Swimming Pool  $1,107,000
A new 50 meter swimming and teaching pool for children and adults will be constructed to the south of existing Gyms A and B. The 50 meter pool will be of sufficient size to accommodate daily lap swimming and occasional competition and will be handicap accessible. The pools will be surrounded by a concrete apron and expansive lawn areas will be installed for sunbathing and picnicking.
Parking and Circulation $398,000

Proposed off-street parking for the Master Plan comprises approximately 317,000 square feet of paved area providing 827 parking spaces as follows:

- Standard Spaces: 418
- Compact Spases: 400
- Handicap Spaces: 9
- Total Spaces: 827

The increased number of parking spaces from existing conditions has been achieved by reconfiguring the parking stalls in a more efficient layout and expanding parking in the area of the existing tennis courts. This has resulted in a 15% increase in the number of parking spaces from existing conditions.

An analysis of the City of Palo Alto's "Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations" in the Appendix indicates that a total of 1654 spaces are required based on the proposed use of facilities. However, a reduction of required total spaces is permitted under Section 18.83.070 (5). "Vehicular parking has been set aside south of the existing parking lot adjacent to the athletic fields to accommodate additional automobiles as required by future uses.

To determine parking requirements for the Cubberley site based on actual use a schedule of tenant hourly use has been prepared (see Appendix). The survey of tenant use of the existing site indicates that week nights (Monday to Thursday) between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. are the periods of heaviest use and that at these times between 1,200 and 1,300 persons might conceivably be on the site simultaneously. This finding is consistent with neighbor and tenant observations about periods of intense use.

This large number of occupants must be qualified. The majority of persons, over 90%, using the Cubberley site during this peak period are attending night classes at Foothill College. A survey of

Foothill students during May of 1990 was undertaken to determine the level of use of automobiles by students. 2,742 students were surveyed. Of these, 92% drove cars to the site. While this is a high percentage, it was also observed that during the survey period, a typical week in the early part of a quarter, only 63.2% of enrolled students actually attended class. Given these two figures, approximately 56% of enrolled students can be expected to drive their automobiles to Cubberley on a given evening or, conversely, 42% can be expected not to drive. This 42% of Foothill students is the equivalent to 37.8% of total Cubberley users.

If we assume, conservatively, that 1,300 persons are at Cubberley on a week night, 37.8%, or 491, of these persons would be expected not to drive. Assuming the remainder did drive, also a conservative assumption, this would amount to 809 cars on site at peak hours. While this number exceeds parking spaces currently available on site, it falls below the number provided for in both the Master Plan and Implementation Plan.

On the basis of this study, it is recommended that the current parking situation be improved but that the number of parking spaces not be increased to the extent required by the City of Palo Alto's "Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations."

The proposed reduction from required total parking spaces is also consistent with statements from the public. During the public input process, there was a clear directive from the public to limit automobile parking on site and maximize the area of athletic field and landscaped areas.

If the proposed number of parking space is insufficient for parking demands in the future, a portion of the athletic fields can be converted to parking. However, it is our recommendation that the demand for more parking should be clearly established before, perhaps, unnecessarily paving portions of the well used athletic fields.
The site will continue to be accessed by automobile from existing entry driveways along Middlefield Road at the northeast and northwest corners of the site. Two-way circulation will be provided around the east, south, and west sides of the community center buildings through parking lots. This has been achieved by two significant changes to the existing site circulation. The first change is relocating the one-way road at the south side of the Pavilion so the sharp right angled turn is eliminated and two-way circulation is permitted. The second change eliminates the one-way road located at the south side of Buildings J, K, and L by relocating the tennis courts. This modification will permit two-way circulation through the expanded parking area and reduce existing hazardous conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian circulation.
RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION

RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES

It is envisioned the Master Plan will be implemented over a period of years as funding becomes available from public and private sources. The elements of the Master Plan as described in the previous section were evaluated and prioritized for phased implementation. In determining the use priorities of this facility, the following criteria were taken into consideration:

1) Repairs to meet safety and code requirements.
2) Attempt to meet facility requirements of existing tenants.
3) Feedback from the community.
4) What visual impacts could be made to convert this site from an "old high school" to a "new community center".

The following are the recommended priorities that appear to best meet the above criteria. Total anticipated construction cost for these projects is $6,889,000.

1. Code Repairs $447,000

Improvements as outlined by CSS Associates Architects required to bring the buildings up to current code and handicap accessibility standards must be undertaken on all buildings that are to be occupied.

2. Condition Repairs $2,483,000

Improvements necessary to restore to full operation all mechanical and electrical systems and provide basic exterior improvements to existing facilities as outlined by CSS Associates Architects is the second recommended priority.

3. Buildings E, F and U Renovation $521,000

Two community groups, visual artists and fine arts dance, are not currently accommodated at Cubberley. With the renovation of Buildings E, F and U, over 15,000 square feet will be converted to artist studios with the appropriate interior partitions, ventilation and plumbing. Given the financial constraints of available funding, the roof structure of Buildings E and F will not be modified.

4. Building L Renovation $949,000

To accommodate the second new user group, fine arts dance, Building L will be converted into dance studios, lockers and office space. The addition of 5,000 square feet to the west of Building L will be postponed due to the large expense.

5. Parking and Circulation $1,093,000

The existing parking lots will be resurfaced and landscaped and 30,000 square feet of new area will be paved and landscaped.

6. Athletic Fields and Landscaping $1,237,000

The athletic fields will be reconfigured, leveled and reseeded and renovation of the courtyards adjacent to Buildings, A, B, C, D, E, F, H, J, K, S and T will be implemented. In addition, the Central Courtyard will be landscaped, additional exterior lighting will be installed and PACO has offered to donate funds for the construction of a new acoustic shell.

7. Field Restroom and Storage $72,000

A consistent request from field users and neighbors is the provision of restroom facilities on the athletic fields. Attached to these restrooms will be some storage for sports equipment and garbage collection receptacles.
8. Gym B - Men's locker  $87,000

The Men's Locker Room is currently inoperable and lockers and other fixtures have been removed from the premises. Work in addition to that recommended by CSS Associates Architects needs to be undertaken to restore this portion of the gym to full operation.

PROJECTS NOT INCLUDED

Not included in this Implementation Plan are the following projects that were included in the Master Plan, but couldn’t fit within the anticipated funding. They are listed in order of priority based on the same criteria used to select the projects to be initially implemented.

1) Covered Walkway Renovation  $313,000
2) Interior Repairs: Buildings A, FH, H, M, Theater, S, T, Gyms A & B (except mens lockers), Pavilion, Multipurpose  1,181,000
3) Tennis Courts  43,000
4) Building V - Black Box Theater  95,000
5) New Theater Lobby and Restrooms  395,000
6) Renovation of Gyms A and B  448,000
7) New Swimming Pool  1,107,000
8) Multipurpose Building Expansion  1,552,000
9) New Gymnasium Facility  1,294,000
10) Pavilion Renovation  83,000
11) Central Courtyard  326,000
12) New Building L Wing  1,076,000
13) Additional Renovation of Buildings D, E, F  318,000
14) New Building A/B and Building C Expansion  3,528,000

TOTAL OF PROJECTS NOT INCLUDED  $11,775,000

PARKING AND CIRCULATION

Proposed off-street parking for Recommended Implementation comprises approximately 335,000 square feet of paved area providing 827 spaces as follows:

Standard Spaces:  653
Compact Spaces:  165
Handicap Spaces:  9
Total Spaces:  827

The increased number of parking spaces from existing conditions has been achieved by reconfiguring the parking stalls in a more efficient layout and expanding parking to the west of the tennis courts and to the east of the existing dirt parking lot. This has resulted in a 15% increase in the number of parking spaces from existing conditions.

The analysis of the City of Palo Alto's "Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations" in the Appendix indicates that a total of 1,193 spaces are required based on this proposed use of facilities. This requirement is just 15 more parking spaces than is required for use of the existing site. As indicated previously, this reduction of required total spaces is permitted under Section 18.83.070 (5). While the existing parking situation is inadequate to serve the facility, the addition of 112 spaces should help to alleviate the problem.

The site will continue to be accessed by automobile from existing entry driveways along Middlefield at the northeast and northwest corners of the site. Two-way circulation will be provided around the east and west sides of the community center buildings through

See Point 6 in the Appendix, page 56.

See Point 4 in the Appendix, page 56.
parking lots but will remain one-way on the south side of the site between Buildings J, K, and L and the tennis courts which will remain in their current location. While this traffic pattern is not optimal and may present safety problems, public input indicated an unwillingness to relocate the tennis courts to the athletic fields to provide a wider vehicular access. The one-way road at the south side of the Pavilion has been relocated to eliminate the sharp right angled turn and permit two-way circulation to the south of the buildings. This change should eliminate some of the traffic which currently must exit from the south side of the site through the narrow driveway by the tennis courts.
NEIGHBORHOODS

Under the proposed implementation, all Neighborhoods requesting space at the Cubberley site will be accommodated. Existing uses will be retained on site at approximately existing areas. The new uses, visual art and dance will be accommodated, primarily in the buildings vacated by the Palo Alto Unified School District.

Following is a list of Proposed Neighborhoods and floor plan of the Proposed Tenant Location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURLY MEETING FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>4,808 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC &amp; THEATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V - BLACK BOX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>14,157 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PROFIT/COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,529</td>
<td>13,625 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>MULTIPURPOSE</td>
<td>13,572</td>
<td>13,572 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>15,465 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>182,789</td>
<td>46,378 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAVILION</td>
<td>17,355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYM A,B</td>
<td>29,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD RESTROOM</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>46,378 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBBERLEY ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCERS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>13,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>6,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,512 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRES

In order to obtain as much public input regarding the Cubberley site as possible, members of the Palo Alto City Staff developed a questionnaire that was distributed to the public on several different occasions. The questionnaire sought responses in several different categories: general site improvements, individual/group needs and interests, and additional requirements such as parking and childcare needs.

Input from these questionnaires was used to help formulate building programs for the Master Plan and Implementation Plan. Samples and a summary of the questionnaires follow.

To All Palo Altans

What’s Happening at Cubberley?

On February 6 & 7 the city held public meetings to encourage the community to “dream about what the facility could become” and hear what current lessees, local arts groups, Cubberley neighbors, sports groups, hourly users and general public want to do with the site.

Cubberley Master Plan consultants Spencer Associates have developed options for use of the Cubberley site. The purpose of this meeting is to present these options to the community and generate community reaction.

For more information on the meeting, please call Del Thorpe at 329-2418 or Anne Cribbs, 329-2429

Second Meeting: Tuesday, March 13, 1990
7:30pm at the Cubberley Theater, 4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto

Last Chance for Advice: * If you cannot come to the March 13 meeting, please send us your comments

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________ Zip: ________
Phone: ____________________________

We should develop the Cubberley facility as a

Please return to Cubberley Facilities Manager, 4000 Middlefield Road J2, Palo Alto, 94303
CUBBERLEY HIGH SCHOOL SITE - MASTER PLAN

COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME: ___________________________________ PHONE: ( ) ____________________________

ADDRESS: ___________________________________ ZIP CODE: ____________________________

GROUP AFFILIATION/INTEREST IN CUBBERLEY: ____________________________ # IN GROUP: __________

GENERAL SITE/PROGRAM NEEDS

SUGGESTIONS FOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS, SERVICES OR PROGRAMS DESIRED:

____________________________________________________________________________________

INDIVIDUAL/GROUP - NEEDS AND INTERESTS

TYPE OF ROOM/SPACE NEEDED: ____________________________ SQ. FT. __________

IF CURRENTLY OCCUPYING SPACE, IS IT ADEQUATE?

ROOM LOCATION PREFERRED: ____________________________

DAY(S) OF THE WEEK NEEDED: ____________________________

TIME(S) OF DAY NEEDED: ____________________________

EXCLUSIVE USE? (Yes/No) ____________________________ SHARED USE? (Yes/No) ____________________________

SPECIAL AMENITIES NEEDED (i.e., water, storage, counter space, flooring, etc.):

____________________________________________________________________________________

PARKING NEEDED? (Yes/No) ____________________________ HOW MANY SPACES? (#) ____________________________

DAY CARE NEEDS (IF ANY):

OTHER NEEDS:

____________________________________________________________________________________

GENERAL COMMENTS:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

CUBBERLEY HIGH SCHOOL USER PLAN

Community Survey Summary - January 31, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Use</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resid.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballroom Dancing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports - Volleyball/basketball, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studios/classes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music Concerts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting/Fitness Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise/Aerobics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance/Ballet Classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports - Baseball/Football/Softball/Soccer, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for PA Chamber Orch./PA Symphony</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par Course</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic School Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Jogging Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for International &amp; Community Support Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Classroom Space for non-academic Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery/Exhibition Space</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services/Cafe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Usage</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Non-Resid.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballroom Dancing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports/Volleyball, Basketball, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studios/Classes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance/Ballet Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports - Baseball/Football/Softball/Soccer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool/Spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Jogging Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for International &amp; Community Support Gp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Classroom Space for Non-academic Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service/Coffee House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Enrichment Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA/YMCA Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Programs/Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-cost Housing/Senior Care Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments & suggestions:
- Better outdoor lighting in corridors
- Attractive landscaping
- Complete wheelchair access
- Improved parking
- No garbage cans
- More grass maintenance
- Expanded/expanded daytime use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Usage</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Non-Resid.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballroom Dancing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studios/Classes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Lifting/Weight Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise/Aerobics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance/Ballet Classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery/Exhibition Space</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Classes &amp; Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Enrichment Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENANT SCHEDULES

The following tenant schedules have been prepared for the present use of the Cubberley site (as of June 30, 1990), the proposed use in the Master Plan and the proposed use in the Implementation Plan. Schedules indicate use of the individual facilities by groups on an hourly basis (8:00 am - 11:00 pm) Monday through Thursday (peak use days of the week). Total number of users on site during each hour are also indicated. Total number of users on site at peak hours have been used to analyze actual off-street parking needs for the existing site, Master Plan and Implementation Plan.
OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS

The following analyses of "Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations", Chapter 18.83 of the City of Palo Alto Zoning Ordinance, have been prepared for determining parking requirements for the existing site, the proposed Master Plan and the Implementation Plan. In determining required parking spaces, the following assumptions have been made:

1) Calculation of required parking spaces is based on maximum occupancy of all facilities.

2) Individual parking ratios have been assigned to facilities based on use rather than assigning one common parking ratio to the Community Center.

3) Gross floor area of facilities has been used in the calculation of required parking spaces, except in the case of childcare facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>TENANT, NON PROF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TENANT, NON PROF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TENANT, NON PROF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>TENANT, NON PROF</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>33.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>13,576</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>54.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>1/1.5 STAFF</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>1/1.5 STAFF</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MUSIC/THEATER</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>22.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1/1.5 STAFF</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHILDCARE</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>1/1.5 STAFF</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td>5,529</td>
<td>1:250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PALO ALTO</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>TENANT, NON PROF</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>6,728</td>
<td>AREA/154</td>
<td>112.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>5,684</td>
<td>AREA/200/4</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>AREA/300/4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAVILION</td>
<td>GYM</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>AREA/154</td>
<td>220.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>ATHLETICS/RECREATION</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>20.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GYM</td>
<td>ATHLETICS/RECREATION</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>AREA/154</td>
<td>220.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXERCISE</td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>11,128</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>55.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL     | 181,989 | 1,178       |

CUBBERLEY MASTER PLAN
OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS
EXISTING SITE
### CUBBERLEY MASTER PLAN

**OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

**MASTER PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/B</td>
<td></td>
<td>CUBBERLEY ADMIN.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GALLERY/CAFE</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURLY/CONFERENCE</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>38.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>NON PROFIT</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>26.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>54.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MUSIC/THEATER</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MUSIC/THEATER</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MUSIC/THEATER</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>105.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td>11,728</td>
<td>1/1.5 STAFF</td>
<td>75.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>5,684</td>
<td>AREA/200/4</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>AREA/300/4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GYM</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>AREA/15/14</td>
<td>222.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;B</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>AREA/16/4</td>
<td>222.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>24.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOOD CON.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GYM II</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>AREA/16/4</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOL</td>
<td>787/4</td>
<td>787/4</td>
<td>196.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203,478</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUBBERLEY MASTER PLAN

**OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

**PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>USE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CUBBY. ADMIN.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>NON PROFIT</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>26.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOURLY</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>54.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DANCE/THEATER</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>MUSIC/THEATER</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>VISUAL ART</td>
<td>5,049</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>6,728</td>
<td>32/54</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>AREA/300/4</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GYM</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>AREA/15/4</td>
<td>222.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;B</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>AREA/16/4</td>
<td>222.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKERS</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>AREA/50/4</td>
<td>24.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD CON.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>ATHLETICS</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>GYM II</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>AREA/16/4</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>787/4</td>
<td>196.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182,789</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36
ESTIMATES OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST

A. The cost summary prepared by CSS Associates Architects for the City of Palo Alto as part of the Site Condition Survey of Fillmore P. Cubberley High School (September 15, 1989) summarizes probable construction costs for code required, condition recommended and cosmetic recommended work. Estimates for code required and condition required work have not been updated to present day costs and have been included "as is" in the description of the Master Plan, Implementation Plan, and estimate of probable construction cost for the Cubberley Master Plan by Adamson Associates.

B. The estimate of probable construction cost prepared by Adamson Associates for the Cubberley Master Plan (January 30, 1991) summarizes probable construction costs of various building projects described in the Master Plan. These estimates have been developed in the absence of detailed design drawings and should be viewed as construction budgets for the projects described.
### A. COST SUMMARY

"Site Condition Survey of Ellwood P. Cubberley High School"
September 15, 1959
CSS Associates Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST REQUIRED</th>
<th>CONDITION REQUIRED</th>
<th>COMPLT. REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>STRUCT</td>
<td>MACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>14,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,532</td>
<td>22,705</td>
<td>28,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>19,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>34,405</td>
<td>14,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>50,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>36,420</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>46,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>14,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>17,301</td>
<td>19,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>14,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>24,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>28,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>12,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVIL./S</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>17,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT. CORRIDOR</td>
<td>32,220</td>
<td>32,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,018</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>197,856</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Add 2% OH & P and General Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>77,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>388,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>323,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,159,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>274,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,106,498</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING FEES**

Feas for the production of design and construction documents have not been included. It cannot be determined at this point which portions of the work will be undertaken. Therefore, add the following percentage for the various construction contract ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>A/E Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $100,000</td>
<td>12 - 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>10 - 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>8 - 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. COST ESTIMATE
Cubberley Master Plan
January 30, 1991
Adamson Associates

January 30, 1991

Spencer Associates
Architects
700 High Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Attention: Mr. Steve Bowers
Cubberley High School Masterplan

Gentlemen,

In accordance with your instructions, we enclose our Masterplan Estimate for
Cubberley High School.

We have used the estimates provided by CSS Associates for Code Required and
Condition Recommended items.

We should be pleased to discuss these figures at your convenience. Should
you have any questions, please contact Alice Nguyen at our office.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Martin Gordon
AN/th
Enclosure
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Cost Plan prepared from:
- Site layout - 3 sheets
- Phase I Description - 4 sheets
- Phase II Descriptions - 1 sheet
- Building Areas - 2 sheets
- Sketches - 6 sheets
- Cost Estimate by CSS Associates

Cost Plan includes:

Master Plan includes code and condition measures recommended by CSS
Associates, which includes repairs to correct safety and code requirements.
Items include hardware replacement, re-roofing, exterior painting, soffit
repair, modifications for handicap plumbing fixtures, allowance for
mechanical and electrical systems modification.

Architectural improvements include central courtyard development; covered
walkways between Buildings C, D, E, F, H; replacement of Building A/B by
new 2 story structure; renovating and subdividing Buildings D, E, F and U
into spaces for artist Studios by changing building cross section,
courtyard improvements including new landscaping and screen wall; addition
and renovation of Building C; renovation and expansion of Building L; expanding
Theater lobby to include toilets, outdoor stage, acoustical shell
and seating area on west side of Building H; expansion and renovation of
Building H; renovation of boys locker room, and new facade at north
elevation of gym; Buildings S & T will receive work as described by CSS
Associates, Building V will be demolished and replaced by landscaping;
Building FH will be demolished and replaced by open courtyard; Buildings H,
I, J, K, P receive minor improvements as described by CSS Associates.

Parking improvements include addition of 20,000 SF area and allowance for
restriping of existing parking. Athletic fields include provisions for
tennis courts, challenge course, grooming existing fields, new
restroom/storage building.

Other improvements involve gymnasium expansion, demolition of Pavilion West
Wing, new 50 meter swimming pool, and gym facade renovation.

Cost Plan excludes:

- Asbestos abatement.
- Professional design, testing, management and inspection fees.
- Legal and financing costs.
- Change order contingency.
- Fire and all risk insurance.
- Premium for work performed outside regular trade work hours.
### General Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Repairs by CSS Associates</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Repairs by CSS</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A/B</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building FH</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building H, I, J, K, and P</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building M &amp; Band Shell</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings D, E, F, U</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building L</td>
<td>1,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Building</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyms A &amp; B</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium Expansion</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings S, T, and V</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Field</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Courtyard</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Structures</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Walkways</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Budget for Construction**: Jan-91 $18,230

### Quantity, Unit, Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Code Repairs by CSS Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Condition Repairs by CSS Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Building A/B</td>
<td>10,416 SF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building - two story, wood framed, cement plaster exterior, aluminum windows, flat roof. Space for cafe/gallery, offices, classrooms, meeting rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A/B &amp; C Interior Courtyard</td>
<td>20,000 SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit CSS repair work</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(186)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair - CSS study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New addition</td>
<td>3,430 SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Building FH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish existing</td>
<td>1,400 SF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building FH Interior Courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair - CSS Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$M259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M259

7. Building M & Acoustic Band Shell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic Shell - including outdoor stage and shell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallways</td>
<td>2,000 SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000 SF</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair - CSS Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$M289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M289

8. Buildings D, E, F, U Art Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross section change D, E, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish (e) roof/wall section</td>
<td>7,650 SF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical supports</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof structure</td>
<td>5,100 SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie into existing</td>
<td>510 LF</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerestories</td>
<td>2,550 SF</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify exterior wall ends</td>
<td>1,200 SF</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing and waterproofing</td>
<td>5,100 SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfigure interior partitions - E, F, U</td>
<td>10,800 SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair E, F - CSS Study</td>
<td>10,416 SF</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing/Electrical E, F, U</td>
<td>15,465 SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair - U</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings D, E, F, U Courtyards (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softscape (30' wide)</td>
<td>15,300 SF</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New screen 6' wall with plaster</td>
<td>510 LF</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior work to Building D by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M691
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9. Building L - Dance Theater, Visual Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovate existing building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior partitions</td>
<td>16,500 SF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior finishes</td>
<td>16,500 SF</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>16,500 SF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/electrical systems</td>
<td>16,500 SF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions - Black Box and Studio space</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M1,411

10. Multi-purpose Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovate existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate kitchen</td>
<td>550 SF</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior partitions</td>
<td>13,572 SF</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior finishes</td>
<td>13,572 SF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/specialties</td>
<td>13,572 SF</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/electrical</td>
<td>13,572 SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New addition</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M1,088

11. Theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enlarge lobby to provide new public restrooms</td>
<td>1,375 SF</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>$M275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M275

12. Gyms A & B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolish east wing</td>
<td>6,800 SF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate boys locker</td>
<td>1,900 SF</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Repair - CSS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockers and new fixtures</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New facade at east wing</td>
<td>1,250 SF</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New facade at north wall</td>
<td>3,000 SF</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit CSS repair work</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M372
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,975</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regular Meeting
May 6, 1991

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. Master Plan for community center reuse of the Cubberley High School site located at 4000 Middlefield Road (continued from 4/22/91) (300) (CMR: 2/5/91)

Mayor Sutorius said the item was continued from the Council Meeting of April 22, 1991, after conclusion of the public hearing.

MOTION: Council Member Cobb moved, seconded by Levy, to adopt a negative declaration and take the following action with respect to the Cubberley Master Plan:

1. Approve the Cubberley Master Plan in concept as a policy of the Council, and incorporating the concepts of the Alternative Field design.

2. Approve the implementation of Phase 1 of the Master Plan (the Implementation Plan), subject to the availability of funds for that implementation.

3. Affirm that any implementation of the Master Plan beyond Phase 1 will be subject to the normal City review and approval processes.

4. Establish the policy that the existing open space at Cubberley will be preserved in its entirety, and not be used as a parking reserve.

5. Instruct staff to determine and report back to the Council for consideration and possible action: (a) the degree to which public/private partnerships can be used to generate financial support for the Master Plan implementation, (b) potential mechanisms for the creation and implementation of such partnerships.
FINDINGS

1. The Master Plan will ensure construction and operation of the uses in a manner that will be orderly, harmonious with the existing or potential uses of the adjoining or nearby sites, in that the facility will be improved and maintained for community center use for cultural and recreational purposes. This desire expressed in the Comprehensive Plan and reaffirmed by the neighboring residents during the Master Plan, a community outreach process.

2. The Master Plan will ensure the desirability of investment in the same adjacent areas, because it will allow for maintenance and improvement of facilities, which would otherwise be unable to be properly maintained and improved.

3. The Master Plan will ensure that sound principles of environmental design and ecological balance shall be observed, as documented in the attached environmental determination.

4. The Master Plan will ensure that the use will be in accord with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan, particularly Policies 1, 2, and 3 of the Schools and Parks Element.

CONDITIONS

1. Any further proposals to require additional parking beyond that anticipated in the Master Plan shall be referred by the Director of Planning and Community Environment to the Planning Commission for recommendation and City Council for final action. This condition is intended to prevent the conversion of required parking, shown in the Master Plan as landscape deferral in the field area, to be converted through an administrative process to actual parking without benefit of a full public hearing. Any such additional parking shall be established by: (a) a reduction in the proposed new improvements, (b) further restriction through the use permit on the simultaneous use and occupancy of certain large-occupancy facilities, or (c) a substitute proposal for satisfying the parking requirements other than a parking structure.

2. A Cubberley Advisory Committee shall be appointed, comprised of representatives of the Green Meadow Community Association, existing and potential tenants of Cubberley, members of the community at large, a member of the Planning Commission and Community Services Department staff. This Committee shall hold open public meetings to develop recommendations for future implementation phases of the Cubberley Master Plan prior to any application for the Master Conditional Use Permit beyond the Implementation Plan defined in the document. The recommendations of the Cubberley Advisory Committee and a summary of their process for deriving the recommendation will be transmitted to the Zoning Administrator with any future applications for future Conditional Use Permits on the site.

The nature of any public/private partnerships and their relationship to the Advisory Committee shall be determined at a future date.

3. The alternative field design shown on Exhibit A shall be substituted for that included on the Implementation Plan and Master Plan. This substitute design shall be conditioned with either a) a reduction in the proposed new improvements, i.e., the extra gymnasium; b) further restriction through the use permit on the simultaneous use and occupancy of certain large-occupancy facilities; or c) a substitute proposal for providing additional spaces on-site.

Council Member Cobb believed the City should begin with the larger canvass of planning and vision that the Master Plan represented because it would be easier to make adjustments to it than to start with a smaller vision and try to add to it should the results of the potential public/private partnerships and fund-raising warrant it. The approval would be for the first phase of the Implementation Plan and subject to the availability of funds. The language stated the City would not go beyond the Planning Commission recommendations at the present time and recognized the serious funding issues which must be dealt with. Under no circumstances would the open space, which included the tennis courts, be used for parking. If other parking solutions were required, they would not come out of the existing open space and would have to be some kind of combination of conditions outlined. The entire community needed to be involved in the process of determining the kinds of funding it would take to make a grand vision for Cubberley a reality. He recognized the budget issues before the Council and the impact on the City, but Cubberley was a "once in a lifetime opportunity." Cubberley had been an issue for ten years, with five years of discussion with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), and several more years of difficult negotiations wrapped around the utility user tax (UUT) measure, the result of which was a 25-year lease with options. Approval of the motion would take cautious, prudent, and carefully-controlled first steps to see if the community would rise to the occasion.

Council Member Woolley referred to Item 3 of the motion and queried the City's review and approval processes beyond Phase 1.

Council Member Cobb said the present or a future Council would have to authorize any subsequent steps. Item 3 was included in the motion to reassure the public there would be an opportunity to participate during further review process.

Council Member Woolley understood the process consisted of Architectural Review Board (ARB) and Zoning Administrator approval, but not Council or Planning Commission approval. The only way the Council would come involved was through the P&Z Committee and the budget process.

City Manager Bill Zander said that was correct. The formal actions outlined were correct but none of them made any sense without some
policy on the part of the Council as to where the project should go which was the subject of Council Member Cobb's motion. With a policy, the ARB and Planning Commission had guidance as to how the project should proceed.

Council Member Woolley preferred to have some of the actions taken through the Planning Commission and the Council process.

Council Member Cobb said the broad policy questions needed to be addressed at Council level, and the motion said the Council authorized the implementation of a certain portion if funds were available but did not authorize anything else. The motion implied the project would return to Council with proof that the next step could be taken.

Council Member Woolley said the motion authorized the Master Plan.

Council Member Andersen referred to the staff report (CMR:240:91) and Condition No. 1(c) of the motion and queried whether the parking requirements included building a parking structure which would accommodate additional parking.

Zoning Administrator Nancy Lytle said the concept of a parking structure was not well received with the community, but the option was not precluded for the future. Staff was looking at programs which reduced the demand for parking or alternative means of parking offsite.

Council Member Andersen believed Condition No. 1(c) should include an incentive other than a parking structure.

Council Member Cobb disagreed. A fee structure or permit system could be devised for the college users; but for the people using the playing fields and the casual users, a permit system would be a deterrent and a fee structure would be extremely complex.

LANGUAGE INCORPORATED INTO MAIN MOTION TO INCLUDE THE ADDITION OF "OTHER THAN A PARKING STRUCTURE" AFTER PARKING REQUIREMENTS IN CONDITION No. 1 (c).

Council Member Andersen referred to Condition No. 2 and queried the change from "members" to "representatives."

Director of Social and Community Services Paul Thiltnsen said staff was concerned because there were representatives from a broad section of the community.

Mayor Sutorius clarified the term would be used to connote a representative and not all the members of an organization.

Council Member Andersen believed the word representative meant a person outside of the organization which was not what was intended.

Mayor Sutorius suggested Council Members consider the concept that Council would be involved in the original Planned Community or a major modification to a Planned Community zone, and the same concept could be applicable in a community center of the magnitude suggested and where the special nature of site and design review process was applicable.

Council Member Kniss queried the language "subject to the availability of funds" referred to in Item 2 of the motion.

Council Member Cobb referred to the difficult budget decisions facing the Council and said the foundation on which the entire Cubberley question was based was the lease which was driven in part by the UUT revenues. Without those revenues, there was no Cubberley project. The thrust of the motion was to bring the community together in such a way as to get everything necessary done to build on that foundation by raising money through the public/private partnership. That meant going beyond the basic civil lease and the necessary code and conditions improvements attached to it which would be handled by the public/private partnership. He was not sure where one could draw a hard line between those two areas.

Council Member Kniss referred to the staff report (CMR:256:91) and clarified going beyond code and condition repairs meant taking money from a source other than the General Fund and not from the UUT. She asked for clarification.

Mr. Thiltnsen said funding currently existed only for the code and conditions improvements and then additional funding would be necessary. Staff worked under the basic premise that if money was not available, no building would be done.

Council Member Kniss clarified as the need for funding went beyond those funds allocated in what the public perceived to be UUT revenues, building would stop until another funding source was found or until the funds were generated through the public/private partnership or some other donation. She queried whether that needed to be spelled out in the motion or whether it was inherent.

Mr. Koner believed Council Member Kniss' understanding was built into the motion in the sense that staff could not spend money until Council approved funds in the budget.

Council Member Renzel assumed the motion paralleled the staff recommendation and queried whether it was the intent of the plan that nothing beyond Phase 1 would be done until Phase 1 was completed.

Mr. Thiltnsen said staff's intent was to proceed with the basic funding level. As funds were generated, staff would move forward in stages of the first phase because those were the areas of most need. However, if a donor was willing to donate funding for something not included in the first phase, staff would like the opportunity to take advantage of the donation and use it as an incentive to generate more funding.
Council Member Renzel queried whether Foothill College had any right to the parking.

Mr. Thiltgen said as a tenant, Foothill College had a right to use the parking. There was no designated parking for any one specific use other than a couple of reserved spaces for public safety and handicapped.

Council Member Renzel recalled a previous indication by the Dean of Foothill College that at the beginning of the semester, Foothill College accounted for 25 percent of some other high percentage of the night parking which did not leave a lot of space for the City’s activities, and she queried to what extent the City had control over the intensity of the Foothill College use.

Mr. Thiltgen said a cap was placed on the amount of space Foothill College would use so that the rest would be available for community use. Except for the first week of a semester, there was sufficient parking to accommodate the other uses on the site.

Council Member Renzel said the Dean of Foothill College also indicated Foothill would like to better utilize the space it had. It seemed the City had leased so much square footage and there was no control over how it was used. She queried whether Foothill College was limited in terms of not being able to use the space after 10:00 p.m. or before 7:00 a.m.

Mr. Thiltgen said the comment by the Dean of Foothill College reflected on the fact that Foothill College basically used the campus between 8:30 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. with some uses during the day. Their intent was to increase their programming and activity use during the day so they could make better use of the space being leased. The primary parking problem occurred between 6:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. when the two sets of classes coincided. Staff worked its scheduling around when Foothill College would use the site to avoid the parking problems. The City’s primary use of the property was Friday and Saturdays which worked well since Foothill’s primary use was Monday through Thursday. He believed the City had a good, harmonious relationship with Foothill College.

Council Member Renzel referred to doing something beyond what was included in Phase I of the Implementation Plan if a donor wanted to provide money for it. The City had a first phase Implementation Plan and some other things recommended by the Planning Commission and ARB which would have demands and impacts not yet tested. If a donor funded one of the intensive uses which remained in the Master Plan before everything else and it was later discovered that there was inadequate parking, she queried what would happen to what was already included in the Implementation Plan.

Mr. Thiltgen said the Master Plan was designed to include the parking impacts. If whatever was developed along the way created a parking impact, staff’s intent was always to look at different ways to deal with the parking either through different scheduling or alternative methods.

Council Member Renzel was not sure that would always be possible and she was concerned about underestimating the parking demand.

Mr. Thiltgen said since most of the square footage and uses included in the Master Plan were already there, the only two things he could see that would create a problem were the additions of the gymnasium and the second floor. He did not even see the swimming pool as a major impact because of the scheduled and seasonal use of the facility. If the extra gymnasium was to be built, it would require studying and monitoring present parking impacts before proceeding.

Council Member Renzel queried if staff estimated the building area with 800 spaces to a comparable facility in Palo Alto, what would that approximate, i.e., equivalent to City Hall, Rinconda Park, or Palo Alto Square.

Ms. Lytle said Rinconda Park or the Terman Community Center were good comparisons. She referred to Attachment C of the Staff report (CMR:240:91) to the Planning Commission and the equivalent calculation which compared the Master Plan for Cubberley with the Terman facility and the parking provided there. The Cubberley Master Plan would provide more than double the parking based on square footage than what Terman provided although Terman was not a satisfactory parking situation. The Implementation Plan included provision for 112 extra parking spaces and would decrease the existing deficit. If the parking implementation was done in Phase One as projected, there would be the ability to approve some extra development and experience what would happen before moving on to any other projects.

Council Member Renzel queried the percentage of time the fields and the open areas were scheduled during the daylight hours and the opportunities for casual neighborhood use of the area.

Recreation Superintendent Anne Cribbs said the fields and open areas had a full schedule during daylight hours, but there were spaces not designated for practice fields available.

Council Member Renzel queried whether the track was available for casual use.

Ms. Cribbs said yes.

Council Member McCown suggested the following two additional paragraphs be added to the motion after paragraph No. 4, and that No. 5 would become No. 7:

5. The highest priority shall be to renovate existing facilities, including upgrading and enhancing through additions of square footage where necessary for efficiency and better utilization. The policy was intended to encompass the elements of the Implementation Plan.
6. Additional renovations and major new uses proposed beyond the Implementation Plan (swimming pool, new gymnasium, new Buildings A, B, and C, new wing on Building L, and the multipurpose expansion) would be a lower priority and would only be pursued if they could be accomplished consistent with the site constraints defined by the parking limitations and the continued use of the renovated facilities. Before any major uses could be added, a parking analysis would be performed to evaluate whether additional uses could be added without negatively impacting existing site uses in the surrounding neighborhood.

NO. 5 AND 6 INCORPORATED INTO THE MAIN MOTION BY MAKER AND SECONDER WITH OLD NO. 5 BECOMING NO. 7.

Vice Mayor Fazzino asked Council Member McCown to list those items of lower priority.

Council Member McCown clarified the new swimming pool, the multipurpose building expansion, the gymnasium wing on Building L, and the expansion of Buildings A, B, and C were items in excess of $1 million and the last item in excess of $0.5 million and were major capital projects. She listed them as a lower priority and to be accomplished only if the parking situation permitted it and the existing use of facilities. The highest priority would be to reuse the site effectively.

Vice Mayor Fazzino agreed with Council Member McCown but queried what would happen if an investor came forward and wanted to provide a new facility and whether staff would return to Council for approval to take the item off the lower priority list.

Council Member McCown said her recommendation did not change the elements of Council Member Cobb's motion beyond the Implementation Plan and only clarified the priority. Staff would be required to return to Council to determine whether it could be done in a manner consistent with the parking situation and continue to maintain the renovated site in existence. If the answer was yes, the offer from an investor could be considered. If the answer was no, i.e., more parking would need than could be provided, or a building would need to removed and eliminate some uses, then the policy would say it could not be done because the higher priority was to continue with the reuse of the existing facility.

Vice Mayor Fazzino clarified all the items beyond the Implementation Plan would be subject to City review. He queried whether the parkland could be dedicated and what kind of flexibility the City would have with respect to the Master Plan if the parkland was dedicated.

Mr. Calonne said the parkland could probably be dedicated, but he needed to review the Education Code for areas which might create a problem.

Mr. Thiltgen said the dedication was based on a piece of property's shape and dimension. If the property was dedicated, the ability to reorganize would be restricted and the item would have to return for a vote of the people to be changed.

Vice Mayor Fazzino understood there were different kinds of restraints and queried whether the baseball fields at El Camino Park could be moved.

Mr. Thiltgen believed the code referred to actual definitions of what the space perimeters were of the fields.

Vice Mayor Fazzino said the uses would not be affected.

Mr. Zane said the uses could be affected and there were procedures for making improvements to parks on dedicated land which involved the adoption of ordinances by Council. He could not think of a more difficult and vexatious problem than El Camino Park in terms of its costing the City hundreds of thousands of dollars a year all because it was a dedicated park for lease. There was a difference between dedicating a park when the City owned the property but the City leased El Camino Park, and it was a very difficult problem for the City to deal with and a solution had not been found. He could not foresee what would happen with Cubberley in 10, 20 or 25 years, and he urged Council not to dedicate a leased piece of property and put Council or its successors in the same kind of position as the present Council was in with regard to El Camino Park. Council was in complete control of the Cubberley lease and dedication could only serve to restrict the Council.

Vice Mayor Fazzino said one difference was the PAUSD was accountable to the same voters as the City Council and it was a different situation than the Stanford Board of Trustees.

Mr. Calonne said the Palo Alto Municipal Code stated an ordinance was required before any substantial building construction, reconstruction or development could occur. He believed that implied some insubstantial development could occur without an ordinance.

Council Member Levy queried the present cash availability that would be dedicated to the Implementation Plan.

Mr. Zane said the cash availability varied with the amount of utility sales because it was tied to the UTU. It was not so much pegged to rental income because the large bulk of the rental income under the agreement passed through to the PAUSD. The key was how much utility sales were made which determined how much the particular percentage brought in, and what was left went to the Cubberley project. Over the ten years, staff estimated if sales went as projected, there would be approximately $1.5 million.

Council Member Levy clarified the implementation phase based on the funds available would be approximately a 20-year plan.
Mr. Zaner said that was correct. Staff always anticipated the basic improvements at Cubberley, e.g., those things which had to be done to make the building safe for occupancy, would be done as quickly as possible. The money was not "in hand" because the UUT came in quarterly, and the plan had always been to "borrow" from one of the City's funds and repay the fund over a period of time. The Council would have complete control over how fast repayment was to occur because it would need to be included in the budget.

Council Member Levy clarified the City received some money from rents and he queried whether a policy existed in terms of how much the City charged for rents at Cubberley.

Mr. Zaner said Council adopted a policy which favored a far below market rate for nonprofit groups, e.g., artists, persons who were not commercial endeavors, and the current rate was $.33 a square foot.

Council Member Levy queried whether any policy existed which precluded the rent being more than that.

Mr. Zaner said nothing precluded Council from raising the rent.

Council Member Levy clarified the policy did not set the figure but rather stated the figure would be below market rates.

Real Property Manager Bill Fellman said Council set the rates at $.33 for artists and $.55 for non-profits. Since that time, the rent to artists was elevated to $.37. There were current tenants who were under the original PAUSD leases until July, 1992.

Council Member Levy queried whether data existed which indicated the costs for maintenance of the facility, and whether the $.37 would pay for maintenance in any way.

Mr. Zaner said no. Staff had the total costs for maintenance and could compute a per foot cost.

Council Member Levy queried whether the amount would still be well below market rates if Council set a policy which stated its objective was to have the maintenance costs covered.

Mr. Fellman said if the rates covered the maintenance costs, they would be about market rate. The market rates at Cubberley were about $1 per square foot.

Council Member Levy said at some point he would like to pursue the question of why reimbursing the City for maintenance brought the rental figure up to market rate.

Mayor Sutorius believed as of the close of the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1990-91, with one quarter to go, the City's rental income at Cubberley was approximately $668,000, which was a satisfactory performance rate. It meant the City was assured it would more than exceed that portion of the rental revenue which was a pass through of the Cubberley lease. Staff accomplished what it said at the outset, i.e., despite what needed to be done in taking over the Cubberley site and some vacant spaces because the PAUSD vacated the portion it occupied, it could cover the revenue obligation and exceed it.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Levy moved, seconded by Kniss, to amend Item No. 3 to add at the end "and to include City Council review and approval."

Council Member Levy believed the addition would cover the concern that any additions beyond the Implementation Phase to the Master Plan return to the City Council.

Council Member Kniss believed the addition helped to make the intent of the Council's discussion more precise.

Mr. Calonne clarified the City Manager had indicated to the extent implementation meant budgeting it would return to the Council. He noted actions of the Zoning Administrator were appealable to the City Council, and ARB actions could be referred directly from the Director of Planning and Community Environment to the Council. If Council wanted something more than budgeting to return to Council, it should be explicitly stated.

Council Member Levy preferred for Council to approve the Implementation Plan and the Master Plan would be on the table, but any part of the Master Plan would have to return to the City Council for approval. For example, Council was not approving a swimming pool simply because the funding was being made available from a private source. While it was true the Zoning Administrator and ARB decisions could be appealed to the City Council, the language proposed in his amendment would require something to return to the Council not merely because of the funding elements but other elements as well. He wanted the City Council to have the opportunity to be comfortable with the parking and whatever the community's thinking was at the time.

Mr. Zaner clarified Council Member Levy's intent was those elements of the Master Plan would return to Council on a project-by-project basis for approval.

Council Member Levy said the elements beyond the Implementation Plan would return to Council project-by-project.

Mr. Zaner had no problem with the amendment but clarified a project had to return to the Council regardless because they had to become capital improvement projects and staff needed authority to budget the items and spend the money. There was no way for staff to do a project without Council approval.

Council Member Renzel supported the amendment if it meant the projects would return to Council for review as a matter of policy and not just as a part of the budget document. The budget document did not provide the kind of public exposure that a specific policy
issue did and it was important for the items to be agendized and clear to the public.

Council Member McCown understood what the amendment intended to accomplish. She referred to Condition No. 2 regarding the process for future implementation phases and master use permit process and queried whether any pursuit of a further project would return to the Council before it went through any of the other processes.

Council Member Levy envisioned a project coming before the Council after it went through the Zoning Administrator.

Council Member McCown suggested wording be added to Condition No. 2 that whatever came out of the Zoning Administrator's processes would go through the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Zaner was concerned about going through the entire public process, having the community group work on the project with staff, going through the formal processes, and then the project going to Council. If Council wanted to make some judgment about whether a project should move forward, it should happen at the beginning so regardless of whether funds were received from a private party for a swimming pool, Council could decide whether it wanted to pursue a pool and if so, the processes could determine how and where the pool should be constructed.

Mr. Calonne suggested the amendment to Item 3 read "and to include City Council review and approval before zoning Administrator, Board or Commission action." If Council wanted to include the language as part of Condition 2, the third sentence could read, "The recommendations of the Cubberley Advisory Committee and a summary of their process for deriving the recommendation will be transmitted to the City Council and then the Zoning Administrator with any future applications for future Conditional Use Permits on the site."

Council Member Levy did not believe that was what he had in mind. Council was either approving a master plan, the elements of which were 20 years off, or it was approving some very big projects in concept which could only materialize if private funding was received. Since those projects were envisioned to be very big, they needed to return to Council in detail because they would affect the entire use of the facility, e.g., parking and fields, etc. Even though Council believed a new swimming pool was an acceptable concept on the site, the swimming pool detail would go to the Planning Commission, etc., and would return to the Council. While he did not believe Council needed to approve the concept of something twice, Council needed to review and approve the detailed implementation plans at its level.

Mayor Sutorius believed what Council Member Levy described was the concept of a Planned Community (PC) zone modification where there was an approved PC zone project and when a proposal was made to change it, it went to the Council for review.

Ms. Lytle believed if the intent was to have the Planning Commission's and the Council's review of specific development approval within the Master Plan, Council should impose a (D) overlay on the Cubberley property in order to accommodate a site and design process. A minor project would go through the minor site and design approval process, which included ARB on site and a major site and design project would require Planning Commission review and recommendation and Council approval. Because of the new streamlined process where any action which ultimately required Council approval was accompanied by another action, such as a use permit, the use permit would go along with the site and design application and the use permit would also be a Council decision.

Council Member Levy did not consider himself enough of an expert on the details of site and design. He believed his original amendment on Item 3 would provide for going through whatever the normal City review and approval process were to include City Council review and approval.

Ms. Lytle said the concern was the abnormity of the process. She was thinking about whoever was the Zoning Administrator in ten years who looked at a PF designation and knew the process for a permitted or conditional use was ARB approval and Zoning Administrator approval, and that buried in an internal planning document was a motion of the Council that he or she would not remember. The "normal process including City Council review" was an oxymoron.

Mayor Sutorius was convinced the (D) overlay was the way to go.

Council Member Cobb believed the (D) overlay as outlined by staff and by the motion of Mayor Sutorius was the direction to go. The protection was in place already and nothing could move forward without funds, and a vote was needed to apply those funds. Major projects would come back through that channel. He believed the (D) overlay was a good solution. He did not want to send a message to adopt the Cubberley Master Plan in concept as a policy of the Council and then add language that said the Council would not do that, which the original amendment did. The (D) overlay made it clear that the project had to go through the process and return to Council which gave the community the ability to enter into the process, appeal directly to the Council to make their feelings known, and for the Council to act accordingly.

Council Member Woolley supported the (D) overlay because the process was already in place and would distinguish between minor and major projects. Item No. 3 indicated "any implementation" and then the projects would have to come to Council. There was no process set up to define what was a minor or major project.

Council Member Andersen queried the difference between a major and minor project.

Ms. Lytle said a minor project was determined to have no physical impact or significant environmental affect, would not add square
Council Member Andersen referred to the items on the Master Plan not approved by the Planning Commission and queried which items would be considered minor.

Ms. Lytle said the items within the Implementation Plan would be minor, e.g., rest room and interior code renovations. Major items would be the addition of the theatre, multi-purpose room, swimming pool, and new gymnasium.

Council Member Andersen queried whether the covered walkway renovation would be minor.

Ms. Lytle said because of the controversy over the project, it would be sent through the major process unless resolved in a previous review.

Council Member Renzel queried how the suggested (D) overlay would tie into Council Member McCown’s motion regarding additional renovation beyond the Implementation Plan which would be a lower priority and only pursued if the parking was adequate and there was continued use of the activities. Ms. Lytle indicated a future parking Administrator could say everything was all right if there was a conditional use permit and master plan would only have to go through the ARB. The design review allowed the Council to look at the swimming pool and decide what they wanted but did not allow a decision of yes or no. She understood Council Member McCown’s amendment and Council Member Levy’s comments would allow the review and consideration of how those major items in the Master Plan would dovetail with what was on ground and how it would function, which was different than site and design review. The Master Plan suggested those elements were ready to be reviewed, but Council needed a way to interact. Council Member McCown’s motion dealt with a certain amount of that, but she wanted a policy decision to proceed with the other processes. She did not believe site and design review would be the place. She would not support the (D) overlay.

Mayor Suttorius said there would be difference of opinion regarding the validity of the design review for rejecting or changing a project. There were instances in the past with regard to major undertakings where council had determined whether to continue in a given direction or make significant changes not previously incorporated in the elements of master plans, e.g., Bybee Park or the Baylands area. He was not comfortable with the (D) overlay.

Council Member McCown said the project would dovetail together by not beginning the design review unless the project had already passed the basic policy statement. The projects would have to be consistent with the uses and parking. If the project could not pass that threshold, even with money available, it would not be in front of the Council as a proposed project for design review.

Council Member Woolley said Ms. Lytle referred to projects which were in the Implementation Plan and she queried whether the (D) overlay would have Council review the design of all of the projects listed on the Staff report (CMR:236:91).

Ms. Lytle said the projects listed in the Implementation Plan were examples of minor site and design.

Council Member Woolley queried whether the new theatre lobby was minor.

Ms. Lytle said no. The theatre lobby was added in the Planning Commission’s recommendation as part of a follow up in the Master Plan and would be considered a major site and design. The Implementation Plan was primarily code repair, and the only expansion was a new bathroom.

Council Member Woolley queried whether the theatre lobby would be the only item reviewed by Council.

Ms. Lytle said yes, except through the budget process. The existing facilities were being upgraded and were only code repairs which were not considered major site and design applications. There would be no expansion of square footage. The construction of new buildings, swimming pools, gymnasiums, and the covered walkway renovation would be considered major use changes.

Council Member Woolley clarified the athletic fields and landscaping would not return to Council, and she was concerned those items were as major as the covered walkway renovation.

Ms. Lytle said the projects would not return to Council.

Planning Commission Chairman Pam Marsh clarified the Planning Commission had used site and design in a broad manner in recent applications to successfully address policy issues. The site and design was typically applied to the hill sides or the baylands and were looked at for intricacies of the design, e.g., colors, tiles, roof material. When multi-use projects came through, the design was placed on a secondary level. The prime concern would be how the different elements within the project reacted with the surrounding environment and whether the multi-use project integrated with the surrounding developments.

Council Member Kniss queried if with the (D) overlay, in ten years the Zoning Administrator would have the clarity needed since there appeared to still be matter of interpretation.

Ms. Lytle said future zoning administrators would use their discretion when deciding a minor and a major project. Some rules came from the California Environmental Quality Act as well as how the new development affected the surrounding community or the community center environment. There were some grey areas. The discretion of the Planning Commission and Council of the findings
through the review process for the site and design could bear on the decision.

Council Member Kniss said Council Member Levy's amendment was a more precise measure of the process returning to the Council.

Ms. Lytle said if the project was major and would change the site significantly, it would go through the Planning Commission and Council. The other process recommended was not codified or adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. There would be no major reference document to use in the day-to-day administration of land use in the Planning Department so applicants would not be advised unless there was knowledge of the specific clause in the motion which could be lost.

Council Member Kniss clarified for long-term clarification the process worked.

Ms. Lytle said that was correct.

Council Member Renzel queried whether a policy threshold would be reached before any site and design review went to Council.

Council Member McCown said the Council would give policy direction for participants in the stages beyond the Implementation Plan if the policy criteria had been met. Any further pursuit of those major projects had to meet the criteria. Something might need to be done with the earlier stage.

Council Member Renzel queried if there was an adopted master plan and in the conditions of adoption there was Condition No. 6 about later projects having a lower priority which had to meet certain thresholds, how a subsequent Zoning Administrator would be flagged for that; and what needed to happen administratively for the flagging problem with respect to the main motion.

Ms. Lytle said the high priority projects would have been done and staff would have moved on to the low priority projects. If the staff had changed or the intent forgotten, administration would research the intent that was conveyed with every motion.

Council Member Renzel said her approval was contingent upon meeting the criterion outlined by Council Member McCown. She wanted to ensure the public was involved and that the site would not be overdeveloped without clear guidance. The issues raised during the hearings needed to be addressed.

Ms. Lytle said the concerns were compensated with Condition No. 2, and the formation of the Cubberley Advisory Committee, which was not a normal process for that type of project, and would keep a lot of the conditions alive.

Council Member Andersen queried how staff would determine there was sufficient parking to proceed with the process; whether it would be at the outset and whether the procedure provided staff with the incentive to do the necessary research to know there was sufficient parking available.

Ms. Lytle clarified the concern was whether the site and design process was sufficient for incorporating a parking consideration.

Council Member Andersen queried when the parking question would be answered. He did not want the process to go forward and then the data would show there was insufficient parking.

Ms. Lytle said the policy makers were not comfortable with the staff recommendation to approve the parking as indicated in the Master Plan. They wanted to be more incremental, test the parking as it went along, and not rely on the provision of new spaces as the only solution but to rely on some Transportation Demand Management programs which could be administered as another facet in the solution. The staff would say enough was enough through the public hearing process when the use permit came together with the site and design. At each individual major project, a decision would have to be made to determine whether there was a significant impact on parking; and if there was, the project would be denied.

Council Member Andersen understood Council Member McCown's amendment suggested the process would not even be started unless the staff knew there was parking available.

Ms. Lytle said the Implementation Plan would provide 112 parking spaces and improve the situation.

Council Member Andersen said 112 spaces would not improve the situation unless Foothill College moved. Before starting any one of the Master Plan projects, the staff would have a clear picture if parking was available and queried whether the projects would be implemented without having the information.

Ms. Lytle said the staff assumed the deficit of parking would not be completely filled, and the goal was not to make the deficit worse than it was now. The Implementation Plan included 112 new parking spaces as a cushion for any future development. The existing need was not at maximum and would not get worse until square footage was added.

Council Member Andersen queried whether the calculation considered any growth on the part of Foothill College.

Ms. Lytle said maximum use of Foothill College was considered in the parking calculations.

Mr. Thiltsen said during peak parking times, Foothill College was at their maximum.

Council Member Andersen queried whether any part of the Master Plan could be visualized beyond the existing square footage with only 112 additional parking spaces.
Mr. Thilgen said based upon the Implementation Plan, the use pattern would not change substantially from what currently existed. The 112 parking spaces added spaces to alleviate the times of overflow during those two- or three-week periods. Foothill College was using all the square footage available during their peak times with maximum capacity.

Council Member Woolley said the Council needed to make the policy decision up front, and Ms. Lytle said that when the design review was before the Council, then the parking would be reviewed.

Mr. Zaner said when a project was brought before Council, the staff did not present a project that did not meet the minimum requirements for parking and open space. The existing overlay mechanism would trigger a process that reminded the staff that the process needed to include a consideration by the Council. The projects would not be brought to Council without adequate parking because staff would know it would not go through. The protection that Council wanted was there. He urged Council to put the overlay into the project to trigger the right response and the Council's opportunity to review the process at the proper time.

Council Member Woolley queried how the process would dovetail with the Cubberley Advisory Committee in Condition No. 2.

Mr. Zaner said the Cubberley Advisory Committee was designed to give the opportunity to work directly with the community, who would be heavily involved in the completion of the condition. The committee would have an opportunity to review all aspects. The Cubberley Advisory Committee happened before site and design and was a conceptual, organizing phase.

Mayor Sutorius clarified the amendment included Item No. 3 of the motion and affirmed that any implementation of the Master Plan beyond Phase One would be subject to City review and approval processes as established by the (D) overlay.

Mr. Calonne suggested the motion be an instruction to staff to prepare a zoning amendment to designate the site under the Site and Design Review Combining District which could be accomplished by a separate Item No. 8. Item No. 8 would read "instruct staff to initiate a rezoning action to designate the site for the Site and Design Review Combining District."

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT: Mayor Sutorius moved, seconded by Cobb, to add as Recommendation No. 8 "instruct staff to initiate a rezoning action to designate the site for the site and design process."

Council Member Levy would not support the motion. He wanted a policy statement, and the amendment referred to the elements of the zoning, etc., all of which could change. The facility would be important, and he was uncomfortable with the staff indicating that they could not meet the Council's needs to design now. He believed staff could put into the process a way in which they would not forget that there was a policy in place.

Council Member Renzel said Council Member Levy had raised another issue, which was that the whole rule of design review could be abolished by another Council and the intended impact would be lost. She supported the design review. When the projects were brought forward, the public would be told it was in the Master Plan and that Council had approved the Master Plan. A solution could be to take Council Member McCown's No. 6 and incorporate it into the Master Plan so that the Zoning Administrator at the time could recognize that the approvals in the Master Plan were conditional.

Mayor Sutorius said the (D) overlay would be on the property and anything that site criteria would come back for site and design review even though it was in the Implementation Plan.

Mr. Zaner said there was no problem because it was coming back anyway because the money needed to be appropriated for the projects.

Mayor Sutorius said there were elements of the Implementation Plan which people were concerned about that otherwise would not have come forward.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT PASSED 8-1, Levy "no."

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION - 9:47 P.M. TO 10:20 P.M.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Andersen moved, seconded by Renzel, to add to the end of Council No. 3, the final line shall read: “... track where it is. The bleachers on the north side may be removed to improve the visual appearance and integration of the track area into the rest of the site, provided, however, they should not be removed until and unless there is a project to replace them that is visually less obtrusive."

Council Member Andersen said the area and bleachers were used by the community organizations and were in as good a condition as the bleachers at Palo Alto High School. The track provided a facility for many of the unorganized athletes in the community.

Council Member Renzel concurred with Council Member Andersen and thanked Mr. Sandy Snodgrass for his efforts in detailing the amount of use of the area. She did not believe the bleachers should be removed unless replaced with other bleachers less visually obtrusive.

Council Member McCown supported the amendment. The impact on the visual and aesthetic view and the ability to integrate the feeling and incorporation of the track area into site was important. She would like to have the flexibility to move them but recognized the use which should be provided for in a way that accomplished the visual goals without eliminating the use.

Vice Mayor Fazzino said response from members of the public clearly showed both the track and the bleachers were used extensively. There were very few tracks similar in the City. He believed the
bleachers were sound but was open to the possibility that they
could be changed. There was an emotional attachment to the current
placement of the track and bleachers.

Council Member Cobb queried whether Council Member Andersen's
motion intended that any bleachers removed be replaced in the exact
same location.

Council Member Andersen did not see a great deal of loss if the
bleachers were relocated to the same general area. He was not
totally persuaded the bleachers should go on the other side of the
field.

Council Member Cobb suggested a language change "that the bleachers
should not be removed unless and until they have been functionally
replaced." The function trying to be replaced was the protection
of the runners from flying balls. There might be some other way of
doing it without retaining old space-consuming bleachers if the
seating could open the area more, provide all the screening and
protection, meet all the needs and desires of the people using the
track area, and give more flexibility to the field for other users.

Council Member Andersen could not accept the suggestion as a
friendly amendment. He believed it gave the flexibility to staff
but also gave a sense of vagueness to the people concerned about
the item.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT: Council Member Cobb moved, seconded by
Levy, that the bleachers should not be removed unless and until
they have been functionally replaced.

Vice Mayor Fazzino referred to the amendment to the amendment and
was concerned about the proposal because he did not want the main
bleachers beyond the south side and close to neighboring homes.
The bleachers on the present site could serve people using the
track as well as serving as observation post for events on the main
part of the turf. The amendment would provide that the bleachers
would be torn down and new bleachers constructed on the south side.

Council Member Kniss would leave the bleachers where they were. Any
attempt to relocate or remove the bleachers would be a considerable
amount of money.

Council Member Renzel was opposed to the amendment to the
amendment. The bleachers served the community well in their
current location and agreed with Council Member Andersen. She
would be willing to look at replacement with bleachers less
visually intrusive. The movement of the bleachers was very low
priority.

Mayor Sutorius believed Vice Mayor Fazzino's comments regarding the
neighboring properties was the most significant to attend to in
design. He opposed the amendment to the amendment.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT FAILED 2-7, Cobb, Levy "aye."

Council Member Andersen clarified the amendment would be under
Condition No. 3 at the end of the first sentence.

AMENDMENT PASSED 9-0.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Renzel moved, seconded by Andersen, to
incorporate the language in No. 6 in the Master Plan so that those
items were in the Master Plan and conditional on the criteria.

Council Member McCown queried how all of the changes would be
incorporated into the Master Plan and what the final document would
look like.

Mr. Zaner said the document would end up being comparable to the
Terman Master Plan document. The document would have within it all
of the motions, the master conditional use permit, and site and
design in place which were adopted by the Council.

Mayor Sutorius queried the maker of the amendment that if the total
material as described was in the Master Plan, then the condition
concerned about would already be there without reference.

Council Member Renzel preferred the language be part of Master Plan
which made it clear the Council's intent when adopting the Master
Plan that there be some incremental review as to whether the larger
projects needed the criteria.

Council Member Cobb queried why one item should be singled out and
not the others.

Mr. Zaner said the Council had that option. All the parts of the
action would have equal weight and would be noticed.

Council Member Cobb queried whether they would be contained in one
common document.

Mr. Zaner said yes.

AMENDMENT FAILED 5-4, Renzel, Andersen, McCown, Kniss, "aye."

Council Member Renzel queried the proposal which existed to move
the tennis courts and whether there was an understanding that the
protection of all existing turf areas would preclude that and
whether Council needed to specific that understanding.

Mr. Thilltgen said the Alternative Plan was agreed upon which
included not moving the tennis courts.

Council Member Levy said the term Master Plan implied a definite
which was not reflected in the project before Council. With the
money available, the Master Plan was very long-term, which would
not take place unless private funding was secured. He was
cconcerned when talking about the Master Plan, the community would
assume it was in the works and within a reasonable amount of time
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the items would happen. He wanted to add the word "conceptual" before the words Master Plan in order to lower the public's expectations of what the funding would accomplish.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Levy moved, seconded by Rensel, to add the word "conceptual" prior to "Master Plan" wherever it appears.

Council Member Kniss queried how the wording would alter expectations.

Mr. Calonne said there would be no change.

Vice Mayor Fazzino supported the amendment and believed the Council had created a conceptual Master Plan based upon all the actions taken in order to implement any part of the Master Plan. He believed the word "conceptual" would add credence to the philosophy of the Council that many of the decisions with respect to resources and use were yet to be made and was in keeping with the votes of the people. The Council needed to demonstrate to the voters that over the 10 or 15 years that the resources were in place to move forward with different aspects of the plan.

Council Member Cobb opposed the amendment because of one effect, that is, Item No. 7 referred to putting together a public/private partnership where the community could go out and attempt to raise the money to make the vision that the Master Plan defined reality. The Master Plan was a marketing document and the more it was qualified, the more it was weakened as a marketing document.

AMENDMENT PASSED 6-3, Cobb, Sutorius, Woolley "no."

Council Member Anderson said at the south end of the property there was a considerable number of redwood trees, and some of the items suggested, i.e., challenge course, could impact the trees. The preliminary drawings indicated there might be some removal of redwood trees. The trees were on the perimeters and did not intrude into the playing field area.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Andersen moved, seconded by Rensel, to retain the redwood trees groves in the south area around the track.

Council Member Andersen was concerned about the impact of the challenge course and the play area on the redwood trees in the southern area. One of the plans would remove some of those trees and he encouraged a statement of policy that Council was committed to continue the development of the trees.

Council Member McCown said that level of detail was not necessary in the Master Plan and was suited for the site and design process. She did not see any proposals contained within the Master Plan which suggested the trees removal. The specific details of the play area without impacting the trees could be left to the site and design process. She did not support the motion.

Council Member Kniss supported the retention of the trees but if Council got into a level micromanagement, the removal of one tree would be brought back to Council. She did not support that level of detail.

AMENDMENT FAILED 3-6, Rensel, Andersen, Fazzino "aye."

MOTION: Council Member Fazzino moved, seconded by Rensel, to direct the City Attorney and the City Manager to analyze the impact of the park dedication on the Master Plan and to report back to the City Council.

Vice Mayor Fazzino was not prepared to propose a dedication of the property because there might be some limitation in use. He was interested in exploring the possibility which was the only way the City could guarantee the open space area would remain in open space. He concurred with Mr. Samer's comments and concerns regarding El Camino Park negotiating difficulties. The PAUSD was accountable to the same set of voters as the Council and if the property was dedicated or if and when the property reverted back to PAUSD, the PAUSD would support the community's wish to preserve open space around closed schools. It was an important step to take in order to see whether dedication could provide the guarantee needed to assure the property remained in open space.

Council Member Rensel concurred with Vice Mayor Fazzino and believed there might be creative ways through the continuing elections of ongoing funding of Cubberley. The removal from park dedication might be a portion of an election and a negative vote could remove the park dedication which could be a companion measure to the continuing funding measure.

Council Member McCown supported the motion, but the emphasis would have to be on the long-term policy decision far more than the legalities of whether to dedicate or not dedicate. She would rather have the policy issue dealt with rather than the legal technicalities.

Mayor Sutorius said the lease would be reviewed carefully for descriptions and how the property needed would be returned in the event of termination. He directed staff to report back to Council.

MOTION PASSED 8-1, Woolley "no."

Mayor Sutorius said there were eight points in the main motion, four findings, and three conditions. The negative declaration would be adopted and the following action would be taken with respect to the Cubberley Master Plan:

1. Approve the Cubberley Conceptual Master Plan in concept and incorporate the concepts of the alternative field design.
2. Approve the implementation of Phase One of the Conceptual Master Plan (Implementation Plan) subject to the availability of funds for that implementation.
3. Affirm that any implementation of the Conceptual Master Plan beyond Phase One would be subject to normal City review and approval processes.

4. Establish a policy that the existing open space at Cubberley would be preserved in its entirety and not be used as a parking reserve.

5. The highest priority would be to renovate existing facilities, including the upgrading and enhancement through additions of square footage, where necessary for efficiency and better utilization. The policy was intended to encompass the elements of the Implementation Plan.

6. The additional renovations and major new uses proposed beyond the Implementation Plan (swimming pool, new gymnasium, new building A, B, and C, new wing on building L, multi-purpose expansion) would be a lower priority and would only be pursued if they could not be accomplished consistent with the site constraints defined by the parking limitations and continued use of renovated facilities. Before any major uses could be added, a parking analysis would be performed to evaluate whether additional use could be added without negatively impacting existing use rate and the surrounding neighborhood.

7. Instruct staff to determine and report back to Council for consideration and possible action: a) the degree to which public/private partnerships could be used to generate financial support for the Master Plan implementation; and b) the potential mechanisms for the creation and implementation of such partnerships.

8. Instruct staff to initiate a zoning action to designate the site for the site and design review process.

Findings
The four findings were as proposed in the staff report (CMR:240:91) and were unchanged.

Conditions
There were sentence removals, rearrangements, and some new wording.

1. Any further proposals which require additional parking beyond that indicated in the Master Plan should be referred to the Director of Planning and Community Environment to the Planning Commission for recommendation and City Council for final action. Any such additional parking should be established by: a) a reduction in the proposed new improvements; b) further restrictions for the use permit on the simultaneous use and occupancy of certain large occupancy facilities; or c) a substitute proposal for satisfying the parking requirements (other than a parking structure).

2. A Cubberley Advisory Committee (CAC) would be appointed comprised of representatives of the Green Meadow Community Association, existing and potential tenants, members of the community-at-large, a Planning Commission member, and staff from Community Services. The CAC should hold open public meetings to develop recommendations for future implementation phases of the Cubberley Master Plan prior to any application for the Master Conditional Use Permit beyond the Implementation Plan defined in the document. The recommendations of the CAC and a summary of the process for deriving the recommendations would be transmitted to the Zoning Administrator with any future applications for further conditional use permits on the site. The nature of any public/private partnership and their relationship to the CAC should be determined at a future date.

3. The alternative field design shown on Attachment A of staff report (CMR:240:91) should be substituted for that included on the Implementation Plan and Conceptual Master Plan. Field layout should retain the existing track. The bleachers on the north side could be removed to improve the visual appearance and/or integration of the track area into the rest of the site provided, however, they should not removed until and unless there was a project to replace them with visually less intrusive ones.

Council Member Andersen queried the offer received for volunteer labor and materials with respect to the bleachers and the issue of volunteer service or materials. He would like Item No. C added to No. 7 of the motion which would state "the use of volunteer labor or donated materials would also be explored by staff to determine what extent that could be accomplished."

Council Member Cobb said the issue was implicit with the public/private partnership and he would only want the broadest construction of that phrase.

Council Member Andersen said there was a difference between financial support and volunteer labor or donated materials and could create complications. He said under Item No. 7, No. C would read "use of volunteer labor and/or donated materials."

NO. C UNDER ITEM NO. 7 INCORPORATED INTO THE MAIN MOTION BY MAKER AND SECOND;

Vice Mayor Fazzino said he was delighted the community center would become a reality after four and one-half years. He believed the structure of the plan and the use of the UUT funds for the Phase One was keeping faith with the voters. An election would not be needed in the Fall of 1991, but the City would have the opportunity in the future to go to the voters for new sources of revenue for the additional phases of the Master Plan. He believed softening the Master Plan to a Conceptual Master Plan was not enough of a tangible item to go to the voters for support. He recommended both the staff and public. The staff came up with the plan, the public
participated in the modification of the plan, and then it came before Council. He commended the preparation of Council Members Andersen, Cobb, and McCown on the notion.

Council Member Andersen said it was important for the community to recognize that a Master Plan had been developed that some people believed would never happen. There was a vision, but there was a site that would not accommodate what was established. He did not want to shape this vision that 20 years from now the Master Plan would be there because what was driving the machine was parking. There was not sufficient space provided for parking. The parking area was accommodating a Foothill College system that consisted of 4,000 students who drive and use 95 percent of the space available. He did not want expectations raised unless some major change occurred in the driving pattern or Foothill College left. He did not want nor did the community want Foothill College to leave. The College was a tremendous asset to the community. The Master Plan was visionary and would be a plan which would be difficult to implement because of the demands for parking. He believed the Master Plan as originally conceived was too intensive. The Master Plan before Council would establish priorities, allow for the priorities to be set, with constraints, in a way which would not intrude on the community, and to have creative input from the community so that alternatives to the parking could be found. He supported the proposal, but the reality was that it would not happen without extraordinary amounts of contributions from various sources. He proposed that established the loss of State contract with Foothill College to put in a swimming pool as a higher priority or some other activity lower on the list. The Master Plan was prudent financially because there was a tight reign on the funds and the parking.

Council Member Kniss echoed Council Member Andersen’s comments and the partnership had preserved the relationship between the schools and the City. The original promise had been delivered which was to preserve open space, the facilities, and allow amenities, e.g., child care, to continue on the site. The Council had provided an excellent start, but the funds were in short supply and the entire Conceptual Master Plan might not be delivered.

Council Member Woolley clarified with all of the precautions, the Master Plan was not that much different than the Planning Commission recommendations. The plan had accomplished the goal to transform an unattractive high school into a Community Center. The staff had endeavored to put in the Master Plan a sense that there would be neighborhoods within the Community Center which would provide a center similar to the Lucie Stern Community Center. If the property was leased for 25 years, a lot of things could happen and the flexibility needed to be maintained in terms of park dedication. She hoped the driving patterns would change so not as much parking would be needed to support all the uses in the Conceptual Master Plan. She was grateful for the vision provided by staff and hoped that most of them would be accomplished.

Council Member Cobb said to succeed, the vision must be a community vision not a neighborhood vision, must be sensitive to the neighborhood, but must serve the entire community. He had wanted to see Cubberley as a community facility for over ten years. The community had the beginning of something that could happen. There were no problems because the vision was not constrained. The victory was not final but a beginning, and it was up to the community to make it happen. He believed out of the structure would come something unique and special for Palo Alto.

Council Member McCown said the Council needed to go forward with a positive attitude and continue to have a successful project whether or not all of the planned uses of the Master Plan were completed. While there was no question there would be substantial constraints on how fast or how much the City could do on the site, there was a longer-term vision of possibilities which may or may not be successfully pursued. The process was excellent because Council did something different than the Planning Commission by endorsing a concept of a half-full cup attitude.

Council Member Levy said even before beginning the Master Plan process, he was gratified to see the wonderful ways the Cubberley site was being used, e.g., child care, youth and religious groups, athletics, theatre, Foothill College, and the artists. The Council was fearful when schools were being closed that school sites would be lost completely. It was a tribute to the many partnerships in the city that it had not happened as had been anticipated. The loss of that space had been offset to a large degree. The partnership included not only the neighbors and the users of Cubberley but the Planning Commission, the ARB, the Recreation Division, the Planning Department, and City staff. He commended the professionalism by everyone with regard to the meetings with the community in working out all differences. Many people fought hard for their own individual choices but at the same time kept the larger purposes in mind. He commended staff for making the Council’s decision so easy and fruitful.

Mayor Sutorius said the process began four years ago, and the program had been undertaken as a part of a covenant and lease with PAUSD. There was a lease for a firm 25 years and a likely additional two five-year extension with only mutual agreement. He would work to pursue further lease modifications as far as the term or even by acquisition of the site. The amortization of the costs associated with the undertakings would be justifiable over an extended period. During the course of the discussions, there were references to the UUT and the Council had an obligation to the public which included the businesses, commercial, industrial, and institutional customers who pay the lion’s share of the total UUT revenues which made the things possible, i.e., protected sites, elementary and middle schools, extended day care, and a significant contribution to the community’s first priority which was the education of the youth. Before the end of the month, there would be a scheduled discussion regarding the status of the UUT, the amounts of monies which have been collected since inception, the disposition of those monies, and a full opportunity for discussion.
NOTION AS AMENDED PASSED 9-0.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 11:32 p.m.
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TO:          HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM:        CITY MANAGER    DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
AGENDA DATE: AUGUST 5, 1996       CMR:335:96
SUBJECT:     PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CUBBERLEY MASTER PLAN TO PROVIDE FLEXIBILITY OF POTENTIAL USES IN FOUR BUILDING WINGS

REQUEST
This report requests Council approval of an amendment to the Cubberley Master Plan to provide more flexibility for potential uses in four wings at the site.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends that Council authorize staff to amend the Cubberley Master Plan in order to provide for additional uses in four wings at the site and apply for an amended conditional use permit to allow the additional uses identified.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS
The report recommends implementation of a revised policy regarding applicable uses for wings A, K, L and V at the Cubberley Community Center. This proposal to provide a more flexible alternative of uses in the A, K, L and V wings will not significantly affect the "neighborhood concept". In keeping with the neighborhood concept, the proposed expansion of uses still maintains a grouping of users and tenants based upon similarity of use and required facilities.

BACKGROUND
In 1991, Council approved the adoption of the Cubberley Master Plan (CMR:249:91). The Master Plan is divided into two parts: the Implementation Plan, which focuses on the improvements planned for the first three to five years; and the Master Plan, which focuses on the future potential of the site for the remainder of the City’s lease. Following adoption of the Master Plan, staff obtained a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with the layout of uses in the Implementation Plan portion of the Master Plan. The Implementation Plan was
developed to prioritize a phased implementation of the Master Plan as funding became available from public and private sources.

The Master Plan was designed to create a community center at an existing high school site through appropriate space allocation, campus organization, renovation and construction of facilities and aesthetic improvements. The space allocation and campus organization were designed to accommodate the needs of the public and create a feeling of community. During the public input process, numerous requests were received for space rental at Cubberley on both an hourly and long-term basis. A unifying concept, “neighborhoods,” was developed to meet those requests. Proposed users were grouped into neighborhoods according to similarity of use and similarity of required facilities. It was further proposed and accepted by the public that the facilities required by a neighborhood should be adjacent to one another and be architecturally unified. This organization would promote the development of small communities of users within Cubberley, and provide for a more logically organized campus. It would also enable visitors to locate facilities with greater ease. The identified neighborhoods and their related users are identified on the Implementation Plan Tenant Location Map, attached as Exhibit A.

DISCUSSION
The uses identified in the Implementation Plan were proposed to meet the needs of the groups interested in obtaining space, in meeting the needs of existing users and tenants, and in maintaining the neighborhood concept of the Master Plan. To date, all of the uses identified in the Implementation and Master Plans have been allocated to users and long-term tenants in accordance with the Master Plan neighborhood concept. However, due to the lack of sufficient demand for certain Master Plan-designated uses, staff is proposing to amend the uses in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>CURRENT MASTER PLAN DESIGNATED USES</th>
<th>PROPOSED EXPANSION OF USES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wing</td>
<td>Hourly/Admin. Offices</td>
<td>Hourly/Admin. Offices/Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K wing</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education/Childcare/Nonprofit &amp; Community Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms L1/L2</td>
<td>Music/Theater/Dance</td>
<td>Music/Theater/Dance/Education/Arts/Nonprofit &amp; Community Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 to L5</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Dance/Theater/Arts/Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V bldg</td>
<td>Music/Theater</td>
<td>Music/Theater/Education/Childcare/Nonprofit &amp; Community Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cubberley Site parcels & reuse opportunities

All buildings on the site warrant further review for rehabilitation and re-use.
Cubberley Community Center
Current Facilities vs. Master Plan Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Center Program</th>
<th>Current GSF</th>
<th>Program GSF</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Event Space</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>Added classroom capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose w/kitchen</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Social</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>Added teen, senior lounges, café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>Added storage, support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>Additional gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness, Dance, Support</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Added capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist Studios</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>Adjusted sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Added gallery/display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>Added capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Admin/Support</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>Adjusted sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease/Private Uses</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 1: Stand Alone

PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDALONE</th>
<th>Joint Use</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>Shared</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K/Elem</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Event Space</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performance Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio/Arts</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease/Office Use</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50,300</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>74,800</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>241,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reduced Parking Quota: 30%
- Bicycle Parking: 1 per 5 students

LEGEND

- Elementary School
- Community Center
- High School
- Middle School
- Shared Uses
- Adult Education

PHASES

- PHASE 1
- PHASE 2, 3, OR 4

PHASING SHOWN FOR CONCEPT PURPOSES ONLY

DRAFT 2012-03-23
Option 2: Minimum Share/Land Swap

PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM SHARE</th>
<th>Joint Use</th>
<th>K/Elem</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Shared</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Event</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio/Arts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Admin Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased/Private Uses</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>158,400</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reduced Parking     | 20%       | 20%    | 20%    | 20%    | 20%    | 20%    | 20%    | 20%    |
| Parking Capacity    | 1600      | 1600   | 1600   | 1600   | 1600   | 1600   | 1600   | 1600   |
| Bicycle Parking     | 1 per 5   | 105    | 483    | 150    | 385    | 385    | 385    | 385    |

LEGEND

- Elementary School Community Center
- High School
- Middle School
- Shared Uses
- Adult Education

PHASING SHOWN FOR CONCEPT PURPOSES ONLY

PHASE 1

PHASE 2, 3, OR 4

PHASE 2

PHASE 3
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Option 3: Moderate Share/Land Swap

PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERATE SHARE</th>
<th>Joint Use</th>
<th>V/Elem</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Shared</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; Event Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>278,800</td>
<td>278,800</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>285,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio/Cafe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>60,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>30,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease/Public Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50,300</td>
<td>89,700</td>
<td>43,300</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>189,400</td>
<td>158,500</td>
<td>349,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reduced Parking Space (%)    | 20%       |        |        |        |        | 261   | 81    | 342   | 734    |
| Bicycle Parking              | 1 per 5   | 105    | 183    | 50     | 385    | 385   | 385   | 385   |

LEGEND

Elementary School Community Center
High School
Middle School
Shared Uses
Adult Education

PHASING SHOWN FOR CONCEPT PURPOSES ONLY
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GAP Group Gelfland Partners Architects
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PALO ALTO, CA
City of Palo Alto Financial Outlook Presentation
Meeting No. 6, 8/8/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>$26.3</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>$26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Adjustments</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Adjustments</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2013 General Fund Budget Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Gap (4/30)</td>
<td>($5.844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue adjustments</td>
<td>4.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Budget Gap</strong></td>
<td>(1.370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net changes in operating budget</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional infrastructure funding</td>
<td>(2.200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Public Safety Concessions</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Budget</strong></td>
<td>($1.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Budget Gap</strong></td>
<td><em>(390)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Council approved a one-time reserve draw*
General Fund Impacts

- Closed Station 7 (SLAC – 9 positions)
- Added 6 Paramedic & 4 Operations Positions
- Eliminated 6 Firefighter Positions
- Froze 7 Police Officer Positions
- Eliminated positions in Planning, Public Works and Community Services
- Froze 5 Library positions
- Increased some municipal fees
- Reduced staff in Animal Services (effective January)
General Fund Revenue by Type
$153.0 Million

- Sales Tax - $22/15% 15%
- Property Tax - $27/18% 18%
- Charges for Services - $23/16% 16%
- Operating Transfers-In - $19/13% 13%
- Rental Income - $13/8% 8%
- Charges to other Funds - $11/7% 7%
- Other Revenue - $1/1% 1%
- Return on Investment - $1/1% 1%
- Permits & Licenses - $6.5/4% 4%
- Other Taxes and Fines - $2/1% 1%
- Utility Users Tax - $11/7% 7%
- Transient Occupancy Tax - $9/6% 6%
- Document Transfer Tax - $5/3% 3%
General Fund Major Revenues

![Graph showing General Fund Major Revenues from 1991 to 2013. The graph includes lines for Sales Tax, Property Tax, Utility User's Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax, Documentary Tax, and Revenue.]
General Fund Expense by Category

$152 Million

- Salaries & Benefits: $94/62% (62%)
- Contract Services: $11/7% (7%)
- Supplies & Materials: $3/2% (2%)
- Rents and Leases: $1/0% (0%)
- Facilities and Equipment: -$0.5/0% (0%)
- Allocated Charges: $17/11% (11%)
- Operating Transfers Out: -$1.6/0% (1%)
- Transfer to Infrastructure: $13/10% (9%)
## Citywide Budget Summary
(in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$153.0</td>
<td>$23.9</td>
<td>$176.9</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>$264.7</td>
<td>$35.8</td>
<td>$300.5</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$417.7</td>
<td>$59.7</td>
<td>$477.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes Internal Service Fund CIPs totaling $3.7 million
10 Year Trend - Citywide Pension Expense Paid by City ($Millions, FY 2012 Forecasted, FY 2013 Adopted)

*Employee contribution data prior to FY 2013 not included in chart
Capital Projects by Fund

$62.90 Million

- Capital Project Fund (General Fund), $23.9 Million, 38%
- Electric Fund, $10.9 Million, 17%
- Gas Fund, $7.8 Million, 12%
- Water Fund, $6.1 Million, 10%
- Wastewater Collection Fund, $4.4 Million, 7%
- Wastewater Treatment Fund, $2.6 Million, 4%
- Storm Drain Fund, $3.1 Million, 5%
- Technology Fund, $2.5 Million, 4%
- Vehicle Replacement Fund, $1.2 Million, 2%
- Fiber Optics Fund, $0.4 Million, 1%
Enterprise Funds Overview
Average Residential Utility Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Current FY 2012 Bill</th>
<th>Proposed FY 2013 Bill</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric (1)</td>
<td>$42.76</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (2)</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas (3)</td>
<td>55.19</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>(18.03)</td>
<td>-32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater (4)</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>29.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse (5)</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain (6)</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Tax (7)</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Monthly Bill</strong></td>
<td><strong>$235.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>$231.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>($4.20)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gas rate decrease – 10% average
  - Residential 32.7% (as of March 2012)
- Water rate increase – 15%
- Refuse rate increase – varies, above reflects 32-gal can
- Wastewater Collection rate increase – 5%
- Storm Drain & Fiber Optics rate increase 2.9% (CPI)
Enterprise Fund Highlights

- Utilities Organizational Assessment
  - Draft report received end of July
  - Department added 3 FTE and reclassified 2 FTE

- Landfill Closure (Refuse Fund)
  - Eliminated 9 FTE
  - $8.9M expense decrease which includes:
    - $1.6M landfill rent
    - $6.1M landfill closure CIP
    - $0.4M vehicle maintenance/replacement
    - $0.8M position eliminations & changes
Citywide Position Changes

FY 2012 Adopted FTE 1,016.60
Midyear Changes 8.25
FY 2012 Adjusted FTE’s 1,024.85

FY 2013 Proposed Changes (10.5)
FY 2013 Proposed Budget 1,014.35*

*Includes 14 Frozen FTE
Citywide FTE in FY 2011 was 1,078.50 FTE
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee

August 8, 2012
2012-13
Proposed Budget

June 12, 2012
# Budget Development/Financial Reporting/Calendar

For the 2012-13 & 2013-14 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2012</th>
<th>Adoption of 2012-13 PAUSD Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>Governor Signs the 2012-13 State Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>Property Tax Projections from County of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>First Revision of 2012-13 PAUSD Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>County Controller-Treasurer Property Tax Projection Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>First Interim PAUSD Financial Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>PAUSD Enrollment Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Release of Governor’s Recommended 2013-14 State Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>County Controller-Treasurer Property Tax Projection Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>State Budget Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Governor’s May Revise &amp; Property Tax Projection Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Adoption of 2013-14 PAUSD Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>Governor Signs State Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

- Estimated Actuals for 2011-12

- Proposed Budget for 2012-13
  - Revenue and expenses
  - Trends
  - Budget balancing

- Multi year projections

- Uncertainties
  - Governor’s tax initiative
  - Downside risk/upside potential
  - Weighted Student Formula
2011-12 Estimated Actuals

- Basis for 2012-13 Budget

- Estimated Fund balance available to mitigate future budget cuts of $12.7 million, an increase of $350k since second interim

- Increase due to:
  - Increase in property tax, lottery, and K-3 CSR revenue
  - Decrease in staffing budgets, special education NPS, and departmental budgets

- One-time savings of $1.3 million in mental health costs, designated in the ending fund balance
## 2012-13 Proposed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted/Reserved/Designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available to Mitigate Future</td>
<td>$31,105,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td>$18,387,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,718,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>$157,699,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$163,241,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Excess of Revenues over</td>
<td>($5,541,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (Unrestricted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDING FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted/Reserved/Designated</td>
<td>$25,564,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available to Mitigate Future</td>
<td>$18,413,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Cuts</td>
<td>$7,150,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of General Funds 2012-13

2012-13 Proposed Budget - Revenue Sources

- Property Taxes, 115,866,838, 74%
- Parcel Tax, 11,900,000, 8%
- State Revenue, 5,333,260, 3%
- Federal Revenue, 3,390,981, 2%
- Lease Revenue, 9,455,240, 6%
- PIE Revenue, 4,500,000, 3%
- Other Local Revenue, 6,779,799, 4%
- Transfers In, 576,673, 0%
2012-13 Proposed Budget - Revenues

- 2.0% property tax growth ($2,223,000)
- Budget is based upon Governor’s May revision
- $5.3 million additional reduction due to state community funded district “fair share” cuts (total reduction - $12.6 million)
- Parcel tax - $11,900,000
- PIE income - $4,500,000
- Lease revenue – 3% increase
- No state/federal carryover dollars included, only 12-13 revenue
Revenue Trends – Sources

![Revenue Trends Graph]

- State Funding
- Parcel Tax
- Leases - Surplus Sites
- Federal Funding
- PIE Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
<th>Leases - Surplus Sites</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>PIE Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Revenue Trends – Per Student Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funding*</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>106,194,134</td>
<td>109,289,695</td>
<td>110,126,767</td>
<td>111,207,000</td>
<td>113,383,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax - Special Ed</td>
<td>2,788,537</td>
<td>2,984,663</td>
<td>2,891,641</td>
<td>2,756,356</td>
<td>2,483,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Tax</td>
<td>9,346,204</td>
<td>9,452,073</td>
<td>11,383,617</td>
<td>11,683,512</td>
<td>11,683,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>16,877,168</td>
<td>12,806,108</td>
<td>13,855,528</td>
<td>10,095,567</td>
<td>5,333,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funding</td>
<td>5,258,193</td>
<td>5,267,796</td>
<td>5,236,741</td>
<td>5,545,995</td>
<td>3,390,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases - Surplus Sites</td>
<td>8,395,359</td>
<td>8,534,460</td>
<td>8,727,232</td>
<td>8,842,442</td>
<td>9,175,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,859,595</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,334,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>152,221,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,130,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,450,253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increase from 2008-09*: (3,409,342)

*% Increase from 2008-09*: -2%

*Excluding local sources*

### Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11th Day Enrollment</th>
<th>11,431</th>
<th>11,680</th>
<th>12,024</th>
<th>12,286</th>
<th>12,466</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Increase from 2008-09*: 1,035

*% Increase from 2008-09*: 9%

*Decrease from 2008-09*: $ (1,355)

*% Decrease from 2008-09*: -10%

*Notes: Total General Fund Revenue does not include donations from PIE, PTA or any other donations and local revenue to the schools.*
Use of General Funds 2012-13

Salaries and Benefits, 138,948,141, 85%

Supplies and Materials, 6,482,259, 4%

Services and Other Operating Expenses, 16,411,158, 10%

Capital Outlay, 81,000, 0%

Transfers Out, 1,421,737, 1%
2012-13 Proposed Budget - Expenditures

Personnel Budgets

- Step and Column costs for all employees
- 10 growth teachers (8 regular classroom teachers and 2 special education teachers)
- Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) rate increases from 10.923% to 11.417% ($125,000)
- Unemployment Insurance (UI) rate decreases from 1.61% to 1.10% ($500,000)
- Health and Welfare decreases due to loss of one-time Federal Jobs Funds ($1.4 million), although carryover funds still available
Other non personnel budgets:

- **Utilities**
  - 3% increase in electric and refuse
  - 20% increase in water
  - 20% decrease in gas

- 10% increase in non-public school tuition and placement ($400,000)

- Budget for other operating services and contracts remain relatively flat
Budget Balancing Plan

- $8.1 million budget deficit projected, if the Governor’s tax initiative does not pass ($5.3 million cut to PAUSD)

- Proposed budget includes:
  - $2.6 million in revenue enhancements and budget reductions
  - $5.5 million use of fund balance

- No reductions to sites
Change In Property Tax Revenue Per Student
Amount and Percentage

- 1999-00: $337, 6.82%
- 2000-01: $561, 10.63%
- 2001-02: $798, 13.67%
- 2002-03: $235, 3.55%
- 2003-04: -$102, -1.49%
- 2004-05: $413, 6.11%
- 2005-06: $383, 5.34%
- 2006-07: $579, 7.66%
- 2007-08: $398, 4.89%
- 2008-09: $742, 8.63%
- 2009-10: $72, 0.77%
- 2010-11: -$198, -2.12%
- 2011-12: -$111, -1.21%
- 2012-13: $48, 0.53%
- 2013-14: -$8, -0.08%
- 2014-15: -$43, -0.47%
- 2015-16: -$3, -0.04%
- 2016-17: $0
- 2017-18: $0

*Estimate
Assumptions in 2013-14 to 2017-18 Projections

- Weak growth outlook for the national and state economy
- Ongoing $12.6 million state “fair share” cut
- Property tax growth at 2% for all five years
- Expenses for thirteenth elementary site and loss of rental revenue for Garland site beginning in 2014-15
- Estimated fund balance available to mitigate future budget cuts of $12.7 million will be fully exhausted by the end of 2014-15
## Estimated General Fund & Basic Aid Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Economic Uncertainties</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Available to Mitigate Future Budget Cuts</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Aid Reserve</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED ENDING RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>$27.0</td>
<td>$21.6</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>$14.5</td>
<td>$14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$162.4</td>
<td>$163.2</td>
<td>$164.4</td>
<td>$166.2</td>
<td>$165.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All amounts in millions
## Impact of Governor’s Tax Initiative

### Budget Scenarios to the Governor's Proposal

#### If tax initiative fails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>8,136,504</td>
<td>7,565,369</td>
<td>7,132,780</td>
<td>5,249,495</td>
<td>783,575</td>
<td>649,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Solutions</td>
<td>2,595,000</td>
<td>3,825,000</td>
<td>3,811,164</td>
<td>5,241,850</td>
<td>876,530</td>
<td>747,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Fund Balance</td>
<td>5,568,138</td>
<td>3,773,636</td>
<td>3,377,034</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance Available to Mitigate Budget Cuts</td>
<td>7,150,670</td>
<td>3,377,034</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### If tax initiative passes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>2,844,504</td>
<td>2,273,369</td>
<td>5,675,342</td>
<td>7,603,222</td>
<td>4,906,404</td>
<td>769,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Solutions</td>
<td>2,595,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,472,749</td>
<td>4,879,276</td>
<td>864,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Fund Balance</td>
<td>276,138</td>
<td>2,421,386</td>
<td>5,845,383</td>
<td>4,175,901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance Available to Mitigate Budget Cuts</td>
<td>12,442,670</td>
<td>10,021,284</td>
<td>4,175,901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Downside Risk

- Governor’s tax initiative fails
- Weighted Student Formula
- Slow property tax growth
- High enrollment growth
Upside Potential

- Governor’s tax initiative passes
- Property tax growth above 2%
- Lower than projected enrollment growth
Weighted Student Formula

- Governor has updated proposal in the May Revise
- Education Coalition and many legislators oppose proposal
- Many winners and losers
- Relies on unrealistic growth assumptions of funding to education
- Community funded districts would lose all categorical funding
City of Palo Alto Capital Budget Presentation
Meeting No. 7, 8/22/2012
Cubberley Infrastructure

August 22, 2012
IBRC Recommendations

IBRC New Projects $210.7

- Public Safety
- Fire Station 3 & 4
- MSC
- Animal Services
- Other

1 IBRC listed with no assumed timeframe for implementation; IBRC recommendations intentionally excluded enterprise funds
2 Civic Center, LA Treatment Plant, Byxbee Phase II, 101 Bike/Pedestrian Bridge
IBRC listed with no assumed timeframe for implementation; IBRC recommendations intentionally excluded enterprise funds

1. Civic Center, LA Treatment Plant, Byxbee Phase II, 101 Bike/Pedestrian Bridge
2. Other
3. $4.2M annual catch-up over 10 years
Drag and arrange the blocks on the potential 2014 measures stack to the left with your highest priority on the bottom of each stack and ascending upward towards the lowest priority Projects you don’t want to include there but which you think some action should take place before New 2014 (pay-as-you-go) or enterprise projects, which won’t need a ballot bond or tax measure, can be stacked as blocks in the Other Action stack on the right. You may choose to not place every project/need into a stack.
## Cubberley Infrastructure Needs

(Thousands of $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating FY2012</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>Total CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$381</td>
<td>$3,871</td>
<td>$8,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>$361</td>
<td>$3,096</td>
<td>$10,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>$742</td>
<td>$6,967</td>
<td>$11,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cubberley Statistics

- 35 Total Acres
  - 27 Acres School District
  - 8 Acres City
- 175,540 sq.ft. Building
  - 94,402 School District
  - 76,138 City
- 750 Parking Spaces
  - 620 School District
  - 130 City
Cubberley Update

Kevin Skelly, Ph.D.
Superintendent

August 21, 2012
Palo Alto Unified School District

PAUSD Interests

1. Continuation of the revenue from the Lease and Covenant. Loss of this ongoing, almost $7 million would require major structural cuts to the PAUSD educational program.

2. Preservation of the option to reopen Cubberley sometime in the future including the possibility of multiple comprehensive schools / for maximal usage for educational purposes as a third comprehensive high school to meet enrollment projections.

August 21, 2012 Palo Alto Unified School District
Board Information Needed from CPAC & CCAC

Clarifying current and desired uses for Cubberley including possible combined use opportunities. This would include the period under consideration for renewal (the five years from 2014 to 2019) and more long term.

August 21, 2012   Palo Alto Unified School District

Board Information Needed from CPAC & CCAC

Identifying criteria to prioritize present and future community uses and examine Cubberley capacity.

**While this is more an issue at the City level since they currently have responsibility for the site, any scenario that places PAUSD educational functions on the campus will either add to the programs on the campus or reduce the non-PAUSD space available to the community.**

August 21, 2012   Palo Alto Unified School District
Board Information Needed from CPAC & CCAC

Consider *complementary* infrastructure maintenance needs of the site and alternative ways to pay for them. While there have been some studies of these needs done in the past, having the CCAC and CPAC’s thinking in these areas would be helpful for the Board.

---

Board Information Needed from CPAC & CCAC

Considering some post-2014 Cubberley lease alternatives that would give some certainty to Cubberley users and the community while meeting the interests of the District and the City of Palo Alto.
Additional Request to the Board –
Regarding a Fourth Middle School Site

Staff would like to explore the possibility of an alternative site for a middle school and utilize some consulting services to help in this regard. While land for a middle school would be difficult to find, staff believes that a strong effort to find a suitable alternative space for a middle school is warranted at this time.

**BOARD APPROVED THIS REQUEST**

August 21, 2012          Palo Alto Unified School District
Capital Budgets

2012-2013
Palo Alto Unified School District
Capital Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Beg. Bal.</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>$1.4 M</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Fund</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
<td>$0.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Projects Fund</td>
<td>$0.1 M</td>
<td>$-- - M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Maintenance</td>
<td>$2.6 M</td>
<td>$-- - M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facilities Fund</td>
<td>$2.9 M</td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Schools Bond</td>
<td>$386.0 M</td>
<td>$-- - M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCAC Problem Statement Matrix

CCAC Forum No. 1, 11/8/2012
## CUBBERLEY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE — PROBLEM STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Finances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Need to work in a willing partnership to determine the best use of Cubberley’s 35 acres to serve the entire community.</td>
<td>- There is a significant growing list of deferred maintenance needs.</td>
<td>- Need to maintain the revenue stream from the Cubberley lease by continuing the lease for 5 years.</td>
<td>- Should the lease be renewed, and if yes on what terms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How should City’s acres be used? A 5 year lease extension must include plans for short/medium term maintenance with a commitment to plan longer term.</td>
<td>- How can negotiation of new lease/covenant terms mitigate costs to PA and incorporate commitments to current and medium, term upkeep and future cooperation?</td>
<td>- Need to determine a site for a new middle school ... if one is not to be located at Cubberley, the lease could be continued for 10 years.</td>
<td>- City and School finances have changed since original lease/covenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Which programs currently housed at Cubberley should be retained? Which should remain there and which will need alternate locations?</td>
<td>- What is the potential for joint City / School use and how can collaboration/cooperation between PA and PAUSD be fostered in the short term to secure adequate long term investment/planning?</td>
<td>- What is the impact of building standards required for school uses?</td>
<td>- Need to determine potential for shared maintenance costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The community values the services provided at Cubberley.</td>
<td>- A significant infrastructure investment would be needed to extend the life of the buildings at Cubberley.</td>
<td>- If the site is not needed for a middle school during this period, what lease arrangements between the City and the PAUSD would be mutually beneficial and acceptable?</td>
<td>- Need to determine potential for cost recovery from rentals. Should rental rates be increased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The community recognizes that the PAUSD will likely not be ready to plan a school at this point, but this will not stop planning for traffic and parking and building at least some facilities to meet community needs.</td>
<td>- Current facilities are an inefficient use of the site.</td>
<td>- To what degree can the site be used effectively to meet both community and school needs during this period?</td>
<td>- How can/should Foothill rental space be replaced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How should City’s 8 acres be used? The Cubberley site provides a unique opportunity for Palo Alto and PAUSD to work to work together to plan a creative co-location of community and school services for highest and best use of this last-of-its-kind property.</td>
<td>- Uncertainties associated with PAUSD future use create a barrier to planning for investment in new construction.</td>
<td>- $18M in capital improvements needed for the site. How could this be funded?</td>
<td>- Absent a better understanding of future PAUSD needs, will the City need to independently determine the future of its 8 acres — would this require giving up on innovative/cost saving ideas for joint use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can the community — the City and PAUSD — work together and collaborate to make this happen?</td>
<td>- To what degree can the site be used effectively to meet both community and school needs during this period?</td>
<td>- How can the City determine a construction plan without clarification of the PAUSD long term needs?</td>
<td>- How can/should Foothill rental space be replaced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ideally, could the Cubberley site provide a location for multi-generational, multi-cultural, multi-disciplinary program to serve the entire community?</td>
<td>- The City lacks sufficient alternative facilities / real estate to accommodate the services currently provided at Cubberley.</td>
<td>- The PAUSD wants the flexibility of keeping the entire 35 acres unencumbered for future school use.</td>
<td>- Will there still be community-serving uses on the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The PAUSD is unwilling to give unrestricted rights to even portions of Cubberley beyond 2025 (or at most 2030) because of potential need for a full high school.</td>
<td>- This is the last sizable space in the City proper for redevelopment ... to maximize flexibility and for future use, multi-story facilities should be considered.</td>
<td>- School buildings must meet higher building code standards.</td>
<td>- How will the City / PAUSD fund needed new construction and / or remodeling — and on-going maintenance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School buildings would conflict with and displace key community uses, especially playing fields and the gyms.</td>
<td>- A full high school would conflict with and displace key community uses, especially playing fields and the gyms.</td>
<td>- PAUSD does not see a need to remove existing buildings.</td>
<td>- To use all 35 acres, the PAUSD must purchase the City’s 8 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic and transit support facilities would also be impacted and require careful planning.</td>
<td>- Need to work together to plan a creative co-location of community and school services for highest and best use of this last-of-its-kind property.</td>
<td>- General obligation bonds would generally need 30 year amortization — thus, community uses would have to be available for 30 years.</td>
<td>- How will the City / PAUSD fund needed new construction and / or remodeling — and on-going maintenance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary Title: Cubberley Guiding Principles

Title: Council Approval of Guiding Principles for the Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee and the City Manager and Superintendent Community Advisory Committee

From: City Manager

Lead Department: City Manager

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the City Council approve the Guiding Principles for the Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) appointed by the City Manager and PAUSD Superintendent.

Background and Discussion
On May 8, 2012, the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) approved the draft Guiding Principles without amendments. As Council is aware, the draft Guiding Principles were revised and forwarded by Council to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) composed of Council Members Yeh, Shepherd and Klein; and Board Members Mitchell and Townsend. The PAC met on April 20, 2012 and prepared the draft presented to the PAUSD School Board. The draft is now before the Council for final approval and is as Attachment A.

The PAUSD School Board also suggested an additional member of the CAC in the “Other Community Members” category. Brian Carilli was suggested to the City Manager and Superintendent and has been added to the draft CAC list.

Timeline
Once Council approves the final Guiding Principles and all suggestions for the CAC
members have been made, Staff will poll the CAC for a convenient meeting time the 3rd or 4th week of May.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Final Draft Cubberley PAC Guiding Principals (DOC)
- Attachment B: PAUSD Board Packet 5.8.12 Action Item 9 (PDF)

Prepared By: Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager

Department Head: James Keene, City Manager

City Manager Approval:

James Keene, City Manager
The Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) consists of two Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Board members appointed by the School Board President and three City Council members appointed by the Mayor. The PAC shall be the primary advisor to the Council and the School Board on issues related to the lease and possible re-use or joint use of the Cubberley campus.

The Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is jointly appointed by the City Manager and Superintendent, and shall represent a cross section of Cubberley, neighborhoods, schools and citywide representatives. The CAC shall review Cubberley background and history and provide the PAC with community input including but not limited to possible re-use scenarios, alternative lease arrangements, site plan configurations, possible funding plans, identification of joint use opportunities and compatible standards.

1. The City and PAUSD recognize that our citizens have substantial investments, both emotional and financial in the Cubberley Campus, and shall work to reach decisions for the benefit of our entire community.

2. The Committees shall maintain open and transparent processes at all times, and members of the public shall be invited to all meetings. The CAC shall complete a final report. PAC and CAC meetings shall be audio-recorded with minutes completed for the PAC, and notes completed for the CAC. (Costs of minutes shall be cost-shared by the City and PAUSD).

3. Documents, architectural drawings and other written communication provided to the Committees shall be made available to the general public as soon as possible.

4. The City and PAUSD recognize that Cubberley is a major cultural, educational, recreational and non-profit resource, very important to the community’s health and vitality.

5. Acknowledging that each entity has different regulations and governing legislation, the City and PAUSD shall seek to work cooperatively to explore all practical joint-uses of the Cubberley campus for both educational and community services.

6. The City and PAUSD have ownership interests in portions of the campus: PAUSD owns 27 acres and the City owns 8 acres. The parties may consider relocation of
their ownership interests within the site to facilitate optimal site layout and efficiency.

7. The City Manager and PAUSD Superintendent shall jointly prepare a project budget for 2012/13, with costs shared equally between the City and PAUSD.

8. While the Policy Advisory Committee planning shall occur as cooperatively as possible, the City Council representatives and the PAUSD Board Members shall retain independent recommending authority should consensus not be reached.

9. Maintaining the quality of PAUSD schools is a significant community value, and planning for a growing population is essential to maintaining educational excellence and the overall health and well-being of our community.

10. Cubberley programs enrich the community and criteria shall be developed to prioritize and/or retain existing uses as well as assess prospective new uses.

11. The City and PAUSD recognize that joint-use could result in stronger educational and cultural programs provided more efficiently.

12. The City Council and PAUSD representatives on the Policy Advisory Committee shall report, not less often than every other month, to their respective bodies on Cubberley planning activities.

13. The City and PAUSD shall work to continue community access to Cubberley to the extent possible. Recreation facilities provided at the Cubberley campus produce important services benefitting the community at large.

14. The residential neighborhoods surrounding Cubberley shall be considered in determining the compatibility of possible changes on the Cubberley campus.

15. Transportation issues and access to and within Cubberley shall be considered in determining possible options including improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

16. All recommendations shall be mindful of the dynamic short-, mid-, and long-term forces impacting the PAUSD and City.
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Kevin Skelly, Superintendent of Schools
SUBJECT: Cubberley Community Advisory Committee Composition and Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee Guiding Principles

STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVE
Governance and Communication

BACKGROUND
A process for discussing the Cubberley site began in November of 2011. The plan is to achieve consensus on a vision for the future of the Cubberley site one year prior to the City's current lease expiration in December 2014. The process involves forming three groups: a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) made up of executive staff from PAUSD and the City; a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) to be appointed by the City Manager (with recommendations from the School Superintendent); and a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) composed of three City Council members (Yeh, Shepherd and Klein) and two PAUSD members (Mitchell and Townsend).

Note: At the last meeting, conceptual site plans were presented and discussed. This part of the item from the last meeting has been removed.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
The CAC is intended to represent a cross section of Cubberley, neighborhoods, schools and city-wide representatives. The members are appointed by the City Manager, with input by the Superintendent of Schools. They will provide the PAC with community input. A listing of the proposed membership as of May 3, 2012 is attached. The Board is asked to approve this list for consideration by City Council on May 14, 2012.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
A draft set of Guiding Principles (GPs) for use by the PAC and CAC has been developed. The GPs are intended to reflect community values of transparency ensuring that the public is invited to meetings and offered opportunities to interact with both groups. In addition, the Guiding Principles set up very broad objectives to clarify that the process is intended to be collaboration between the City and the School district, emphasizing joint use of the facilities where possible. A discussion regarding these GPs took place at the PAC meeting on Friday, April 20, 2012 and the PAUSD Board meeting on April 24, 2012. Staff has provided an updated version of the Guiding Principles based on Board input and recommends approval. These Guiding Principles are scheduled for consideration by the City Council at its May 14, 2012 meeting.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE
The City's Cubberley lease expires in December 2014. At that time, the lease may be extended an additional 5 years upon mutual consent of the City and the District. The City's schedule assumes providing
the District notice of its intentions regarding renewal of the lease at the end of 2013 to provide the District with one year's notice prior to the lease expiration. The first meeting of the CAC was anticipated to be in early May and there will be approximately 12 months of meetings. As mentioned, the PAC had their first meeting on Friday, April 20.

As discussed above, the CAC and PAC are scheduled to meet over the course of 2012 concluding their recommendations in 2013. This timeline allows the Council to engage in lease negotiations with the School District two years prior to the expiration of the lease in 2014. The timeline anticipates a decision on the lease by the end of 2013, providing a one-year notice period if either party decides to not exercise the 5 year option to extend the lease.

RECOMMENDATION
The Guiding Principles and Citizen's Advisory Committee composition, as attached, are recommended for approval.
Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee
City Manager and PAUSD Superintendent Community Advisory Committee

Guiding Principles
Draft for Board of Education Agenda May 8, 2012

The Cubberley Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) consists of two Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Board members appointed by the School Board President and three City Council members appointed by the Mayor. The PAC shall be the primary advisor to the Council and the School Board on issues related to the lease and possible re-use or joint use of the Cubberley campus.

The Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is jointly appointed by the City Manager and Superintendent, and shall represent a cross section of Cubberley, neighborhoods, schools and citywide representatives. The CAC shall review Cubberley background and history and provide the PAC with community input including but not limited to possible re-use scenarios, alternative lease arrangements, site plan configurations, possible funding plans, identification of joint use opportunities and compatible standards.

1. The City and PAUSD recognize that our citizens have substantial investments, both emotional and financial in the Cubberley Campus, and shall work to reach decisions for the benefit of our entire community.

2. The Committees shall maintain open and transparent processes at all times, and members of the public shall be invited to all meetings. The CAC shall complete a final report. PAC and CAC meetings shall be audio-recorded with minutes completed for the PAC, and notes completed for the CAC. (Costs of minutes shall be cost-shared by the City and PAUSD).

3. Documents, architectural drawings and other written communication provided to the Committees shall be made available to the general public as soon as possible.

4. The City and PAUSD recognize that Cubberley is a major cultural, educational, recreational and non-profit resource, very important to the community’s health and vitality.

5. Acknowledging that each entity has different regulations and governing legislation, the City and PAUSD shall seek to work cooperatively to explore all practical joint-uses of the Cubberley campus for both educational and community services.

6. The City and PAUSD have ownership interests in portions of the campus: PAUSD owns 27 acres and the City owns 8 acres. The parties may consider relocation of
their ownership interests within the site to facilitate optimal site layout and efficiency.

7. The City Manager and PAUSD Superintendent shall jointly prepare a project budget for 2012/13, with costs shared equally between the City and PAUSD.

8. While the Policy Advisory Committee planning shall occur as cooperatively as possible, the City Council representatives and the PAUSD Board Members shall retain independent recommending authority should consensus not be reached.

9. Maintaining the quality of PAUSD schools is a significant community value, and planning for a growing population is essential to maintaining educational excellence and the overall health and well-being of our community.

10. Cubberley programs enrich the community and criteria shall be developed to prioritize and/or retain existing uses as well as assess prospective new uses.

11. The City and PAUSD recognize that joint-use could result in stronger educational and cultural programs provided more efficiently.

12. The City Council and PAUSD representatives on the Policy Advisory Committee shall report, not less often than every other month, to their respective bodies on Cubberley planning activities.

13. The City and PAUSD shall work to continue community access to Cubberley to the extent possible. Recreation facilities provided at the Cubberley campus produce important services benefitting the community at large.

14. The residential neighborhoods surrounding Cubberley shall be considered in determining the compatibility of possible changes on the Cubberley campus.

15. Transportation issues and access to and within Cubberley shall be considered in determining possible options including improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

16. All recommendations shall be mindful of the dynamic short-, mid-, and long-term forces impacting the PAUSD and City.
## Cubberley Community Advisory Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhoods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Meadow</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Vician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Grove</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Meadow</td>
<td>Lanie</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greendell</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Gardens</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Furman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Retail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charleston Plaza Tenant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Properties</td>
<td>Damian</td>
<td>Cono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmeadow Elementary</td>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Kirner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLS Middle School</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Markevitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunn High School</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto High School</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cubberley Tenants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Samoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Lessa</td>
<td>Bouchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Profit -Cardiac Therapy</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOPAL</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Arts &amp; Services</td>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>Thom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Rec Commission</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Members</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Rekls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Brian</strong></td>
<td><strong>Carilli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acterra</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Closson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PABAC</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City School Traffic Safety</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Ellson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Sports League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Ball</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years 0 - 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to work in a willing partnership to determine the best use of Cubberley's 35 acres to serve the entire community.</td>
<td>There is a significant growing list of deferred maintenance needs.</td>
<td>Need to maintain the revenue stream from the Cubberley lease by continuing the lease for 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should City's acres be used? A 5 year lease extension must include plans for short/medium term maintenance with a commitment to plan longer term.</td>
<td>How can negotiation of new lease/covenant terms mitigate costs to PA and incorporate commitments to current and medium, term upkeep and future cooperation?</td>
<td>Need to determine a site for a new middle school ... if one is not to be located at Cubberley, the lease could be continued for 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which programs currently housed at Cubberley should be retained? Which should remain there and which will need alternate locations?</td>
<td>What is the potential for joint City / School use and how can collaboration/ cooperation between PA and PAUSD be fostered in the short term to secure adequate long term investment/planning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the impact of building standards required for school uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years 5 - 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community values the services provided at Cubberley.</td>
<td>A significant infrastructure investment would be needed to extend the life of the buildings at Cubberley.</td>
<td>If the site is not needed for a middle school during this period, what lease arrangements between the City and the PAUSD would be mutually benificial and acceptable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community recognizes that the PAUSD will likely not be ready to plan a school at this point, but this will not stop planning for traffic and parking and building at least some facilities to meet community needs.</td>
<td>Current facilities are an inefficient use of the site.</td>
<td>Absent a better understanding of future PAUSD needs, will the City need to independently determine the future of its 8 acres — would this require giving up on innovative/cost saving ideas for joint use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainties associated with PAUSD future use create a barrier to planning for investment in new construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what degree can the site be used effectively to meet both community and school needs during this period?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years 15 - 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should City's 8 acres be used? The Cubberley site provides a unique opportunity for Palo Alto and PAUSD to work to work together to plan a creative co-location of community and school services for highest and best use of this last-of-its-kind property.</td>
<td>The City lacks sufficient alternative facilities / real estate to accommodate the services currently provided at Cubberley.</td>
<td>The PAUSD wants the flexibility of keeping the entire 35 acres unencumbered for future school use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the community — the City and PAUSD — work together and collaborate to make this happen?</td>
<td>This is the last sizable space in the City proper for redevelopment ... to maximize flexibility and for future use, multi-story facilities should be considered.</td>
<td>The PAUSD is unwilling to give unrestricted rights to even portions of Cubberley beyond 2025 (or at most 2030) because of potential need for a full high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideally, could the Cubberley site provide a location for multi-generational, multicultural, multi-disciplinary program to serve the entire community?</td>
<td>A full high school would conflict with and displace key community uses, especially playing fields and the gyms.</td>
<td>School buildings must meet higher building code standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic and transit support facilities would also be impacted and require careful planning.</td>
<td>PAUSD does not see a need to remove existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H - Working Paper on Cubberley Site

Why This Document?
Throughout the life of the Commission, Cubberley has stood out as the “elephant in the room.” Until very recently, we have been ambivalent about whether to expend any time and energy on a very complex and politically charged issue, other than gathering infrastructure needs related to the site. We were also unsure whether the Council even wanted any advice from us on the matter.

However, recent events have changed that dynamic. On June 27, the Council indicated its intent to explore selling the City’s 8 acres at Cubberley to the Foothill-DeAnza Community College District, and later reversed that decision when the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) board formally indicated its intent to reuse the site for a school. At the Commission’s July 18 workshop with the City Council, several Council Members asked questions directly related to Cubberley.

Since the Council and the PAUSD are unlikely to come to any decisions on Cubberley prior to our final report, and since decisions related to Cubberley could have a significant impact on infrastructure plans and financing, a number of us felt it was too important to address in a limited manner. Mark Harris, Jim Olstad, and Ray Bacchetti agreed to put together an issue paper covering the key elements of the Cubberley situation as a means to facilitate a discussion by the Commission regarding Cubberley. Even if the Commission ultimately decides not to make any recommendations regarding Cubberley, at least 17 city residents will be well versed on the Cubberley situation and could individually provide input to the Council at the appropriate time as he or she desired.

Background and Context of the Cubberley Situation
Substantial budget pressures were being experienced by the PAUSD due to a variety of circumstances starting in the late 1970s and early 80s, including

- passage of Proposition 13 in 1978.
- declining PAUSD enrollment and revenue during the post–Baby Boom era.

In response to that stressed financial situation, the PAUSD closed several schools and sold some existing school sites in order to help sustain its educational programs at the level the community expected. This included the closure of Cubberley in 1979 and the City’s acquisition of Terman in 1981, among the sale and/or closure of other sites.

The City realized that the PAUSD was one of the City’s major assets and its decline would have severely negative impacts on the City as a whole, not the least of which would have been a decrease in general property values. The City and the PAUSD also recognized that sites once sold would never again be available for school use should the trends reverse in the future.
In 1987, the City put Measure B on the ballot with the intent to create a 5 percent utility users tax (UUT) that would be used primarily to fund lease payments by the City to the PAUSD for unused school sites (Cubberley being the premier site) of about $4.0 million annually, with $2.7 million applicable to Cubberley. In 1989, the City and PAUSD entered into what is known as the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop Agreement (Cubberley Lease), which covers a variety of complex clauses including lease arrangements at Cubberley and other sites.

At the time the original lease negotiations were taking place, the City was in a relatively good position in terms of financial capacity as compared to the PAUSD’s circumstances. The Lease and Covenant Not to Develop arrangement had the benefit of providing a major injection of operating budget money to the school district, while providing corollary benefits to the City such as preserving open space and playing fields, providing childcare sites and protection from liability for new infrastructure requirements (how ironic!) had these sites then been sold and developed.

Flash forward nearly 25 years and the respective financial situations and site needs have changed dramatically.

Here are a few of the key developments that make the situation very different today:

- The PAUSD is now a Basic Aid District, which essentially means that local property tax revenue far exceeds the amount of revenue the State is required to provide the district in excess of “basic aid” – a very small amount per student. Although property tax revenue has been somewhat affected by the recent financial crisis, PAUSD has not seen the reductions that many other California school districts have encountered and is likely poised to see property tax increases in excess of inflation for the foreseeable future. Property taxes are budgeted to provide about 73 percent of the PAUSD’s general fund revenue in 2011–12, or about $114 million out of a $159 million budget. The remainder is accounted for as follows:
  - Federal funds: 3 percent
  - Local income: 5 percent
  - Lease revenue: 6 percent
  - Parcel tax: 7 percent
  - State income: 6 percent

- The district has received approval from the voters for more than $500 million (Measure B in 1995 and Measure A in 2008) and a $600 parcel tax (Measure A in 2010) generating about $11–12 million annually, or about 7 percent of its annual operating budget. In addition, parents provide gifts in excess of $2 million annually through the foundation Palo Alto Partners in Education (PiE).
Enrollment has recovered dramatically since its low in about 1990, to the point that the district is now reopening sites: most recently, Garland is slated to reopen in several years, and the Board recently expressed an intent to reuse the Cubberley site in the near future for a secondary school (which halted the Council’s efforts to negotiate an offer to sell the City-owned 8 acres at Cubberley to Foothill-DeAnza College).

Thus, the current respective financial and enrollment conditions related to the Cubberley Lease are substantially different than they were 22 years ago when the City and the PAUSD entered into it. Financially, the City has been grappling annually with the issue of balancing the General Fund operating budget as well as meeting the ongoing capital assets/infrastructure needs of the community (pressures which were the impetus for the formation of our Commission).

The City’s current option on the Cubberley Lease expires by its stated terms at the end of 2014, and the City must notify the PAUSD by December 31, 2013, if it intends to renew the lease for another five years.

Now is the time for the Commission to provide input regarding the lease agreement as it relates to infrastructure.

**Key Elements of the Cubberley Lease as They Relate to Infrastructure and Infrastructure Financing**

**Cubberley Lease Payment.** In the current 2011–12 operating budget, the City is obligated to pay $4.60 million in lease payments for Cubberley (section 2.1 of the lease). Those payments are escalated each year at an agreed upon inflation factor currently estimated at 3 percent. This payment covers the 27 acres leased from the district, not the 8 acres the City now owns as a renegotiated consequence of the swap for the Terman site approved in 2002.

**Childcare Sites.** The Lease Agreement also includes City payments to the PAUSD for onsite childcare at 12 elementary school sites. In 2011–12, the City will pay $0.675 million for the combined 12 sites including utilities costs. The City contracts with Palo Alto Community Childcare (PACC), a nonprofit provider independent from the City, to operate the 12 sites. PACC pays the City approximately $100,000 in rental payments and utilities reimbursement. The childcare lease also runs concurrent with the lease term and will end if the lease is not extended by mutual consent of the City and the PAUSD in 2014. Without any information to the contrary, we assume that this arrangement will be renewed even if the current Lease Agreement is not. If this were not the case, the City would have an additional net slightly in excess of $0.5 million dollars annually to use for other purposes.

**Covenant Not to Develop.** An additional $1.78 million expense is budgeted for 2011–12 with a similar 3 percent inflation factor for succeeding years. In reading
the Cubberley Lease agreement, it is a section (2.2) that is separate from the Cubberley payments but clearly under the grand lease arrangement. The sites included in the original covenant are Ohlone, Jordan, Jane Lathrop Stanford, Garland, and Greendell. The Lease agreement allows for sites to reopen without reducing the covenant payment as long as new elementary schools are substituted, which has happened over the lease term as PAUSD reopened schools due to increased enrollment. Section 4.1 indicates that the purpose of the covenant is “to prevent further burden on the City’s infrastructure and in order to preserve a substantial amount of the City’s remaining open space.” If the lease is not renewed, the covenant payments expire as well.

This clause now appears to be obsolete given the district’s recently expressed intent to reopen existing sites. Further, there is no current plan for any sites to be sold for development, and the district has just recently purchased additional property at 525 San Antonio Road. Ironically, the $1.78 million annual covenant payment (from the City to the PAUSD) directly or indirectly puts a burden on the City’s infrastructure budgeting because these funds are not available to support infrastructure needs including Cubberley maintenance.

These “reversed financial circumstances” clearly need to be addressed during the Cubberley Lease option considerations/negotiations process.

**Key Elements Regarding Cubberley Not Embedded in the Lease**

**City Ownership of 8 Acres.** Through a separate but related agreement, in 2002 the City obtained title ownership of 8 acres of the Cubberley site in a swap exchange for the Terman site, which the City had previously acquired through a lease/purchase arrangement it created in 1981. These 8 acres were the focus of recent Council actions related to Foothill-DeAnza’s offer to purchase the site.

Although the City has the right to develop the 8 acres, as it deems appropriate, until September 1, 2022, the school district has the right-of-first-refusal on the sale by the City of these 8 acres to another party. After that the City has an unencumbered right to sell the 8 acres, if it decides to do so. Of course, the City and the district can renegotiate a sale back to the district at any time.

Given recent actions by both governing bodies, it is unclear as to what the next-or-ultimate disposition of the property will be. The City could retain it and develop it for its own purposes, or sell it at market value estimated at between $15 and $28 million. The recent purchase of the 2.6 acres at 525 San Antonio by the school district for $8.5 million would indicate a current market value of approximately $26 million.
Revenues and Expenses at Cubberley Outside the Lease Obligations. Current revenue at Cubberley is $2.54 million annually composed of the following elements:

- Foothill-DeAnza lease $0.93 million
- Property rental (artists, nonprofits, etc) 0.52
- Hourly rental (events, use of theater, etc.) 1.02
- City office rental 0.07

Annual expenses total $2.21 million including routine annual maintenance costs of about $330,000. Thus, the Cubberley complex is showing a net positive cash flow of about $300,000 (excluding the lease-and-covenant payments expense).

Tenants at Cubberley are being heavily subsidized in their rental payments. When considering the annual lease payments, the City is paying the school district approximately $4 per square foot for the building space it leases. However, it is generating less than $1 per square foot in rental income.

Planned CIP and Deferred Maintenance. As discovered through our Commission’s infrastructure investigations, this maintenance liability – not included in the above figures – cumulatively totals about $18.8 million through 2036, with $10.2 million scheduled between now and 2016. Public works indicates that optimal maintenance expenditures should be about $800,000 versus the $330,000 currently expended. This projected aggregate maintenance liability has several implications.

First, the revenue and expense statement as typically presented to the Council – most recently in the slide presentation at the June 27, 2011, meeting – is incomplete in that it does not include these ongoing maintenance expenses. These real maintenance costs should be acknowledged and represented in future reports. Secondly, the City should neither continue nor consider expending this level of maintenance money into the facility until the long-term use or disposition of Cubberley is resolved. The City should spend only what is needed to keep the facilities operational and safe.

Conclusions

The conditions that created the original need for the Cubberley Lease agreement have changed dramatically and are no longer in play today. With our City struggling to meet the financial requirements of the General Fund, let alone catching-up and keeping-up with the maintenance of the City’s overall infrastructure demands, now is the appropriate time for the school district to re-establish its management and financial responsibilities of and for the Cubberley site.

The Cubberley Lease agreement, with its associated amendments, has accomplished what it set out to achieve more than 20 years ago. It has preserved valuable public space and kept it maintained and available for public use and
enjoyment. In addition, it has provided the PAUSD with more than $125 million in operating cash to date, and will provide approximately $150 million in total cash infusion by the end of the current lease arrangement in 2014, if it is not terminated or amended prior to this date. Finally, it has preserved these sites for the district for its future use as and when necessary (which is apparently the case now).

As we indicated earlier, the PAUSD’s financial situation has improved dramatically over the past 20 years: with the passage of major bond issues for reconstruction and improvements to school facilities, generous community support through contributions to Palo Alto PiE, passage of a sizable parcel tax, and the attainment/surpassing of Basic Aid status. The district is in a strong financial position to finance its operations without all of the subsidies provided by the City through the Cubberley Lease Agreement.

The residents and businesses, through the City government, have contributed significantly to the restoration and financial strength of the district. With strong reserve balances and more than three years of payments left on the current lease option, the district should have sufficient time and financial resources to plan for a smooth transition to clear ownership.

Recommendations

The City should, at a minimum, decline to renew the Cubberley and non-development portions of the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop agreement in order to free $6.1 million (net of rental revenue) annually (in current dollars) and avoid a substantial portion of the upkeep expenditures of $18.8 million (in current dollars) through 2036. Indeed, it would be mutually beneficial for the City and the school district to begin discussions now on any potential new lease agreements related to childcare facilities or other noneducational uses, the transition of the 27 acres back to school district management, and clarification on the final disposition of the City’s 8 acres.

The $6.1 million operating expense savings represents potential annual cash availability to the City that could be reassigned to several infrastructure problem-solving applications. Example 1: If these funds were committed to a new issue of certificates of participation, it could finance a 30-year, $100 million debt obligation, sufficient to finance a new Public Safety Building and replace two fire houses. Example 2: If the funds were used to rebuild an Infrastructure Reserve, it could enable forward funding of new or renovated City assets, accommodating unexpected infrastructure costs without disturbing the ability of the City to keep up routine infrastructure maintenance needs, enable the raising of existing infrastructure quality (e.g., condition of streets, parks, and sidewalks), or any number of other real property redevelopment initiatives (including repurposing other existing infrastructure assets).

Regarding the 8 acres of Cubberley that the City owns, it is important to evaluate the best use of the parcel in relation to the future needs of the community. Historically,
there has been a secondary school campus on these 8 acres and the adjoining 27 acres owned by the school district. This may not be the same use going forward. Indeed, the school district should have considerable flexibility in the design of a middle school and/or high school campus on its 27 acres, together with the school district’s adjacent property at the former Greendell school site and the property recently purchased at 525 San Antonio.

Therefore, we encourage the City to evaluate potential alternatives for the highest and best use of its 8 acres on Middlefield Road, including the possibility of developing a variety of “community center” resources that could provide services to residents. In the event this process does not result in an approved plan for new City infrastructure on its 8 acres, then it may be preferable for the City to pursue sale of the land, either to the school district or to another purchaser. The City is presently bound by the school district’s right-of-first-refusal until September 1, 2022. In any event, the City should request a clear indication from the school district concerning its interest in the 8 acres.

Until the final disposition of the Cubberley site is determined, the City should spend only the minimum amount of funds necessary to keep the site safe and operational for the tenants occupying it. Major expenditures in facilities upgrades will be wasted if a major portion of the site is later razed to construct a new educational facility at Cubberley.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Harris
Ray Bacchetti
Jim Olstad
November 30, 2011
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School Needs Subcommittee Documents
PROBLEM STATEMENT
School Needs Subcommittee

1. PAUSD desires a 5 year lease - 2015-2019
2. If an alternative non-Cubberley middle school location is found, the Subcommittee believes PAUSD could accept a 10 year lease extending to 2025.
3. PAUSD is unable to give unrestricted rights to all or even portions of Cubberley beyond 2025 (2030 at most) because of the potential need for a new high school
4. PAUSD highly values the flexibility of keeping the entire 35 acres unencumbered for ultimate academic use. The Subcommittee believes the district would object to the city constructing facilities on the 8 acres it nominally owns that could not be used for future academic purposes.

Demographics
Palo Alto demographic projections over the coming 30 year (2015-2045) are highly uncertain. Major demographic influences include: California economy; Silicon Valley expansion/recession; ABAG housing requirements and City’s response; PAUSD reputation attracting new students. Because these influences cannot be reliably projected beyond even 3-5 years, only the most general projections can be used beyond that. PAUSD's policy is to use a 2% long-term growth rate. Regardless whether that rate is most appropriate, the Subcommittee believes it is not realistic to expect PAUSD to use any other rate for its decision making.

High School
A 2% long term growth rate, along with existing policy for maximum high school size, implies a new high school likely will be needed between 2030 and 2040. Also under existing policies, a comprehensive high school likely would require the full 35 acres of Cubberley. Gunn and Paly have 50 and 44 acres respectively. While a high school designed in 2035 is unlikely to be identical to existing PAUSD high schools, it is not possible today to confirm that space needs would be significantly less nor to begin designing that future high school.

Middle School
In the shorter run, PAUSD anticipates needing to begin work on a new middle school as early as 2020. PAUSD is looking for a location other than Cubberley for a new middle school but unless and until one is found, the district must preserve the flexibility to use Cubberley. Jordan and JLS middle schools have 19 and 26 acres respectively. The location of the new middle school is expected to be confirmed by the end of the 2012-13 school year.

Elementary School
PAUSD is planning for a 13th elementary school by 2017. Current options being considered are Garland and Greendell/S25 San Antonio with no expected impact of the 38 acre Cubberley site. Plans will be firmed up during the 2012-13 school year.

Future Cubberley building density
Some new PAUSD facilities are 2 story structures. However, if and when PAUSD takes over the current Cubberley site, there is expected to be a strong economic incentive to retain much of the existing single story structures and layout rather than scraping the site and designing a new layout from scratch.

Joint use community facilities
PAUSD’s 2008 Measure A funds an extensive list of district facility needs. As of September, 2012, the district has committed 52% of the bond's $358M. Overall, Measure A funds the district's construction needs through approximately 2020. PAUSD would entertain Cubberley joint use concepts from the city but does not have "needs" that it would currently place on the table.

Facilities Maintenance
PAUSD administration believes the existing Cubberley structures are generally suitable for PAUSD use in their current form and desires them not to significantly deteriorate prior to the site being turned over to the district in the future. The Subcommittee believes the substantial uncertainty in turnover date (2030-2040?) and uncertainty in whether/how the facilities would actually be reused will make it difficult for the district to justify jointly funding maintenance.
## Palo Alto Unified School District Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Students per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Elem School</td>
<td>650 Addison Avenue</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94301</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron Park Elem School</td>
<td>800 Barron Avenue</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briones Elem School</td>
<td>4100 Orme Street</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duveneck Elem School</td>
<td>705 Alester Avenue</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94303</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Carmelo Elem School</td>
<td>3024 Bryant Street</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Elem School</td>
<td>890 Escondido Road</td>
<td>Stanford, CA 94305</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmeadow Elem School</td>
<td>500 E. Meadow Drive</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Hays Elem School</td>
<td>1525 Middlefield Road</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94301</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Elem School</td>
<td>445 E. Charleston Road</td>
<td>Stanford, CA 94304</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon Elem School</td>
<td>1711 Stanford Avenue</td>
<td>Stanford, CA 94305</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone Elem School</td>
<td>950 Amarillo Avenue</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94303</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde Elem School</td>
<td>3450 Louis Road</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94303</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greendell Site</td>
<td>4120 Middlefield Road</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94303</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>K, Adult, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5649</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average

- **Students per Acre**: 73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Students per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Middle School</td>
<td>750 N. California Avenue</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94303</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLS Middle School</td>
<td>480 E. Meadow Drive</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terman Middle School</td>
<td>655 Arastradero Road</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA 94306</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>51.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2679</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gunn High School

- **Street Address**: 780 Arastradero Road
- **City, State, Zip**: Palo Alto, CA 94306
- **Acres**: 49.7
- **Grade Level**: 9-12
- **Enrollment**: 1,864
- **Students per Acre**: 38

### Palo Alto High School

- **Street Address**: 50 Embarcadero Road
- **City, State, Zip**: Palo Alto, CA 94301
- **Acres**: 44.2
- **Grade Level**: 9-12
- **Enrollment**: 1,885
- **Students per Acre**: 43

### Total

- **Students per Acre**: 40

### Special Sites

- **Fremont Hills Site**: 26800 Fremont Road, Los Altos Hills, 94022
  - Leased to Pinewood School @ $105,231/month, expiration 6/30/2033, option 6/30/2023

- **Garland Site**: 870 N. California Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303
  - Leased at $59,563/month, expiration 6/30/2014

- **525 San Antonio**: 525 San Antonio Road, Palo Alto, CA 94306
  - Leased to Athena Academy @ $10,000/month, expiration 6/30/2014

- **Cubberley Site**: Middlefield Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
  - Payment for lease/covenant/child care is $581,533/month

- **Ventura Site Right to Purchase (previously conveyed to CPA)**: 3990 Ventura Court, Palo Alto, CA 94306
  - Right to repurchase 2.4 acres @ current market value
  - 2.2 acres @ 75% of current market value

### Total: 275.0
Community Needs Subcommittee Documents
What’s Special About the Cubberley Community Center?

Cubberley provides an irreplaceable public, comprehensive community facility that reflects our community values.

1. Cubberley is our last large (35 acres), undeveloped (non-parkland), publicly owned space.

2. Palo Alto has wisely chosen to disperse our public buildings to make offerings walkable, bikeable, and transit-oriented, a City of Palo Alto Land Use & Community Services policy as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan. Cubberley in the south and Lucie Stern in the north offer many classes and programs meeting this goal; youth and teen programs at Ventura and Mitchell Park add even more balance for many non-drivers. (Note that the new Mitchell Park community center simply replaces its original community spaces).

3. The Cubberley site provides a unique opportunity for PAUSD and the City to plan a creative co-location of community services and school(s) that could work together to make this valuable public property a treasured part of our community for all ages.

4. It is essential to appreciate what is provided now at Cubberley in order to judge what can best be offered going forward. Staff has recently surveyed current tenants, and the Community Needs Subcommittee has interviewed many of the following significant Cubberley groups.

   - **The Arts:** 22 Artists in Residence currently have studios. Co-location yields benefits to community and to artists; this model is being copied in locations around the world. Three Resident Dance Programs have studios plus several small companies share spaces, providing a complementary community and a variety of classes for all ages and abilities. Music groups include Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra, Peninsula Women’s Chorus, Peninsula Piano School, Palo Alto Philharmonic, and El Camino Youth Symphony. Theater programs and camps round out the Cubberley arts programs.

   - **Sports & Recreation:** Outdoor Sports – Four softball fields and four soccer fields allow spring, summer, and fall youth leagues to practice and play Monday - Saturday. Adults use the fields heavily on Sundays. Tennis courts are used heavily at all hours. The football field and track are used regularly for soccer, football and jogging. Indoor Sports and Fitness – Foothill and the City offer a wide array of sports and fitness classes for all ages and abilities. Foothill is not building a new gymnasium at its new location and would like to maintain a presence at Cubberley after moving to its new site.

   - **Senior Programs:** Avenidas is interested in increasing opportunities for seniors and combining Senior Wellness programs with the existing Stroke and Cardiovascular programs as well as Senior Friendship Day and other senior social activities.

   - **Education:** Preschools and after-school care – Such care provides for early learning and enables parents to work, confident that their children are thriving. Private schools, tutoring and continuing education -- Foothill College, the City, and the School District all offer classes, many of which are adult education classes.

   - **Community Organizations:** Friends of Palo Alto Library, Wildlife Rescue, spiritual groups and others. Rooms can be rented for meetings, retreats, and special occasions.
CUBBERLEY FACILITIES AVAILABLE FOR RENT
http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/30337

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Capac.</th>
<th>Regular Weekly</th>
<th>Infrequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Profit Basic</td>
<td>Non-Profit Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium with Kitchen</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-6 Dance Studio</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4 Gym Activity Room</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym A</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym B</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion – Double Gym</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2 Meeting Room</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3 Meeting Room</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6 Meeting Room</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-7 Meeting Room</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH Classroom</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1 Lecture Room</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6 Activity Room</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6 Dance Studio</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Capac.</th>
<th>Non-Profit</th>
<th>Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-2 Music Rehearsal Room</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-3 Dressing Room</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-4 Activity Room</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUCIE STERN COMMUNITY CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stern Ballroom</td>
<td>70 x 40 feet</td>
<td>300 for assemblies / 200 for dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Room</td>
<td>45 x 25 feet</td>
<td>125 for assemblies / 75 for dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireside Room</td>
<td>25 x 26 feet</td>
<td>50 for assemblies / 35 for dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
<td>70 x 90 feet</td>
<td>250 / for assemblies / 150 for dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW MITCHELL PARK LIBRARY & COMMUNITY CENTER

Community Center Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tech Lab</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matadero Room (Office Classroom)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Room (CBO Classroom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Room (Art/ECR Classroom)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Palo Alto Room (Multipurpose room)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Drop&quot; (Teen Center/Game Room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midtown Room (Program room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Room (Computer room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron Park Room (Group study room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde Room (Group study room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmeadow Room (Group study room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenmeadow Room (Group study room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teen Zone&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VENTURA COMMUNITY CENTER

Multi-purpose event room, with kitchen, suitable for rental
### ART CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Room</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture Garden</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Palo Alto Community Centers

Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto. Operated by the City of Palo Alto since 1990, the center includes space for community meetings, seminars, social events, dances, theater performances, music rehearsals and athletic events. Outdoor space includes tennis courts, soccer, softball and football fields.
E-mail: cubberley@cityofpaloalto.org.
Hours: Mon-Thu 8:30 a.m.-6:30 p.m.; Fri 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m.

Lucie Stern Community Center
1305 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto. Designed by Birge Clark and built in 1934, this Spanish Mediterranean-style complex is home to the City of Palo Alto’s Recreation Department and two theaters. Rooms are available for rent for meetings, weddings, receptions and parties.
Hours: Mon-Fri 8:30 a.m.-5 p.m.

Mitchell Park Community Center
3800 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto. Closed for construction through 2012.

Ventura Community Center
3990 Ventura Court, Palo Alto. Home to Palo Alto Community Child Care, as well as Sojourner Truth Infant-Toddler Program and the Palo Alto Family YMCA's Ventura Activity Center (during school year) and Heffalump and Country Day School.
Hours: Mon-Fri 8 a.m.-5 p.m.

Oshman Family JCC - Taube Koret Campus for Jewish Life
3921 Fabian Way, Palo Alto. The OFJCC is a multi-use facility with programs and services for all ages and for singles and families. Fitness center, double-court gymnasium, indoor and outdoor pools, preschool, meeting rooms and a Cultural Arts Hall.

Chinese Community Center of the Peninsula
470 Anton Court, Palo Alto. Activities located at Cubberley Community Center, 4000 Middlefield Road. A service-oriented, nonprofit center that provides senior community-service work, family-oriented services, and information and referral services since 1968. English and Cantonese.
Co-sponsors activities with City of Palo Alto Recreation Department.
E-mail: info@chinesecommunitycenter.com

Source:
http://www.paloaltoonline.com/cgi/pao_search_fab.cgi?Section=resources&Category=community%20centers
Palo Alto Online Database last updated: Monday, August 20, 2012.
### Additional Music & Art Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Art For Well Beings</strong></th>
<th>2800 West Bayshore PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.artforwellbeings.org">www.artforwellbeings.org</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art for Well Beings (AFWB) offers art classes especially welcoming people with special needs. AFWB is open to the public. Drop-in or sessions are available. All materials provided. Please call to register or visit website for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Art with Emily</strong></th>
<th>402 El Verano Ave. PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.artwithemily.com">www.artwithemily.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Young teaches mixed-media, multi-cultural art lessons for children at her fully equipped studio in Palo Alto. Individual lessons or small group classes available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Art Works Studio</strong></th>
<th>595 Lincoln Ave. PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.artworkspaloalto.com">www.artworkspaloalto.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Works Studio offers a variety of fine-art classes for kids, as well as summer camps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Children's Music Workshops</strong></th>
<th>P.O. Box 60756, PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.Alisonsmusiclessons.com">www.Alisonsmusiclessons.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>International School of the Peninsula (ISTP)</strong></th>
<th>151 Laura Lane, PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.istp.org">www.istp.org</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join ISTP for after-school programs for preschool, elementary and middle-school students. Classes include French cooking, Asian cooking, chess, science, robotics, Chinese dance, art and craft, gymnastics, soccer and multi-sports. For a complete list of classes, visit the Website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Midpeninsula Community Media Center</strong></th>
<th>900 San Antonio, PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.communitymediacenter.net">www.communitymediacenter.net</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Media Center offers classes every month in a wide range of media arts, including publishing media on the Web, pod casting, digital editing, field production, TV studio production, Photoshop for photographers, citizen journalism, and autobiographical digital stories. One-on-one tutoring is also available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Music with Toby</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><a href="http://www.tobybranz.com">www.tobybranz.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toby Branz offers private voice and violin lessons in Palo Alto. She received her master's degree from the San Francisco Conservatory of Music in 2010 and a postgraduate diploma in 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>New Mozart School of Music</strong></th>
<th>305 N. California Ave., PA</th>
<th><a href="mailto:info@newmozartschool.com">info@newmozartschool.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mozart provides private lessons on all instruments for all ages and early-childhood music classes for children 2-7 years of age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Opus1 Music Studio</strong></th>
<th>2800 W Bayshore Road, PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.musicopus1.com">www.musicopus1.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opus1 Music Studio is offering private and group music lessons for all kinds of instruments to aged 2 and up. Beginners to advanced level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pacific Art League</strong></th>
<th>688 Ramona St., PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.pacificartleague.org">www.pacificartleague.org</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art classes and workshops by qualified, experienced instructors for students from beginners to advanced and even non-artists. Classes in collage, oil painting, portraits and sketching, life drawing, acrylic or watercolor and brush painting. Sculpture. Registration is ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Palo Alto Art Center</strong></th>
<th>1313 Newell Road, PA</th>
<th><a href="http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/enjoy">www.cityofpaloalto.org/enjoy</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes and workshops for children and adults in ceramics, painting, drawing, jewelry, book arts, printmaking, collage and more. Register online or stop by the Art Center for a class brochure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cubberley Community Center
### Rental Room Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acme Education Center</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists Studios (23)</td>
<td>E,F,U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Law Revision</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Therapy</td>
<td>G8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Pre-School Center</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Connection</td>
<td>L5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Visions</td>
<td>L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill College Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the PA Library - FOPAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbor Montessori</td>
<td>K3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua Kuang Chinese Reading</td>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Park Library (Temp)</td>
<td>Aud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Rescue</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zohar School of Dance</td>
<td>L4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise/Sports</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYSO Soccer</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area 3 on 3 Basketball</td>
<td>PAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball/Volleyball Camps</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys School</td>
<td>Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Table Tennis Club</td>
<td>Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Table Tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Tennis Club</td>
<td>Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK Self Defense</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taijiquan Tutelage</td>
<td>M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Wushu Association</td>
<td>Aud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Basketball League</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Junior Basketball</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Midnight</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Science Training Institute</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Elite Volleyball Club</td>
<td>Gyms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dance

- Academy of Danse Libre                       | G6   |
- Belly Rumba with Sol                         | G6   |
- Congolese Dance with Regine                  | G6   |
- Friday Night Ballroom Dancers                | Pav  |
- Red Thistle Dancers                          | G6   |
- Saturday Night Ballroom Dancers-             | Pav  |
- Zumba                                        | G4   |
- Shiva Murugan Temple                         | Theatre |
- Shri Krupa Dance Company                     | Theatre |

### Educational

- Bay Area Arabic School                       | B2   |
- Dutch School                                 | A3   |
- Grossman Academy                             | A2   |
- Kumon Math and Reading                       | A7   |
- Museo Italo Americano                        | A3,6 |
- PAUSD Adult School                           | A2   |
- PAUSD Post Graduate program                  | A2   |
- PA Art Center                                | H6   |

### Music

- El Camino Youth Symphony                     | M4   |
- Foothill Jazz                                | M2   |
- Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra                  | M1/Theatre |
- Palo Alto Philharmonic                       | H1/Theatre |
- Peninsula Women’s Chorus                     | M2   |
- Peninsula Piano School                       | M7   |
- Foothill Symphonic Wings                     | Theatre |
- Heritage Music Festival                      | Theatre |

### Other

- BA Amphibian/Reptile Society                 | H6   |
- Bay Area TheaterSports                       | H1, H6 |
- Christ Temple Church                         |      |
- Liga Hispanoamericana de Futbol              | A2   |
- National Traffic Safety Institute            | B3   |
- Palo Alto Mediation                          | Any  |
- Senior Friendship Day                        | M4   |
- Vineyard Christian Fellowship                | Theatre, A & M rooms |
- Commonwealth Club                            | Theatre |
### WHO PROVIDES WHAT SERVICES IN PALO ALTO

**DRAFT 10-03-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ART CENTER</th>
<th>CUBBERLEY</th>
<th>LUCIE STERN</th>
<th>VENTURA</th>
<th>AVENIDAS</th>
<th>PAUSD ADULT ED</th>
<th>MITCHELL PARK</th>
<th>JCC</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>OTHER/PRIVATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Child Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant/Toddler Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greendell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greendell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green.+Cubb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Lessons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly+Gunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sur la Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting/Drawing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics/Crafts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly+Green.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry Making</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Skills/Lab</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Via Adult Ed</td>
<td>Paly+Avenida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Classes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly+Green.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR / First Aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>ART CENTER</td>
<td>CUBBERLEY</td>
<td>LUCIE STERN</td>
<td>VENTURA</td>
<td>AVENIDAS</td>
<td>PAUSD ADULT ED</td>
<td>MITCHELL PARK</td>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>OTHER/PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paly+Gunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Exercise Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga/Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Barr Prk Elem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Rinconada Pool

YMCA: Palo Alto Family YMCA, 3412 Ross; Page Mill YMCA, 755 Page Mill  

Oshman Family JCC - Taube Koret Campus for Jewish Life, 3921 Fabian Way  
[www.paloaltojcc.org/](http://www.paloaltojcc.org/)

Licensed Child Care Centers & Family Homes in Palo Alto – 2011  
Private Music & Art Classes

Art For Well Beings
2800 West Bayshore Road, Palo Alto
artforwellbeings.org
Offers art classes especially welcoming people with special needs. AFWB is open to the public.

Art with Emily
402 El Verano Ave., Palo Alto
www.artwithemily.com
Mixed-media, multi-cultural art lessons for children. Individual lessons or small group classes available.

Art Works Studio
595 Lincoln Ave., Palo Alto
www.artworkspaloalto.com
Offers a variety of fine-art classes for kids, as well as summer camps.

Children’s Music Workshops
P.O. Box 60756, Palo Alto
www.Alisonsmusiclessons.com
Kids music classes and private lessons for guitar, piano and voice. Music for special-needs children too.

Community School of Music and Arts at Finn Center
230 San Antonio Circle, Mountain View
www.arts4all.org
Classes year-round in music, visual and digital arts for ages 14 months to adult. Vacation and summer camps, one- and two-day arts workshops offered throughout the year. Private lessons also offered.

International School of the Peninsula (ISTP)
151 Laura Lane, Palo Alto
www.istp.org
Aafter-school programs for preschool, elementary and middle-school students. Classes include French cooking, Asian cooking, chess, science, robotics, Chinese dance, art and craft, gymnastics, soccer and multi-sports.

Kindermusik with Wendy
Mountain View
www.kindermusik.com
Group music classes for children ages birth to 7 and their caregivers. All classes include singing, instrument play, movement, musical games, and home materials, and aim to develop the whole child through music

Lingling Yang Violin Studio
Palo Alto
linglingviolin.blogspot.com
Private violin instructions to children 7 and up and adults for all levels.
**Manzana Music School**  
Barron Park Neighborhood, private home, Palo Alto  
www.manzanamusicschoo.com/  
Private and group lessons for children and adults on guitar, violin, banjo, mandolin, fiddle, vocal, arranging, and music theory.

**Midpeninsula Community Media Center**  
900 San Antonio Road, Palo Alto  
www.communitymediacenter.net  
Classes every month in a wide range of media arts, including publishing media on the Web, pod casting, digital editing, field production, TV studio production, Photoshop for photographers, citizen journalism, and autobiographical digital stories.

**Mountain View-Los Altos Adult School**  
333 Moffett Blvd., Mountain View  
www.mvlaae.net  
Offering: Beading, ceramics, chorus, digital photography, drawing, guitar, Ikebana, orchestra and painting.

**Music with Toby**  
www.tobybranz.com  
Private voice and violin lessons in Palo Alto.

**Music Within Us**  
2483 Old Middlefield Way, Suite 150, Mountain View  
www.themusicwithinus.com  
Classes, workshops, and individual sessions using techniques drawn from the fields of life coaching, mindfulness-based meditation, yoga, deliberate practice, group facilitation, sound healing and music improvisation.

**New Mozart School of Music**  
305 N. California Ave., Palo Alto  
www.newmozartschool.com/  
Private lessons on all instruments for all ages and early-childhood music classes for children 2-7 years of age.

**Opus1 Music Studio**  
2800 W Bayshore Road, Palo Alto  
www.musicopus1.com  
Private and group music lessons for all kinds of instruments to aged 2 and up. Beginners to advanced level.

**Pacific Art League**  
688 Ramona St., Palo Alto  
www.pacificartleague.org  
Classes in collage, oil painting, portraits and sketching, life drawing, acrylic or watercolor & brush painting, sculpture.
Private Dance Classes

Bayer Ballet Academy
2028 Old Middlefield Way, Mountain View
www.bayerballetacademy.com
Classical Russian ballet.

Beaudoin's School of Dance
464 Colorado Ave., Palo Alto
www.Beaudoins-Studio.com
Tap, ballet, ballroom and jazz dance classes available for children and adults. Special classes for boys, seniors.

Brazilian Dance
Lucie Stern Community Center Ballroom, Palo Alto
www.cityofpaloalto.org/enjoy
Brazilian dance for ages 16-99

Center for Movement Education
www.movement-education.org
CMER offers both introductory one-day workshops to explore what dance/movement therapy is about, as well as a selection of comprehensive Alternate Route Training Courses for professional development in becoming a dance/movement therapist.

Dance Connection
4000 Middlefield Road, L-5, Palo Alto (Cubberley)
www.danceconnectionpaloalto.com
Graded classes for preschool to adult with a variety of programs to meet every dancer's needs. Ballet, jazz, tap, hip hop, boys program, lyrical, Pilates and combination classes are available for beginning to advanced levels.

DanceVisions
4000 Middlefield Road, L-3, Palo Alto (Cubberley)
www.dancevisions.org
Nonprofit community dance center, offers classes from age 3 to adult. Classes range from modern to hip hop, lyrical, Pilates, jazz, ballet, and contact improvisation, as well as providing a performance showcase.

Uforia Studios
819 Ramona St., Palo Alto
www.uforiastudios.com
Specializes in dance (Zumba, Hip Hop, Bollywood, Hula Hooping).

Zohar Dance Company
4000 Middlefield Road, L-4, Palo Alto (Cubberley)
www.zohardance.org
Offers classes to adults in jazz, ballet and modern dance.
Neighboring Community Centers

Sunnyvale Community Centers  
http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityServices/CommunityCenters.aspx

Community Center, located at 550 East Remington Drive  
The Sunnyvale Community Center is a unique recreation complex which includes a Creative Arts Center, Performing Arts Center, Indoor Sports Center, general Recreation Center and an Arboretum Complex. Use of the Sunnyvale Community Center is for City-sponsored community recreation activities in which anyone may participate. However, there are also accommodations to fit almost every need by private groups from small meeting rooms that can be used by as few as 15 people, to state-of-the-art, Internet-ready conference rooms that can seat 300 guests or clients. A large meeting could be held in the 200-seat theatre, a team building session in the Indoor Sports Center or a wedding reception in one of the fully equipped banquet facilities.

The Sunnyvale Community Center boasts a 200-seat theater, which has a fully rigged and lighted stage that can accommodate plays, recitals and concerts. The theatre hosts two resident theatre companies: California Theatre Center (adult professional theatre company), and Sunnyvale Community Players (volunteer community theater organization).

Programs and Activities

Senior Center  
The Community Center campus also includes the brand-new Sunnyvale Senior Center, which hosts educational, recreational and cultural activities for adults 50 years and older. The Senior Center also includes several rooms, including a large ballroom and a professional kitchen that can be rented for large events.

After School Recreation Programs  
The majority of after-school programs are conducted at elementary and middle school sites in Sunnyvale or at the Sunnyvale Community Center.

Summer Recreation Programs  
The City of Sunnyvale also offers a wide variety of recreation, sports, arts and enrichment activities and camps for children and teens during the summer months. For middle school and high school-age teens, there is a summer recreation volunteer program designed to provide young people with the opportunity to develop leadership and job skills. Swim classes and drop-in swim at local pools are available for children and adults.

Activities for Adults  
Year-round programs for adults range from adult sports leagues and drop-in gym programs to pottery and other visual and performing arts classes.

Therapeutic Recreation Program  
The Therapeutic Recreation Program promotes the development of new leisure skills, increases self-esteem and social skills. The program provides information and referral services and participates in cooperative recreational programs with other cities for special events. We provide social recreation programs for individuals with all types of disabilities and all levels of functioning.

Greenbelt Stroll  
Hike, swim, play tennis, picnic in the park -- enjoy 2.7 mile-long stretch of the John W. Christian Greenbelt.

Columbia Neighborhood Center at 785 Morse Avenue 3.5 miles from the main Community Center  
The Columbia Neighborhood Center (CNC) is located at 785 Morse Avenue in Sunnyvale (not far from Fair Oaks exit from 101) 3.5 miles away from the main Sunnyvale Community Center. It was developed to provide social, recreational and educational services for north Sunnyvale residents. This collaborative project between the City of Sunnyvale, Sunnyvale Elementary School District, Advanced Micro Devices, Sunnyvale residents, and numerous community agencies was formed in the fall of 1994, concurrent with the opening of Columbia Middle School. The CNC, located on a 25-acre site, includes the AMD Sports and Service Center building, Columbia Middle School, and the Sunnyvale Preschool Center. The CNC is open to all community residents and provides a variety of services and activities year round, seven days a week, including evenings.
**Cupertino**


**Quinlan Community Center** located at 10185 Stelling Road, .3 miles from the Sports Center

Built in 1989 and opened to the public in 1990, this 27,000 square foot facility has won numerous awards for its innovative design. It is centrally located on Stelling Road near Stevens Creek Boulevard and enjoys views of the Cupertino foothills and beautiful Memorial Park right out its back door.

The Quinlan Community Center is home to the City of Cupertino's Parks & Recreation Department, the Cupertino Historical Museum, as well as serving as a sub-station for the Sheriff's Department. The art of the Cupertino Fine Arts League lines the walls throughout the building.

The Quinlan Community Center is a multi-use building, offering classrooms for **Parks & Recreation classes**, as well as a variety of other rooms available to rent for your business or personal needs. The **Cupertino Room** features a full caterer's kitchen and can accommodate up to 275 people in a banquet format, or up to 300 people for an event with theater-style seating, making it an ideal spot for weddings, receptions, corporate seminars or meetings. The **Social Room** can accommodate up to 80 people, ideal for smaller gatherings like birthday parties, baby showers or even an employee retreat. The attached **patio** provides a quiet spot to relax and enjoy a bit of fresh air or to slip out for a stroll around the park.

**Community Hall** located at 10350 Torre Avenue 1.2 miles from the Sports Center

Community Hall will wow you and your clients with its beautiful cherrywood paneling, stylish seating, and theatrical lighting. Elegant, ascending windows stretch toward the ceiling and fill the facility with light. Double glass doors on the north and south sides of the building open onto stately brick patio spaces.

The facility also offers state of the art audio/visual equipment for all your technological needs. Two six-foot by eight-foot mounted screens present the opportunity for dynamic presentations, certain to make an impression. Laptop connections are available throughout. A plasma flat screen in the elegant reception lobby adds ambiance to your event while keeping patrons informed. Worried about technology set-up and operation? Our staff assistants are present throughout your event to help.

Community Hall can also be transformed into an elegant banquet facility for wedding receptions or parties. Tables and chairs can be arranged in a variety of ways, one of which is sure to be perfect for your event.

**Cupertino Sports Center** located at 21111 Stevens Creek Blvd

The Cupertino Sports Center features 17 tennis courts, a fitness center with LifeFitness and Star Trac strength training equipment, LifeFitness and Hoist free weights, LifeFitness and Star Trac bikes and treadmills, LifeFitness ellipticals, Techno Gym Waves, Precor AMT's, 2 racquetball courts, complete locker room and child watch facilities. The resident tennis professional offers private and group lesson programs, pro shop and Friday Night Social drop-in tennis programs.

**Cupertino Senior Center** located at 21251 Stevens Creek Blvd 1 block from Sports Center

The Cupertino Senior Center is the perfect place to meet people and enrich your life. We are Cupertino’s hub for activities, information and services that are specifically geared toward active adults 50 years and older.

**Cupertino Teen Center** located at 21111 Stevens Creek Blvd

The Teen Center is a new facility with all of the latest gaming equipment and cool features that teens enjoy. Take your pick from a game of pool, foosball, air hockey, pin ball, Xbox 360, Wii, PSII, five computers, board games, two big screen TV’s, movies, and more! The Teen Center also has a kitchenette which includes: refrigerator/freezer, microwave, toaster oven, two (2) large tables, and fifteen (15) chairs. It can be rented for parties or special occasions for $200 / 3 hours.
Saratoga
http://www.saratoga.ca.us/cityhall/rec/facility_and_park_reservations/facilities/cscenter.asp

Joan Pisani Community Center located at 19655 Allendale Ave
The perfect location for your next gathering at affordable prices. We can accommodate 15 to 300 guests for your wedding, reception, party or meeting. Garden patio, large multipurpose rooms and kitchen facilities are available one year in advance. Non profit groups receive 50% discount, Residents of Saratoga receive a 10% discount.

Preschool, Youth Art & Enrichment
• Saratoga Community Preschool, My First Art Class
• Youth Oil Painting: Public Speaking, Pre-public Speaking
• Music Together, Vocal Performance, Magic, Clay, Piano Games, Beginning Guitar

Youth & Teen Health & Fitness
• Archery, Jr. Rock Climbing, Fencing, Squash, Shotokan Karate, Gymnastics, Just 4 Kicks Soccer, Lil' Sluggers, Deep Cliff Golf, Atherton Lacrosse, Ice Skating, Hockey, Tennis
• Dance Force, April Paye
• Karate, Fun Fun Fundamentals
• Saratoga School of Dance: Ballet, Tiny Tots Dance, Ballet/Tap, Boys Tap Dance, Tap

Teen & Community Programs
• Driver's Ed, CPR, Youth Oil Painting, Beg. Guitar

Adult Health & Fitness
• Jacki Sorensen Aerobics, Hula Hoop, Jazzercise, Baby Boomers Fitness, Ergo Fitness Workshop
• Deep Cliff Golf classes, Adult Tennis
• Cook Your Buns, Eating for Vibrant Health
• Saratoga School of Dance: Tap, Latinizmo, Folk Dancing, Zumba
• Lunchtime Yoga, Vinyasa Yoga, Beg. & Adv. Yoga, Rosen Method Movement, Beg. Tai Chi
• Ballroom, African Dance, Belly Dancing, Ladies Latin

Adult Arts & Enrichment
• Ikebana, Adult Oil Painting, Beading
• Landscaping Design, Chocolate Truffles, Free Your Voice, Take a Tour of Italy, Chinese Painting

Saratoga Senior Center, adjacent to the Saratoga Community Center.
The Senior Center serves as a vital resource for seniors and older adults in the Saratoga community, offering over 35 activities and classes, as well as other services, trips, and special events, programs and activities. Wellness screenings, Speakers, the Opportunity to build friendships, as well as a caregivers’ support group.

Warner Hutton House, located at 13777-A Fruitvale Ave, around the corner from Community Center
This charming & romantic 1896 Queen Anne house includes a garden patio with an inviting gazebo. It is the ultimate setting for your small, intimate garden wedding, and is perfect for small parties, elegant socials or business retreats. The house and garden have a 30 to 80 person capacity. Includes full service kitchen.

Saratoga Prospect Center, located at 19848 Prospect Road, 3.1 miles from Community Center
The Saratoga Prospect Center (formerly the North Campus) offers an attractive site for business meetings, wedding receptions, parties, and seminars. Facility Rental Discounts (one discount allowed per rental): Non profit groups receive 50% discount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grace Building Main Room</th>
<th>Grace Building Conf/Meeting Room</th>
<th>Friendship Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2200 square feet</td>
<td>500 square feet</td>
<td>2264 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-75 person capacity</td>
<td>10-25 person capacity</td>
<td>150 person capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115 per hour</td>
<td>$55 per hour</td>
<td>$165 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes kitchenette facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full service catering kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardwood dance floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mountain View
Community Center located at 201 S Rengstorff Ave in Rengstorff Park
http://www.ci.mtnview.ca.us/city_hall/comm_services/recreation_programs_and_services/facilities_and_reservations/reservations.asp

When the Community Center is not being used for Recreation classes* and City events, it is available for private rental. Our building is the perfect location and facility for that special party or meeting.

Located in Rengstorff Park, the Center provides a relaxing setting along with professional, friendly service. Trees, turf and beautiful plants abound in the park and facilities. You will find a skate park, pool, BBQ areas, tennis courts, playgrounds, and a natural grass play area in this beautiful park.

- Rooms for rent include the Auditorium (capacity 200), Lower Social Hall (capacity 100), Rooms 2 and 3 (capacities 40and 60)
- Preschool programs
- Classes are for Tot & Preschool, Youth & Teen, Adults & Seniors

Gym Rentals – shared facilities with open middle schools

The City of Mountain View has two great gymnasium facilities that are available for rent Monday-Friday, 5:30 pm to 10:00 pm and 8:30 am to 4:00 pm on weekends. Both gymnasiums are divided into two sides/courts (half gym) for $50R/$63NR an hour, or one full gym for $111R/$139NR an hour and are ideal for activities such as basketball or volleyball. The auxiliary rooms are great for many activities including dance and exercise classes. The auxiliary room is available for $121R/$126 an hour.

- Mountain View Sports Pavilion at 1185 Castro St, 1.9 miles from Community Center
- Whisman Sports Center at 1500 Middlefield Rd, 1.4 miles from Community Center

Senior Center located at 266 Escuela Avenue, .7 miles from Community Center

Game Room -- Billiards tables, table tennis, puzzles and more!

Classes & Workshops -- Classes include exercise, arts & crafts, dance, music and enrichment! Also, sign up for free workshops on various topics.

Special Events -- Special events year-round for all to enjoy including a Summer Picnic and Holiday Gala!

Exercise Room -- Equipped with treadmills, elliptical trainers, free weights, stationary bikes and more!

Social Services -- Blood pressure and Alzheimer's screenings, legal assistance and health insurance counseling are offered.

Travel Program -- Expand horizons with trips both locally and further afield.

Mountain View Center for the Performing Arts, 500 Castro Street 1.9 miles from the Community Center
http://www.ci.mtnview.ca.us/mvcpa/mvcpa.html

Intelligently designed with state-of-the-art technology, the Center is perfectly suited for its stated goal—to host a comprehensive performing arts program for a culturally diverse community.

Historic Adobe Building, located at 157 Moffett Boulevard 1.5 miles from Community Center

The restored Adobe Building, located at 157 Moffett Boulevard, maintains its rustic charm while offering modern conveniences to make any event one to remember. It is available for a variety of events ranging from weddings to corporate meetings and boasts the following amenities.

The Rengstorff House and gardens in Shoreline Park are available for rental daily except during our public hours, (Sunday, Tuesday and Wednesday, 11 a.m. to 5 p.m). Included in the rental fee is the use of the entire first floor of this historic Victorian home. The maximum capacity of the house using only the indoor areas is 49 people. Using both the indoor and outdoor areas, the house and grounds can accommodate up to 150 guests and is wheelchair-accessible. The gracious dining room and three lovely parlors, all decorated with classic period décor, open up to brick patios surrounded by manicured lawns, blooming flowers and natural areas.

Menlo Park
Burgess Park, 700 Alma St

Originally a part of the Dibble Hospital Facilities and purchased in 1948, Burgess Park is one of the first City-owned recreation areas in Menlo Park.

Arrillaga Family Recreation Center adjacent to Burgess Park

The picturesque Arrillaga Recreation Center offers room rentals for both residents and non-residents. This center, complete with full kitchen and ample parking, presents a relaxing setting and is surrounded by a park. Arrillaga Family Recreation Center offers seven rooms for rent of various sizes (680 square feet to 2,378 square feet) including 2 dance studios to accommodate a variety of activities from weddings to birthdays and even corporate events

Arrillaga Family Gymnasium adjacent to Burgess Park

Facilities include basketball, volleyball, and badminton courts for drop-in, youth, and adult leagues. The gym is rented 6 mornings per week for health and fitness classes.

Arrillaga Family Gymnastics Center, 501 Laurel Street adjacent to Burgess Park

10,000 sq ft gymnastics room, multipurpose room and exercise room. Menlo Park Gymnastics currently has a girl’s competitive team, which has been very successful in competition. The new facility has the space and equipment to develop a boy’s competitive program and gives the City the ability to host competitions and demonstrations. Future program plans include classes in Rhythmic Gymnastics, Circus skills and cheerleading. In addition to the developmental gymnastics equipment, the new gym has an 1800 sq ft pre-school area with an adjacent toddler restroom.

Onetta Harris Community Center, 100 Terminal Ave by the Belle Haven Pool, 3.6 miles from Burgess Park

The OHCC offers rentals for Menlo Park residents and non-residents. The center features a multi-purpose room, kitchen, gymnasium, computer lab, fitness center, conference room, pre-school room, and two classrooms. Additionally, the OHCC is home to various City of Menlo Park programs and special events which have included Multi-Cultural Days, Teen Dances, Camp OHCC, Game Nights, Career Fairs, Holiday Celebrations, Community Classes, and Meetings.

Senior Center

The Menlo Park Senior Center located at 100 Terminal Ave, Menlo Park, CA 94025 next to the Belle Haven Pool, Onetta Harris Community Center, Beechwood School, and the newly renovated Kelly Park. The Senior Center offers rentals for Menlo Park residents and non-residents. The center features a Lobby, Ballroom, Community Room, Imagination Room, Computer Lab, and Poolside Patio. Additionally, the Senior Center is home to various programs and special events which have included Luncheons, Receptions, BBQs, Picnics, and Fiestas.

Teen Services

Menlo Park Community Services Department has programs geared for teens. All programs are set up so teens will be with others of the same age and same grade. We offer a series of programs focusing on everything from sports and adventure, to education and career development.
Shari Furman set up a very informative visit to the Sunnyvale Senior Center, which is a stand-alone building but part of a larger community center complex. Lead by Gerard, who had also worked in San Jose and San Carlos. Open to 50 and older. 20-25% of users are nonresidents. The building is a Senior Center 8-6 M-F and 10-2 on weekends, but multi-use on evenings and weekends. For example yoga classes may be held there in evening. 23000 sq feet, one story

A main theme is that the nature of senior services has shifted, with the trend for more exercise/wellness classes. On space, preference is for flexible rooms that can have different purposes

2800 paid members. Annual membership fees: Basic is $25, Premium (access to fitness equipment room and offsite table tennis) $29. Daily use fee is $5. Non resident fees are $39/$45. Members receive a $5 discount on classes. Note fees last year were $15 and $19; though considerable complaint about raising fees, no fall off in membership occurred after the increases. 1200 unduplicated users of fitness facility per year. Center now attempts full cost recovery-- have lost much in City funding, so attempting to be cost neutral to city. Try to balance free and fee-based activities. Lectures are generally free; most classes are fee-based. Fees earn about $80k, classes earn about $40k.

Partners as much as possible with other service providers. Some of their Art programs are done by Adult Ed, which is eligible for County/State subsidies. Foothill/deAnza does adaptive exercise class, with similar subsidy. (Some senior services provided at Columbia Neighborhood center are for lower socio-economic seniors, and are part of a facility that seeks to serve families in the neighborhood. Those classes have lower fees, a attract a lower socioeconomic group. ) To avoid confusion in registration, those classes do not appear in the City’s brochure; Adult Ed and Foothill/DeAnza market and register for their classes. Some exercise classes are held in nearby buildings, part of the same complex. Fee for 1 per week 9 week Zumba class is, for example, $34.

Library visits 2x per month; El Camino Hosp. comes 1x per week; Pamf sends speakers; El Camino Health Library provides resources.

Variety of services- lectures, classes, lunch available, lounge, fitness equipment room, computer room, billiard room, art room, art boutique, chatting room, small rooms for privacy

Food- Cafe serves a lunch M-F; $5.50 member/$8.50 non-member. Current deal with food provider is that provider gets an office, a full service kitchen for use in catering; first 30 meals are provided free to SC and cost $4 each above 30. Had lost City subsidy of $30,000 which changed price structure; still this year lunch is cost neutral. Four applicants qualified for the RFP; 3 submitted application. New RFP every 3 years.

Fitness Room- Cardio and weight resistance equipment. Had been about 60 per day, now 100 visitors per day. Small room- 900 sq. ft. Formerly had a part time staff, then volunteers now none. Many of the volunteers were themselves working out when supposed to be volunteering; all (except 1 or 2 who still come) "walked out" when told they could not use equipment during volunteer time. There was an insurance/workers comp issue involved. Currently, per insurance requirements, the room is locked and members allowed entrance to use only after: some training on equipment, watching a DVD that demonstrates how to use equipment. To allow many members to use and because 20 min is sufficient to maintain cardio fitness, each piece of equipment has a 20 minute limit; self policed; users put name on list for equipment to establish time and wait list.

Computer Room- Small with 8 computers. Group had originally wanted 30 computers in larger room, but when it was explained that having a dedicated use would make the large room unable to be used for other functions, and at various times of day, the supporters understood. The room is open 5 hours per day, and well used. There is not a need for waitlists for computer use. In past year have seen a surge in skype use. Some instruction is given for those who want to learn how to use email. Retired engineers help with hardware and software issues. Members can bring in laptops or desktops for free help.

AV room- Used for films on Friday nights and for lectures. Film screenings were much more popular 5 years ago; Now attendance may go as low as 5-10. Not likely to be there in a few years

Consulting Rooms- One of their more more unique features. 4 rooms used for a variety of services where more privacy is need. Blood pressure clinic 2 per week; health insurance counseling; 20 minute free meetings with lawyers who provide this service pro bono; etc.
Large Room- Divisible into 3 rooms by partitions. Some part used for classes, lunch served in one part. Special Events- hold 10 per year. Room is often rented on weekends for weddings/events; reg hourly rate is $175 but premium rate for weekends is $300 per hour. Total room size 4300 sq feet

Boutique- at front entrance; most centers have discontinued boutique, but it seems to work at this center; artists receive space and utilities; MOU with City that 10% of revenue goes to City.

Art room- Have art classes and areas to work. When he arrived, art was 70% of classes and exercise 30% but surveys and subsequent usage have reversed those proportions. Art classes are also offered in other parts of Community Center, but at different level. There is now more demand for health maintenance than for art.

Chat room- This is a use that is likely on way out over time. It was requested by the former center’s most frequent users, a small room where they socialize with some greater degree of privacy. Users are small group of women > 85 who do not want to be home alone.

Lounge- Open area with sofas and chairs, where can get cup of coffee or tea, and read paper, play cards, or talk. Pretty well used.

Billiards- They do have a room with several billiards tables, which is not something he would install, and is somewhat of a luxury in that the space can only be used for billiards. Limits space to one service.

Games- Do not offer Bingo (despite some requests) -- a church down the street does that; chess and cards are pretty flat line; Ma Jong is increasing

Travel- Separate handling of travel which is full cost recovery. They have several day trips each month (sample fees $59-117) by bus that leave from SC, and an “extended trips” abroad arranged differently.

Users- Sunnyvale population is 144,000, of which SC has eligible population of 30,000 people (>50 years) and currently serves 3000. Most are older than 50, but some people in 50’s may come to a lecture on how to care for more elderly parents. Users must be able to use facility “independently” or bring assistance. Wheelchairs, and walkers are fine, but where they have had problems is mental issues, ability to engage. Not able to handle Alzheimer’s patients. If a person is unable to communicate well or to keep up with a card game, for example, then the other participants will tell staff. All rooms are equipped with “T Loop” a system that facilitates appropriate automatic tuning of hearing aids.

Out-of-town users- during the summer, SC sees 50-150 seniors, mostly, East Indian, in who are visiting local family and prefer to have some activity during day when family may be busy.

Transit- They do not have shuttles to bring users to SC. Some senior residences bring users in vans. Local nonprofits and volunteers also provide transit- Road Runners, Heart of Valley, etc. No VTA routes were created for the center, but it is just off El Camino, and is therefore well served by VTA. Maybe 3 bikers a day.

Homeless- is a major challenge. Not aware of all details, but know that sleeping in vehicles is a problem. Some people sneak in to use SC restrooms for a shower-- SC restrooms do not have showers. Other building, Indoor Sports Facility does, has had some unhoused population issues.

Pool is offsite.

Success- Lots of planning and listening to users and potential users. Had focus groups and other meetings. Recommend having separate meetings for public-at-large and shareholders, otherwise, the stakeholders tend to drown out the public-at-large. Recommend having stakeholder gathering in one large room with groups of tables so that stakeholders get to give input and listen to input of other stakeholders. Gathered comparisons of what other cities are doing, and what is available nearby (YMCA, private providers like gyms and cardio circuit facilities in strip malls, nonprofits) He will send us matrix with analyses. Lots of input gathered, but staff made final decisions. The analysis of other services available is ongoing, not just for original design of space.

Tips - Gets lots of input. Have space flexible to use for variety of services and be able to change as demand changes. Monitor demand. Seniors want to maintain mental and physical health. Look at Santa Clara, newer facility, beautiful, two stories so have more space; warm pool on site.

Staffing- 4 full time staff; one part time 30hrs wk; one part time care manager- 20 hr per wk; 220 + volunteers

Youth involvement/ interaction- Youth who volunteer are generally in summer; do work in kitchen or assist with computer, or perhaps entertainment, such as group of youth who play violins. (Also mentioned re youth that the most successful collaborative educational programs with elderly and youth are at more jr college level, or SF
State where have some voc ed for nursing; and further noted that Palo Alto person recruits some SC members to be literacy coaches).

History- Center was approved by Council in summer 1998, in response to group campaign for center. Senior services previously had 7000 sq feet, at a 25000 sq ft multipurpose community center at former school site that was being vacated when school district raised rent. Advocacy group had wanted only senior uses in the building, but compromised with council vote to allow rental and use of facility nights and weekends.

Users generally report that while they want wellness, they did not want SC to be like a membership gym, where someone would tell them to work out; did not want a 24 hour feeling. Like having lounge.
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Introduction

This study endeavors to assist Palo Alto’s City government, local nonprofit agencies, and the community at large in understanding some of the impending impacts of a rapidly changing demographic environment driven by the aging of the Baby Boom Generation. These evolving trends will result in dramatic differences in the characteristics and needs of our residents, and these changes will undoubtedly have an impact on policies, programs, services and practices within our community.

This analysis was initiated by the Community Services Department of the City of Palo Alto and was undertaken by a Task Force of community leaders and service provider agencies. The study does not claim to be scientific or scholarly. Instead it is a surface exploration of the issues and a call to action proclaiming that now is the time to understand and plan for the inevitable.

The White Paper purposely focused on lifestyle issues including education, recreation, health, fitness, leisure and social services. It does not attempt to delve into medical, emergency preparedness, safety and consumer services. These are concerns that demand their own stage.

Need for the Study

There are many reasons why it’s important to understand the future lifestyle and social service needs of this burgeoning population including financial, community planning, transportation and social service implications. It is imperative that we begin planning for these now, before they overwhelm the resources of many of our public and non-profit service providers.

Palo Alto’s population profile has already begun to transform due to significant demographic and social trends:

- The aging of our population with the impending passage of the massive Baby Boom generation into the elder cohort, and
- The increasing longevity of the population due to medical advancement and healthier lifestyles.

Given these facts, one of many reasons for initiating a planning strategy is articulated in research conducted by the National Research Center Inc. (NRC) of
Boulder, Colorado. The NRC analyzed data from 9000 surveys of older adults. The study made a direct correlation between the number of community “strengths”, defined as physical health, outlook on life, and social and family connections, with the number of hospitalizations, institutionalizations and accidents. In short, the study determined that if a community can provide its people the opportunity to “age well” it can save untold hardship and millions of dollars in unnecessary costs.

A second key reason for the study is to begin to identify the resources and opportunities that will come with our aging population. By anticipating the future needs of employers and public agencies, and through appropriate recruitment and training techniques, a new workforce may be discovered, bringing with it wisdom and experience not previously seen in previous generations of elders.

The goal of this paper is to attempt to describe some very real social issues and opportunities, identify some of their impacts and begin a dialogue on how best to find appropriate solutions.
Executive Summary

It’s no secret that America is graying. Newspaper, television, magazines, government and scholarly reports tell us that the first wave of the Baby Boom generation is now entering into their retirement years and that we are on the threshold of a major shift in demographic characteristics. In the next thirty years our nation’s “senior” population will double due to the sheer size of the Boomer generation and, thanks to medical and health advancements, will live longer than any previous generation.

But what about Palo Alto? What will the impacts be to our community and social service delivery systems? Do we need to prepare for these impacts, and if so, what do we need to prepare for? Can we be a community that is “elder friendly”? These are just some of the questions that prompted a nine month examination of this issue by a Task Force of City and nonprofit community and social service providers.

What was discovered in many ways mirrors the national landscape. Boomers will live longer, be more active, have more money to spend, and hold great political clout. Our future population will not only be older – but they will also think differently than past generations. If anything, they will be more socially and culturally engaged, healthier, have increased mobility and be more independent.

How will Palo Alto be impacted? From input provided through a community visioning meeting and a community-wide survey, the thoughts and concerns of some 400 Palo Alto Boomers can be summarized as follows:

- **Boomers want to live independently as they age and the concept of a “senior friendly” environment, especially with regards to mobility, is especially important.**

- **There is a deep desire to be engaged in community and social activities and have a variety of learning opportunities.**

- **Palo Alto Boomers want to stay involved, for either lifestyle or financial reasons, through volunteerism or continued part or full-time employment.**
• Our Boomers want to remain physically and mentally active and healthy, well into their elder years.

Also, a key finding that could greatly impact the Palo Alto community is that 80% of our Boomers say they are planning to stay in Palo Alto as they age. If true, in the next twenty years, and given the fact the Palo Alto is generally considered residentially built-out, the percentage of our older population will outpace all other demographic segments, creating a scenario where upwards of 40 percent of our total population will be 55 years of age or older. Consequently, the service delivery implications may be challenging, especially when you consider the fastest growing population segment will be those age 85 and older. This group will require an unequaled level of support services, placing great demand on public and private support agencies.

Another key factor is whether our Palo Alto based agencies are prepared to meet the service delivery impacts brought on by the aging of the Boomer generation. Palo Alto is currently blessed with outstanding services for older adults including those provided by Avenidas, La Comida, Palo Alto Family YMCA, and the Albert J. Schultz Jewish Community Center (JCC). But are these institutes prepared to meet the challenges of the future? Avenidas, Palo Alto’s largest, full service provider for older adults, has already found its assets strained by the needs of the changing population. Both the JCC and YMCA have unused capacity (the JCC will expand services when it moves to a new campus in 2009), but both organizations indicate the need is increasing. The La Comida nutritional program is at capacity and already requires more space and staffing resources. And, although providing a full spectrum of adult lifestyle activities, the City of Palo Alto devotes a very small percentage of its community services budget to older adult programs.

Of course, with change comes opportunity. Our Boomers will possess the highest educational level of any past generation, and as revealed through our survey, they have a desire to continue to work and volunteer in the community. With appropriate training and through creation of policies and education to end “age discrimination”, the harnessing of this intellectual and skilled labor force could truly be beneficial for the entire community.

This White Paper suggests strategies to meet the projected impacts and make the best of the opportunities that are before us. Where we go from here is up to our community, and over the next few years our government, nonprofit and business sectors will need to better understand the unique needs of this burgeoning generation and answer the questions:
• Given a strained financial environment, is there a way to better distribute our public resources to meet the needs of our Community?

• What changes do we need to make in the City’s physical attributes that will allow people to age well and safely?

• What planning must happen now to meet the anticipated social and community service needs 10, 20 and 30 years from now?

• How can we best use the human resources that come with the numbers, experience and education of the Boomer population?

This study calls for the development of a strategic plan to address these questions and to determine the opportunities inherent with the aging of the largest generation in America’s history. We, as a community, must begin to find answers to these questions now because these inevitable and dramatic demographic changes are happening - now

********

Current Population Trends

The Boomers Are Coming!

The 76 million ‘Baby Boomers’ born between 1946 and 1964 represent the largest birth cohort ever in the United States. The first of the Boomers turned 60 this year and by 2030 all surviving Baby Boomers will be between the age of 66 and 84 and will represent one of every five Americans. America’s Boomers make up 27.5% of the population, have an estimated annual spending power of $2.1 trillion, and comprise 45.8 million households with average spending of $46,000 per household.

---

1 Excerpt from the State of California “SB 910 Strategic Plan for an Aging California Population”, 2003
Palo Alto is already experiencing the profound impact of this “graying of America” trend. Between 1990 and 2000, as a result of the out migration of young adults and the aging of Boomers, the Palo Alto population of 45-60 year-olds increased from 17.5% to 22% of the total population. Indeed, the middle age and senior populations are the only segments in our community that have grown significantly over the past thirty years.

As the Boomers continue to age, they will cause the senior percentage of the population to grow even more dramatically. Between 2000 and 2030, Palo Alto’s population of older adults (age 55 and above) could more than double to over 36,000. Because the total population of the City is unlikely to double over this timeframe, we can expect a significantly higher percentage of older adults in our community.

These projections assume no out migration, as no statistics are available. However, in our survey of 323 local Boomers, 80% reported that they intend to stay in Palo Alto when they retire. If this percentage is anywhere close to reality, we could expect the senior population of Palo Alto to be approximately 36,200 by 2030, which represents a 113% increase.

---

2 Excerpt from “City of Palo Alto Community Profile”, July 2005
The next senior population will be more ethnically diverse as well. At present, about 80% of the Palo Alto senior population is Caucasian and 11% Asian. Over the next thirty years, an increasing percentage of this population will be Asian and, to a lesser extent, Hispanic. (Note: Projections extrapolated from U.S. Census data) Our community must adapt its services to appeal to the different needs and interests of these groups.
Differences Between Generations

Within the older adult population, it is important to distinguish between the “young-old” (those less than 75 years of age), the “old” (75 to 84 years of age), and the “old-old” (85 years of age and older) and to plan for a more ethnically diverse older population.

The California Policy Research Center at the University of California expects the average life expectancy to be 81 years of age by 2020. In 1980 the mortality rate was 73 years. Because of this increased longevity, the greatest growth will be among the oldest Palo Altans, the “old-old” seniors. By 2040, this group will represent more than one quarter of the city’s older residents, up from one in ten in 2000. The “old-old” population will outnumber the “young-old”. Old-old seniors will need the most supportive services and practical help and is likely to have the lowest incomes, placing great demand on the city and those organizations that provide services to them.

Within the “young-old” group, the very definition of “old” is likely to change in coming years. This group will be more mobile and healthier. Its changing expectations, discussed below, will alter our thinking about what is meant to be “old” or a “senior”. Chronological age will become less of a determining factor in what one considers “old”. Instead, functional ability is likely to become more of a determinant, and may become a more relevant criterion for eligibility for public benefits and demand for services. In this way, older adults will be less likely to seek out services and activities designed for others of the same age, and
more likely to participate in activities with people – of all ages - who are similarly mobile and healthy.

The cultural differences between those born in the period 1911 to 1945, and the Baby Boomers born after 1945, are striking, and help us predict how the interests, expectations, and desire for services will change as Palo Alto’s Baby Boomers age.

Many of those currently over the age of 60 served in World War II, may have witnessed the Great Depression, and through their labors created the booming economy of the 1950’s and the rise of the middle class. Their experiences taught them the value of hard work, self-sacrifice, discipline and team spirit. This generation learned to rely on the government and has an expectation that the government will take care of them. Indeed, Social Security gave this generation unprecedented economic security, and they were the first to experience mass retirement and transition to a period of life dominated by leisure. This generation is conservative, risk-averse and conformist.

The Baby Boomer generation, on the other hand, grew up in a period of unprecedented prosperity and unlimited horizons. They disdain authority and traditional values, and prize their individuality. Boomers want to have it their way, have it now, and enjoy the experience. William Novelli, Executive Director of AARP describes them this way:

“Basically, boomers like to have fun...They are looking for the new experience. They want to create their own experiences, because in this “been there, done that” world of today, they are often bored, and searching for novelty.”

Boomers do not associate age with disease and disability; indeed, they have every reason to expect to live longer and healthier than their parents. But they do not take their health for granted and, for them, wellness is very important. This generation wants fitness activities, recreational resources, nutrition, and information about preventative health care and healthy living. But for this very same reason, Boomers tend to be in denial about - and generally are not planning for – the reality that in their latter years they may well experience disability and chronic disease. Undoubtedly, an increasing number of the “old-old” will need supportive services such as in-home care and adult day care to remain in their homes.

---

The needs and expectations of Boomers will be diverse, and they will demand choices. This is not likely to be a generation that seeks out – at least in the short run - the institutions and services that have served their parents so well. Terms like “senior centers” and “old age homes” are quickly becoming obsolete and are being replaced with terms like intergenerational centers and asset-based aging.

There are other differences between Boomers and their parents. They “see retirement as a transition; not a termination.” AARP research has shown that 8 in 10 Baby Boomers plan to work at least part-time. Of that percentage, 35% of them will work mainly for interest and enjoyment, and another 17% would like to start their own business. Given the very high cost of living in this area, many local Boomers will be motivated to work to augment their income to make it possible to remain in the area. Boomers expect to need more money during retirement, and plan to spend it to enhance their lifestyles.

There are also indications that as Boomers seek to remain productive in their retirement years they will turn to volunteering and civic engagement in large numbers. Our survey of Palo Alto Boomers confirms this national trend. In answer to the question “When you have more free time, what do you want to do with it?” 42% of the respondents answered that they want to volunteer in the community.

It will be a challenge to the service sector to offer volunteer work that gives Boomers new experiences, the opportunity to work independently and, above all, many choices. If local institutions are successful in engaging Boomers in community work, they will be greatly rewarded as Boomers direct their considerable talents and energies to addressing some of the community’s problems.

* * * * * * * * *

Local Survey

Palo Alto’s Boomer Landscape

Although there has been much information disseminated on the demographics and characteristics of Boomers on a national and state scale, there is relatively little information describing the characteristics of Palo Alto’s aging Boomers. In order to understand what these Boomers’ needs and concerns are, three methods of obtaining information were used by the study Task Force; a community input event, a written questionnaire, and a survey instrument.

Community Input Event

The Task Force hosted a “Community Visioning Meeting” where residents of Boomer age were asked to participate in a two-hour discussion led by noted facilitator, Diana Schlott. The public meeting was designed to give participants an opportunity to share their perspectives in an open and engaging environment. The meeting was held on May 11, 2006 at the Art Center Auditorium and 48 Palo Alto residents participated.

Following an introduction as to why the meeting was being hosted, and a brief presentation on the history of 20th century generations, the participants were divided into small discussion groups. Each group was given two questions to discuss and report out on. Groups were then asked to develop consensus on the top five answers for each question. The questions asked were:

A. What are the services and programs that you’re presently using that you’ll need more of in the future?
B. What new services may be required in order to allow you to age well?

Due to time limitations, participants were also requested to complete a written questionnaire that asked:

1. Are you planning to stay in or near Palo Alto when you retire?
2. If you’re planning on moving to another location in your next phase of life, what would make you stay in Palo Alto?
3. When you have more free time, what do you want to do with it?
4. If you knew you’d live to be 100 years old, what would you do differently?
Our Community Talks: Concerns and Desires

Group discussions were lively and a great many ideas and themes emerged. The following summarizes the most prevalent themes that surfaced from the dialogue:

- **When asked to identify the services and programs that Boomers are presently using that they will need more in the future, a variety of services and programs were identified. The five major themes, in order of priority, that dominated the discussion where:**

1) **Social, Cultural and Leisure Activities**
   Examples cited most frequently were travel; activities at night for adults/seniors; activities for widows/widowers; creative arts classes; book clubs; Stanford Lively Arts; inter-generational interaction; dance groups; poetry nights; art and theater events; open microphone; and increased social gathering points.

2) **Parks and Recreational Services and Facilities**
   Within this theme the most mentioned uses were activities that draw people to parks; lawn bowling; Tai Chi; playgrounds for seniors; senior and community centers; a golf club for Boomers; and sports leagues for seniors.

3) **Senior Designed Community/Social Services**
   Examples cited included buddy systems for walking, hiking and exercise; quality Police, Fire and EMT services; food closets; outreach for shut-ins; social services targeted at aging; walk-able neighborhood shops and services; universal housing concepts\(^5\); and vibrant downtown neighborhoods.

4) **Education and Library Services**
   Some of the specific services and programs identified as important were readings clubs; technical classes; quality library facilities and programs; Palo Alto Adult School; City-sponsored special interest classes; Stanford continuing studies; and Foothill College.

5) **Information and Referral Services**
   Examples for information and referral programs included continued communication about programs for adults; easy, single point access to information on caregivers; technology services; Medicare advice; tax preparation

\(^5\) A set of accessibility features such as zero-step entrances, wide interior doors, and accessible bathrooms.
assistance; and the need for a Palo Alto-based website for volunteer opportunities and services.

Other themes included health care/in home services, and health and fitness programs.

- The next question asked participants to think about their future. When asked to identify “What new services may be required in order to age well” the themes that gathered the most responses were:

1) Transportation
By far, a transportation and mobility theme resonated the most with the group. Examples cited included a “safe ride” program; bike sharing; more bike paths; car sharing; mass transit that gets “closer to home;” opportunities for electric wheelchairs to use bike lanes; more public transportation; increased frequency of the City and Stanford University shuttle; transportation to distant parks; a cross-town trolley on Middlefield Road; and the need for volunteer drivers in lieu of para-transit services. Much discussion was devoted to keeping ones’ independence, whether or not an automobile was available.

2) Social, Cultural and Leisure Activities
Also ranking very high in interest was social, recreational and leisure activities including references to intergenerational activities, connectivity, social support groups, interest-based activities vs. age-based activities, more daytime activities, senior related activities, and social integration. Participants abhorred the idea of isolation and loneliness, and in general, wanted to be active and share life experiences with others.

3) Parks/Recreational Facilities and Programs
Examples cited for new services for parks and recreation facilities included “younger” senior centers (a blending of adults and elders); more locations for Avenidas; libraries as combined community centers; multi-generational community centers; senior-friendly camping sites; additional off-leash dog areas and trails; more recreational services like the YMCA; and recreational membership fees reduced for those 50 plus.

4) Senior Designed Communities/Social Services
Within this theme some of the ideas that emerged were identifying homebound individuals in case of emergencies; “assisted living without walls”, farmer’s markets in additional areas of town; more home care services, meal delivery services; programs to address loneliness and isolation; transitional services;
neighborhood access to shopping and services; and centers for basic services located throughout town.

5) Education and Libraries
Some of the examples characterizing this theme included learning new languages, educational programs about health and welfare, life-long learning classes, providing a “living history” with Boomers presenting their histories in schools, teaching, mentoring and training opportunities for older adults, the provision of larger print books at well-designed libraries facilities.

Outside of the five themes noted above, housing, assistive living and health and fitness programs were also concepts that emerged during discussion.

Participants were also asked to complete a written questionnaire:

1. When asked the question, “Are you planning to stay in or near Palo Alto when you retire?” 76% of participants said they planned to stay in their present home.

2. When asked “If you’re planning on moving to another location in your next phase of life, what would make you stay in Palo Alto?” the two factors most frequently cited were affordability and better public transportation.

3. For the question “When you have more free time, what do you want to do with it?” the focus was on travel, volunteering, lifelong educational opportunities, spending time with friends and family and staying mentally and physically fit.

4. When views on the question “If you knew you’d live to be 100 years old, what would you do differently?” were solicited, the major themes that emerged were keeping in better mental and physical health, and saving more money for retirement.

It’s noteworthy that throughout most of the discussion, Boomers wanted us to know that they did not want to be “pigeon holed” when it came to the provision of services. In other words, Boomers want choices and the opportunities to participate in most activities according to interests, not age.
A Community Survey

The method used to collect quantitative data was through the use of a survey instrument. Due to funding limitations, the survey was not of scientific design, but was meant to build upon and test the information gathered at the community visioning meeting. The survey was made available in hard copy and through the Internet using the Web tool, Web Surveyor. The survey was advertised through newspapers, email “blasts,” and through newsletters to the constituents of our participating Task Force organizations.

323 surveys were received over a six-week period from Palo Alto resident “Boomers.” To ease the completion of the survey, participants were asked to prioritize specified service themes, which included:

- **Career/Volunteer Opportunities**: full/part time jobs, job banks, career placement, volunteer listings, etc.

- **Civic Engagement Opportunities**: including running for office, board and commission work, advocacy, inter-generational exchanges, political activism, etc.

- **Education & Libraries**: opportunities for advanced degrees, life-long learning, classes and workshops, library facilities and services, collections, reading clubs, lectures, book mobiles, etc.

- **Housing & Assisted Living**: affordable housing, more housing options, assisted care facilities, in-home care services, day-care programs, home repair services, etc.

- **Financial Assistance & Planning**: senior/low income discounts, financial information & referral, financial planning services, financial counselors, etc.

- **Health & Fitness Opportunities**: health clubs, yoga & other fitness classes, nutritional programs, gyms, aquatics, par-courses, senior sports leagues, in-home fitness services, etc.
• **Information & Referral Services**: health, social services, emergency services information services, more information distribution points, one stop shopping for information, life counselors, etc.

• **Parks & Recreation Facilities**: urban and open space parks, enhanced community center facilities, senior centers, athletic fields & facilities, golf course, meeting rooms, etc.

• **Senior Designed Communities**: walk-able neighborhoods, support groups, neighborhood services, universal design concepts, etc.

• **Social, Cultural & Leisure Activities**: theatre, arts, special events, social gatherings, travel, clubs, etc.

• **Transportation**: public transportation alternatives, safer roads and pedestrian access, shared transportation, bike lanes, shuttle services, etc.
The 323 survey participants were fairly divided between older Boomers, born between 1946 and 1955 (58%), and those born between 1956 and 1964 (42%). It should be mentioned that this outcome was significantly different from the participation at the community input meeting where 83% represented the first decade of the Boomer generation.
Survey data and community meeting input were quite similar when asked if Boomers planned on staying in Palo Alto after retirement. Eight out of ten of our Boomers said they planned to continue residing in Palo Alto, echoing data from many previous surveys that predict “Aging in Place” will continue to be the preferred choice of older adults. The data also suggests that housing turnover will slow, making it more difficult for younger families to move into an already built-out city. This phenomenon may also have serious impacts on living arrangements, housing services, and result in an increased need for local elder care, support services and assisted living.
When we asked Boomers to look at their lifestyle needs of today, and begin to project their needs into the near-term future, four themes were clear priorities. Data suggests that Boomers are presently engaged in and will continue to find a priority in leisure activities; health and fitness; park and recreation facilities; and life-long learning and library-based services. This does not come as a surprise, as mentioned earlier, Boomers are individualistic, looking for new experiences and wanting to be fit and healthy enough to experience them.
In this question we asked participants to look into the future. The mindset is indeed different than the pronounced themes from the previous question. As opposed to education and socializing being a top priority, when Boomers contemplate the idea of “getting old” they are more interested in better forms of transportation and staying healthy. Many consider the ability to drive as the last vestige of independence and the survey confirms that Boomers want to continue their independence, car or no car. The survey also implies that the need for more health and fitness programs, continued opportunities for socialization and education, and the ability to age in their own homes as priorities for our aging populous.
Surprisingly, although transportation continues to rank relatively high, the themes that make up lifestyle and education are seen as the most valuable of services. Note that this outcome was expressed different at the community input meeting where transportation was proposed as the highest priority, followed closely by fitness, cultural and educational opportunities. This data does confirm that the provision of a variety of educational, social and lifestyle
programs and services are essential to how Boomer’s perceive the concept of “Aging Well.”

The survey instrument also asked for written comments for the question, “When you have more time, what do you want to do with it?” Hundreds of comments were provided, and the predominant themes, prioritized by the number of times each concept was mentioned, were:

- Volunteering
- Travel
- Reading
- Fitness (swimming, golf, running, bicycling, etc.)
- Education
- Spending more time with family
- Enjoying the outdoors
- Attending and learning about art and cultural activities and presentation

Additionally, the survey asked for general comments. Although it’s impractical to provide all of the comments offered, the following quotes represent some of the individual thoughts provided by our participants:

“Us Boomers will stay active and want places to go dancing, to dinner, theatre, at affordable prices.”

“… the cost of housing and living in this city are the most critical variables for seniors AND young folks. If seniors want to be near family but younger generations can’t afford to live in the Bay Area – we will have to leave!”

“Transportation for people who can no longer drive their own car would be my top priority.”

“Services for seniors in Palo Alto tend to be viewed as assistance for the aged (aged 75+). There doesn’t seem to be anything for active, healthy, people in their 60’s and early 70’s.”

“Retired, or partially retired, PA residents could be hired for short term projects. They might be willing to work for lower wages to offer their expertise to the City. Perhaps you should maintain a registry of residents
with expertise who would be available for City or nonprofit projects at reduced rates?”

“I’d like to see a moratorium on new services so that new taxes and fees can be avoided . . . so I can afford to continue living in Palo Alto in retirement.”

“Provide exercise and recreational programs at reasonable rates or free of charge.”

“Those of us that are at the end of the Baby Boom have paid extremely high prices to afford our homes. . . . We tend to have children later in life . . . . We are going to be very strapped for cash and retiring before our kids graduate from college.”

“The three most important things to consider: public safety, education and health care.”

“I have been retired now for less than a year and have been surprised to see how many current retirees take advantage of travel, cultural and education services. Planning for the huge influx of Baby Boomers who are retiring will be good for Palo Alto and its citizens.”

**********
Inventory of Palo Alto Service Assets

Palo Alto is fortunate to have a wide variety of civic and nonprofit agencies providing programs and services to meet the needs of older adults. These agencies provide a wide range of services from recreational opportunities to social services. The following summarizes the programs and services of each agency and tries to provide some perspective as to the present and future capacities each program in terms of staffing and facility levels.

**Avenidas**

**Services:** Avenidas is a full-service older adult center. It offers a wide range of programming including classes in creative arts, personal interest, and health and fitness. Its service range also includes special events, personal health services, counseling and support, case management, adult day health care, transportation services, volunteer care giving outreach, social clubs, handyman service and volunteer placement.

**Budget:** Avenidas’ total budget committed to older adults is $3.7 million funded in part with $420,000 from the City.

**Capacity:** On average Avenidas’ staffing capacity ranges between 75 to 100% depending on the program while its space capacity is similar. In almost all of its program areas, Avenidas is seeing increased participation and is over capacity in case management and transportation services. There is little doubt that the program continues to grow and to meet the demand it will require more facility space in the not-so-distant future.

**Albert L. Schultz Jewish Community Center**

**Services:** This center, presently located on the Cubberley Community Center campus, focuses on classes, clubs, health and fitness activities and special events for older adults. The agency also offers information and referral services to its members.

**Budget:** Total current annual budget dedicated to older adult services is $80,000.

**Capacity:** The program does have space capacity for increased participation with programs utilizing 25% to 75% of the available space; however staffing is at 100% capacity for almost all services. Note that in 2009 the JCC will have a new

---

6 Staffing and facility capacity have been evaluated by each agency in terms of their ability to meet the perceived needs of their clients for various services. 100% staffing capacity, for example, means that the agency is currently using all of the staff resources it has available for the service or program. 25% space capacity would mean that the program has the facility capacity to increase programming by 75%.
location in south-east Palo Alto and with it increased capacity for both staffing and program.

City of Palo Alto

**Services:** The City of Palo Alto offers few programs focused at older adults. It runs a golf course with “senior” reduced fees, a senior softball league, and the Senior New Year’s Eve Day Bash. Of course, the City also offers a very rich scope of activities and services for adults of all ages including thousands of acres of parks and trails, branch and full service libraries, theaters, community and interpretive centers, aquatic facilities and a full range of art and recreational classes and special events. Palo Alto also provides a shuttle service that offers no-cost transportation on specified routes. Palo Alto does grant, through its Human Services Resource Allocation Program, approximately $500,000 to nonprofit agencies providing older adult services, with Avenidas receiving the largest share.

**Budget:** Funds committed by the City for senior programming is approximately $550,000.

**Capacity:** Use and staffing capacities range between 50% and 100% depending on the program, with library services are running at full capacity in both staffing and facility levels.

Community Association for Rehabilitation (CAR)

**Services:** Located in South Palo Alto, CAR is one of the few local providers of aquatic therapy for older adults.

**Budget:** The total budget dedicated to older adults is $414,000.

**Capacity:** Space and staffing are not at capacity, but the program continues to grow.

La Comida De California, Inc.

**Services:** La Comida serves over 130 noon time meals to seniors on a daily basis.

**Budget:** Total budget is $235,000.

**Capacity:** Capacity for space and staffing is maxed out, but the need is increasing.

Palo Alto Adult School

**Services:** The Adult School offers a mix of classes of adults ranging from creative arts, languages, computer instruction, and health and fitness. It does offer older adults exercise classes in assisted living situations.

**Budget:** The total budget for older adult programming is $67,000.
Capacity: The program is at capacity for staffing level, but has a small amount of space capacity within its personal interest classes.

**Palo Alto Family YMCA**

**Services:** While not offering personal interest classes, the program does offer health and fitness activities, personal health services, special events, lectures, food and nutrition programs, social clubs and a therapeutic exercise program.

**Budget:** Both space and staffing capacity is about 50% and participation is increasing in all programs.

**Capacity:** Total budget dedicated for older adults is $1.8 million.

**********
Meeting Future Needs

Defining the Challenge

The conclusions found in this paper are not solutions, but suggestions on how to move forward and perhaps build upon our existing strengths to provide an environment that will meet the concerns and allow all Palo Altans the opportunity to “Age Well”.

The prominent findings of this study are as follows:

Most Boomers want to live independently as they age and the concept of a “senior friendly” environment, especially with regards to mobility, is very important.

Fortunately, some areas of Palo Alto have neighborhoods that are relatively “walk-able”, but to be truly “senior-friendly”, public and private sectors should explore alternative methods for transportation that allow independence without the use of automobiles. Improved, more flexible and more convenient public transit should be developed to give older drivers viable alternatives to their own car – and to reduce the number of cars on the roads.

Some suggested strategies to help prepare for this scenario:

- Actively promote alternative means of transportation including wider City and Stanford University shuttle routes; volunteer drivers; and shared transportation resources.
- Design infrastructure improvements that support safe use of alternative modes of transportation including pedestrian, bicycle, electric carts, and shuttles. Some examples include replacing old street signs with new, larger signs with larger fonts, widening sidewalks, more defined lane dividers, and creating well-marked pedestrian crossings.
- Provide a network of transportation services that meet older adult needs, such as linking the City’s shuttle service to current and future forms of transit.
- Encourage the location of essential services such as grocery stores and pharmacies in neighborhoods, within walking distance.
A desire to be engaged in community and social activities and have a variety of learning opportunities are strong factors in the way our Boomers want to live out their lives.

The need for continuing educational and cultural activities will increase over time. In the next 5-10 years, the greatest demand will be for “lifestyle” activities and services: educational programs; fitness activities; and leisure and travel programs. Many local organizations that offer these programs exist now and have the capacity for some growth. But it will take a concerted community effort to meet the increased demand at affordable cost.

**Some suggested strategies to help prepare for this scenario:**

- Assemble a task force to assess the need for new and augmented facilities to meet future programming needs.
- Provide information that’s easily found about City and community life-long learning resources.
- Encourage a variety of affordable, culturally appropriate and language diverse learning opportunities.
- Co-mingle public facilities with commercial locations to provide easier access to services and products.
- Facilitate dialogue between all local public and non-profit entities to provide programs for a variety of learning abilities and delivery methods.
- Provide activities and facilities that foster contact with all segments of the population like intergenerational centers or library/community center combinations.

**Palo Alto Boomers want to stay involved either through volunteerism or continued part or full-time employment.**

Boomers, either to stay socially connected and engaged or to augment retirement funds, have clearly articulated the desire for volunteer and employment opportunities. Some have implied that a new career is not out of the question, and the idea of mixing work, leisure and education has been a prominent theme emerging from our discussions and survey data. The importance of this resource cannot be taken lightly. With change comes opportunity, and it will be important to find ways to expand the contributions of older adults in later life.
This human resource is untapped and, if used correctly, it can be a force for social good.

**Some suggested strategies to help prepare for this scenario:**
- Promote, through new policies and education, the elimination of age discrimination in the workplace.
- Actively encourage older adult involvement in elected and appointed office and in policy development and advocacy. For example, use someone like former Mayor Jim Burch as an excellent role model for community involvement during ones’ latter years.
- Create a job database and listing of employment and employment training opportunities for older adults in city and community publications.
- Develop employment policies designed to retain and recruit older adults. These policies should recognize the flexibility and independence Boomers are seeking in their lives.
- Provide incentives to businesses and organizations who promote policies to hire and retain older workers and volunteers.

**Most Palo Alto Boomers want to remain in Palo Alto for the remaining years of their lives.**

Boomers will live longer and remain in their homes longer, and as they approach the “old-old” stage of life, the demand in programs will shift to supportive services including in-home care, practical help, transportation alternatives, and assisted living.

**Some suggested strategies to help prepare for this scenario:**
- Review of the Comprehensive Plan to identify possible solutions to close the gap in housing supply and demand, including the type of housing required, affordability of ownership and rentals, and locations that could provide easily accessible services (within walking distance).
- Provide funding mechanisms for affordable home renovation and repair programs for low income senior households.
- Continue to provide training and technical assistance to City building inspectors on accessibility requirements.
Encourage the development of universal, accessible, user-friendly housing.

Palo Alto Boomers want to remain physically and mentally active well into their elder years.

The concept of being socially and physically active and involved in one’s community can only work if the individual is healthy and fit enough to participate. Medical costs continue to escalate, and it can only benefit our community if older adults are proactive about their fitness and mental wellbeing.

Some suggested strategies to help prepare for this scenario:
- Provide expanded opportunities and facilities for recreation related activities for all levels of fitness, age and disabilities.
- Increase the distribution points for fresh produce and wholesome food products.
- Increase the capacity to support hunger and nutritional programs for older adults.

Meeting the Challenge

The challenge before us is three-fold:

- How do we develop a plan that readies our community to support the dramatic shift the number of older people, especially as Baby Boomers enter into the latter phases of life?
- Can new resources be found or existing resources be redistributed to better handle the anticipated impacts?
- How do we, as a community, make the best use of the intellectual and labor resource that will come with the aging of Palo Alto?

It is this Task Force’s recommendation that our community undertake the development of a strategic plan for aging in Palo Alto. The plan should focus on achievable and meaningful near and long-term strategies to ease the impacts of the population shift as well as discover ways to use the opportunities that come with it.
Although City of Palo Alto staff, in partnership with the Task Force of service providers, initiated this study, it will take a concerted effort from elected and appointed officials, service providers, community leaders, the business community and older adults themselves to find the solutions that work for the entire community. Addressing these challenges will require leadership and vision and it is the hope of the Task Force that this brief analysis will prompt our community towards building its strengths thus providing an environment that will allow all Palo Altans to “Age Well”.
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Selected from CCAC Community Needs Subcommittee Minutes, October 24, 2012:
(slight revisions from Community Needs Subcommittee Report to CCAC, October 4, 2012)

Vision: How to Best Utilize the Cubberley Site and Honor the City’s Interests and the District’s Interests Beyond 5 Years

The time frame and professional support allocated to the CCAC are inadequate to allow for the comprehensive study needed for a detailed recommendation. However, the Community Needs Subcommittee believes that we have enough information to work towards creation of a viable plan over the next 5 years for the community interests on the Cubberley site while respecting the needs for flexibility for the District to open and operate a comprehensive high school or other schools as they are needed.

The Community Needs Subcommittee Believes:

1. The Community values the services and opportunities currently available at the Cubberley Community Center.
2. The Community values the high quality schools in our District and wants to make them even better.
3. It is possible and desirable to plan a Cubberley campus that would support an ongoing Community Center and allow for the eventual design and construction of a school or schools to meet PAUSD’s needs as they develop.
4. A more efficient use of the space in the future would allow more efficient use of the space as both City and District needs grow. This is the last large under-developed publicly owned space in town and it must be used wisely.
5. The redesigned Cubberley campus should be
   - Multi-generational with programs from preschool through seniors
   - Multi-cultural to reflect, meet the needs of, and provide a gathering place for our growing and increasingly diverse population
   - Multi-disciplinary to support programs such as sports, health, music, art, dance, science, and technology throughout our community
   - Lively and fun
   - Flexible for the changing needs of the City and the School District.
6. The creative and productive synergy provided by co-locating community and school district use at Cubberley would more than make up for a smaller footprint for a school.
7. Short term savings cannot be allowed to prevent seeking the best long term solution for this site.
8. This community has the imagination and drive to surmount the many hurdles ahead to achieve this vision.
Additional points:

**Potential New Services at Cubberley**

- Avenidas has proposed a potential Senior Wellness Program including new classes and programs plus the current Stroke and Cardiovascular Programs. They also suggested a new therapeutic pool to replace Abilities United’s aging facility.
- Bathrooms adjacent to fields.
- More services for seniors.
- Multi-age eating area.
- Reading room.
- Display space for artists of all ages.
- Farmers’ market including cooking demonstrations and cultural shows.
- Wheelchair-accessible trail surrounding fields with occasional trees, benches, par course items, or children’s play structures (similar to Greer Park). Eventually link to trails in Mitchell Park.

**Priorities for Selecting Future Tenants at Cubberley**

- Tenants should be selected depending on how well they fulfill our vision of a community center that is multi-generational, multi-cultural, multi-disciplinary, lively and fun, and flexible for changing needs.
- Decisions between similar users should be made with input from outside judges. The juried selection process developed for selecting artists could be a good model.
Facilities
Subcommittee
Documents
Problem Statement
Facilities Subcommittee

Presented 10/3/12

Short Term

1. PAUSD needs revenue that the City is challenged to afford under current budgetary constraints.
2. Significant infrastructure costs have been deferred and will start catching up with us.
3. It is unclear whether we can fill vacancies left by Foothill College (3 years out). If not, red flag re: lost revenue (~ $1 million).
4. The City needs to start planning in the short term for continuation of services with likelihood of at least some future lost space.
5. Negotiation of a lease and/or covenant in the short term should reflect commitments to current and medium term upkeep and future cooperation.

Overarching Medium and Long Term

1. The District is clear about its desire to reclaim some, and ultimately all, of the Cubberley site for school use, while the City lacks sufficient other real estate to accommodate the services currently provided at Cubberley.
2. The current architectural use of the site is extremely inefficient. The ratio of usable space to circulation space is very poor and to maintain these buildings in the current configuration for whatever use is a great waste of valuable land.
3. Cubberley offers a tremendous opportunity to design visionary programming and facilities that can bring our community together, serving students, families and neighbors for years to come. Delaying or foregoing plans for such a resource carries substantial opportunity costs that should not be underestimated.
4. This is the last sizable space in the city for redevelopment and to maximize its flexibility and use, the practicality of multi-story facilities should be considered.
5. District uncertainty about the type of facilities needed, (full high school or not, middle school or not, elementary school or not) as well as the chance they’ll want to use existing structures, creates a barrier to planning for investment in new construction at Cubberley for either community or shared use.
   • If reuse of existing facilities is a realistic option for the PAUSD, scraping space before then for community or shared use could severely limit District flexibility or increase costs for future school use.
6. Sharing space between community needs and school use offers many advantages for both parties, but also poses some significant facilities challenges, including:
   • Inconsistent architectural standards
• Incompatibilities
• Security issues
• Scheduling issues
• Parking
• Traffic demand management (bus, car, bicycle and pedestrian)

7. To the extent community services are displaced, what off-site locations can be repurposed for community use?

Medium Term

1. Significant additional infrastructure investments would be required to extend the life of current buildings (bare minimum requirements have been identified by IBRC).
2. PAUSD may need some portion of the site, while community needs persist. Can use of the site be sufficiently maximized to meet both needs?
3. Under both 2 and 3, above, how will support facility needs change (e.g., safe and convenient access and parking for all modes of transportation: automobile, bicycle, pedestrian and transit, restrooms, etc.)?

Long Term

1. Even with significant shared use of current facilities, a comprehensive high school would likely conflict with community use of the site.
2. Field and gym use will be particularly impacted, even with new construction – you can’t build up for those facilities.
3. Shared use with a high school of any size will dramatically increase the need for support facilities (parking, safe automobile, bicycle, pedestrian and transit access, food services, etc.).
4. Given fluctuations in enrollment and community needs, any new facilities will have to accommodate flexible programming/use.
5. Given high demand on the site, any construction will require careful planning of transitions.
MORE THOUGHTS RE CUBBERLEY FACILITIES

General

Facilities are places where programs and services occur.

The program/service needs should drive the requirement for facilities.

Facilities may be specialized -e.g. a swimming pool, or general purpose--e.g. a multipurpose room. Facilities often serve several purposes even though they are somewhat specialized--e.g., a theater may be suitable for music, lectures, drama, but not ballroom dancing or exercise. A multipurpose room with a simple stage may serve for all of these events in a more limited way.

Facilities require financial support by the sponsoring organization--for staff, utilities, operations, and maintenance, as well as for original construction and furnishing. The cost elements of a particular program/service at a multipurpose facility sometimes are buried within overall facility costs, so that the true program/service cost is not readily available. The overall cost of a program/service at a specialized facility often is more readily discernable.

City of Palo Alto (CPA) Comprehensive Plan: Community Services Element

Programs, and the facilities to support them, should conform to the CPA comprehensive plan when possible. Palo Alto policy has been to provide geographical diversity of services. Currently there are three CPA facilities comprising a network of community centers--Lucie Stern in northern Palo Alto, a small community center adjacent to the Mitchell Park Library (center and library currently being reconstructed, center size about 15,000 sq. ft. including courtyard), and a much larger Cubberley Community Center in southern Palo Alto (buildings alone about 176,000 ft. sq.).

Chapter 6 of the CPA Comprehensive Plan is titled Community Services and Facilities. A background report ["Community Services Background Report", dated 7/21/09] was intended to amend that portion of the Comprehensive Plan. Following issuance of the background report, a series of community service element stakeholder meetings were held. Five (5) summaries of those meetings are available on the CPA website. As a result, recent changes were made to Chapter 6 [Reference: CSE Narratives, Chapter 6, 30 pages].

Chapter 6 covers schools, libraries, parks, community facilities, performing and cultural centers, as well as police and fire services and facilities. Services/programs for all include recreation, lifelong learning, and arts. Services and programs for specialized populations--children, youth, seniors, and disabled--also are covered. For example, in the prior plan, Policy C-22 called for flexible functions at community facilities. Policy C-24 covered reinvesting in aging facilities and avoiding
deferred maintenance. Program C-19, in support of C-24, covered improvement plans at facilities, including a Cubberley Master Plan. The new version of Chapter 6 reorganizes the policies and programs, but covers the same elements.

Page 16 of the 7/21/09 Background Report notes some important challenges that do or could apply to the Cubberley site, abstracted below:

♦ The Cubberley Community Center is largely owned by the PAUSD and is therefore dependent on PAUSD needs.

♦ The Parks and Recreation Department has identified a lack of sufficient playing fields. The need for playing fields is highest on weekdays between 3pm and 6pm, and on weekends.

♦ Gym space and daycare center capacity are inadequate to meet existing demand.

♦ The Community Services Department needs to develop improved cost-recovery strategies to reduce the draw on the general fund for programs and services.

*Note: Efforts have been made here in recent years to increase cost-recovery, including some policy priorities, I think. Check with Rob deGeus for elaboration.*

♦ The City will need to respond to the unique recreation needs of the aging Baby Boomer Generation.

The needed facilities spelled out are: playing fields, gym space, and daycare center. The recreation needs of the aging population are not spelled out—typically they might include simple exercise classes and yoga, swimming, dancing, light recreational activity like Ping-Pong, billiards, shuffleboards, bocce ball and horseshoe courts, etc. Some of the aging population also needs mental stimulation—that can be provided by lectures, films/broadcasts, computer classes, social network classes, and other adult education. Some of these needs are currently supplied by Avenidas (partially supported by CPA) at its center in downtown Palo Alto. Most of the aging population recreation/stimulation needs could be provided in large or small multipurpose rooms, gyms, classrooms, lecture halls, auditoriums, and well-equipped audio-visual rooms. Services that include arts and crafts might require specialized equipment in dedicated rooms—pottery making, kilns, machine and shop tools for wood and metal sculpture, jewelry making, painting, such as at Little House in Menlo Park, or as currently exist in some of the Cubberley individual art studios.

In addition to the needs identified in the Background Report, the Cubberley
Community Advisory Committee (CCAC) recently heard directly from the community regarding its needs. CCAC held a public forum on 11/8/2012 to provide an update on its progress, and to invite community responses. The facilities, where vocal community groups reported shortages, were: playing fields, gym space, and childcare. These shortages have not yet been analyzed or quantified adequately to direct program planning. Speakers at the forum also supported a continuing need for existing art, music, and dance programs. Again, a full analysis or quantification is lacking. One non-resident pointed out that she, and other non-residents who used Cubberley and other community facilities, supported the CPA economy via dining and shopping in Palo Alto.

CCAC also had community response at the 11/14/2012 CCAC meeting. Five (5) cooperating community groups requested a wellness center that would house and integrate their separate programs--Cardiac Therapy Foundation [medically supervised rehabilitation and information programs, Peninsula Stroke Association, REACH (Foothill program for post-stroke recovery), Abilities United (formerly CAR) [aquatic rehabilitation/therapy at the Betty Wright Swim Center], and Avenidas (needs more space for health and wellness programs for older adults and seniors).

In addition to Chapter 6 of the CPA Comprehensive Plan, and the Background Report to amend it, the Land Use and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan also provide some policies and programs that relate to community centers and services:

**POLICY L-61:**
Promote the use of community and cultural centers, libraries, local schools, parks, and other community facilities as gathering places. Ensure that they are inviting and safe places that can deliver a variety of community services during both daytime and evening hours.

**PROGRAM L-68:**
To help satisfy present and future community use needs, coordinate with the School District to educate the public about and to plan for the future use of school sites, including providing space for public gathering places for neighborhoods lacking space.

**POLICY L-64:**
Seek potential new sites for art and cultural facilities, public spaces, open space, and community gardens that encourage and support pedestrian and bicycle travel and person-to-person contact, particularly in neighborhoods that lack these amenities.

**POLICY T-14:**
Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to and between local destinations, including public facilities, schools, parks, open space, employment districts,
shopping centers, and multi-modal transit stations.

*Cubberley Community Center*

Cubberley, as a former high school site leased and owned by CPA, was not designed or built as a community center. Consequently its existing facilities do not ideally conform to, or readily support, community services desired and envisioned in CPA’s comprehensive plan and its proposed amendment. Likewise, some existing programs/services at Cubberley may not conform to the CPA Comprehensive Plan/Amendment, but merely help support overall costs of the Cubberley Community Center. For example, California Law Review is a for-profit tenant, offering specialized classes not intended for the general community. Additionally, Cubberley lacks some facilities present in many community centers--e.g. a pool, a café, an exterior or interior courtyard with seating --that limit the services/programs that could be offered.

A Master plan for a Community Center at the Cubberley site (1/30/91) was developed. It covered the entire site--city owned as well as spaces and facilities leased by CPA. It utilized neighborhoods to provide services. Neighborhoods included were: athletics, childcare, dancers, education, hourly meeting facilities, music and theater, non-profit/community organizations, recreation (expanded MP, distinct from Gyms under athletics), visual art, and administration and gallery/café. Some of the items in the master plan were not implemented, or were moved to spaces other than originally planned.

Most of the buildings and other facilities (track, fields, etc.) at the Cubberley site were completed by 1955. Some additional buildings (Pavilion, Theater, and others) were added in the early 1960s. The site was built to then-existing school standards. In general, the structures have stood up well during the past 57 years, by replacing and repairing roofs, etc., although it becomes increasingly expensive to maintain the structures. Modifications of structures for child-care services added after the site became a community center appear to have been built to lower, more temporary, standards.

The facilities, while usable to support some community services and programs, cannot be considered modern. For example, air conditioning is generally lacking throughout the site. Wired internet access is not available throughout the site. Some classrooms and lecture halls now used by Foothill College have been upgraded with more up-to-date audio-visual equipment than originally existed, but such improvements are inconsistent.

The Cubberley site is inefficiently used by modern standards. Existing buildings are mostly single story, per the 1950’s model of Palo Alto school architecture. The building layout results in long distances between some buildings, and is inconvenient for a Community Center. Some very long covered walkways give a foreboding tunnel effect.
Figure 1 *(Brian’s pie chart, and listing of square footage of items)* shows the overall space utilization. Existing buildings take up 175,500 sq. ft. (4.0 acres) of space, with circulation (covered walkways) taking up another 116,148 sq. ft., (2.7 acres). This 60/40 ratio is quite inefficient. Site open areas (spaces between and around buildings, amphitheater, etc.) take up 426,897 sq. ft. (9.8 acres), while 750 parking spaces take up 239,755 sq. ft. (5.5 acres) of the 35 total acres. The site also supports a football field/track, large playing fields for baseball, soccer, etc. and 6 tennis courts. The fields take up 566,280 sq. ft. (13.0 acres). The space use is very inefficient.

The city portion of the site (8 acres) is 348,480 sq. ft. Note that if all the building’s footprint areas were consolidated into one area, it would cover only 50% of the city portion. Even if the building areas and walkways were consolidated into one area (291,648 sq. ft.), it would only cover 84% of the city portion. Clearly, CPA could build a 2-story (or higher) new community center on less than half of its 8 acres.

Likewise, PAUSD could easily fit a comprehensive high school onto the remaining 27 acres, by more efficient use of the site. As one example, the parking spaces could be placed under the playing fields and tennis courts, freeing up 5.5 acres, effectively increasing the site to 32.5 acres, even while continuing to use inefficient single story classroom buildings.

PAUSD asserts that for its anticipated future needs of one or more schools at Cubberley, many of the existing buildings and other facilities could be directly reused, or modified for reuse, rather than scraped to the ground and built new. This view is not widely shared, nor consistent with technologically facilitated pedagogy. Obviously, room equipment such as smart boards, computers, wired or wireless internet access, etc. would need to be added for any future use, but basic building shells and interior structures might mostly be retained.

*Services/Programs at Cubberley Community Center*

The neighborhoods/services envisioned in the Cubberley Community Center Master Plan remain a good starting point to identify facilities for a Community Center in the near, mid, or far terms. Likewise, additional services/programs identified by the Community Needs and School Needs Subcommittees can help identify additional facilities that ought to be considered for the overall CPA/PAUSD Cubberley site.

All the facilities on the overall site should be shared to the maximum extent possible consistent with the separate needs of CPA for a community center and PAUSD for one or more schools. Sharing (new construction, operations, and maintenance) will result in the lowest overall cost to the residents of Palo Alto who support both CPA and PAUSD via taxes and fees.
Community and school services/programs can be provided in proactive or reactive modes. In proactive modes, most services are well defined, with identified budgets (or shares of the budget), priorities, locations, and responsibilities for execution. In reactive modes, many services are provided in response to events and citizen demands. The proactive mode tends to prevail for many school services/programs, whereas the reactive mode tends to prevail for many community services and programs. School districts necessarily provide a well-established, more focused, highly structured, and usually slowly changing set of educational services. Additionally those services must comply with state regulations and restrictions, and the accompanying bureaucracies and inertia. Community services are generally freer of state regulation and communities are more flexible than school districts in providing the type, quantity, and quality of services/programs. An advantage of the reactive mode is its flexibility and quicker adaptation to inevitable changes in needs and demands for services. A disadvantage of the reactive mode is that priorities among services often are not set. Then, when resources (funds, personnel, facilities) are reduced, cut entirely, or insufficient for competing demands among services, it becomes politically difficult to reduce, eliminate, or reallocate services. This has been true for California in recent years (closing parks, cutting school budgets, reducing CHP staff, deferring maintenance, etc.), as well as for CPA.

In identifying the future desired services/programs (and therefore the supporting facilities needed) at Cubberley, both CPA and PAUSD face problems of uncertainty and prioritization, in different ways. They also face funding problems for ongoing operations, and will need to have voters pass bonds for large-scale improvements at Cubberley.

**PAUSD Challenges**

PAUSD faces considerable uncertainty about what services/programs a high school of the future (about 2030) will provide, what kinds of students it will serve, and what should be the priorities. Certainly PAUSD will continue to offer the core academic subjects. Certain other services may be provided as well. First, there may be increasing demand for music, dance, performing arts, fine arts, and crafts often encountered in economically well-off, highly educated, largely professional areas like Palo Alto. Second, PAUSD may also have demand from Silicon Valley parents involved in science, engineering, industry, and business, for modern versions of vocationally oriented classes--such as software programming/web site design/blog construction rather than drafting; material sciences laboratories/preparation rather than casting/foundry/glassblowing; and electronic design/assembly/testing rather than machine-shop/woodshop/car maintenance and repair. There may be demand for radio/television/web broadcasting design, delivery, and operations in addition to school newspaper experience. Third, part of this demand will be driven by the perceived employment opportunities for some graduating students who do not go directly to college/university. The New Technology High School in Napa CA is a role model for the vocational types of services, and is in partnership in many ways with the surrounding business community. Fourth, PAUSD, known as a high-
performance academic district, may face a demand for less stressful academic tracks than those for college-bound students enrolling in advanced-placement courses. PAUSD is already trying to cope with stress-related student suicides (CPA participates in Project Safety Net directed at teen suicides). Note that the ABAG projections for growth of Palo Alto do not imply that all the growth will be for high-performing students from high-income parents. Fifth, especially for high school and perhaps even for junior high schools, technology advances such as remote computing, simple online courses, and even massive open online courses (MOOC) likely will affect schools of the future. The advances will impact the size and quality of teacher staff, the need for information technology support staff and equipment, very likely the size of classrooms and their technology, etc. It is possible that the physical space needed for a future high school could be much smaller than at Palo Alto HS or Gunn HS, if students take courses at home or in other remote locations, and merely show up for in-class tests or not at all.

Of course, even for the possible reduced size scenario, there will remain a need at schools for space for the non-academic side of middle and/or high-school-socialization, personal interaction, formation and interaction with small and large groups, etc. This cannot readily be quantified into facilities other than general gathering space and places where students can meet, interact, and work out their own problems and concerns. Spaces such as patios, courtyards, and hallways, gymnasiums, locker rooms, and sports/recreation areas will still be needed, even for a small future school.

As a result of these uncertainties, and the eventual prioritization needed to select services/programs while meeting budget constraints, PAUSD may want a different type of high school (and/or middle school) at Cubberley than now exists elsewhere in Palo Alto.

The impact of this uncertainty on shared facilities at Cubberley is somewhat clearer. If PAUSD decides to provide music, etc., then facilities for music, dance, performing arts, and perhaps fine arts and crafts, potentially can be shared during non-school hours. Many of these are now provided at the Cubberley Community Center (on a non-shared basis). Also, if CPA supports individual musicians, dance teachers and troupes, performing artists, fine artists, craftspeople (weavers, potters, glass artists, etc.) through below-market rentals of shared space, potentially PAUSD might utilize those individuals to teach, help teach, or demonstrate, those skills to students, supplementing its own teaching staff in an economical way.

If PAUSD decides to offer more vocationally oriented classes, sharing would be more difficult, but not impossible. That is because vocationally oriented classes tend to require specialized facilities, which are both less usable by the general community, and often require active supervision while in use. This implies higher user fees, and limited times due to availability of qualified supervisors. However, should PAUSD pursue this route, it might well be able to partner with local Silicon Valley firms for donated equipment, personnel to train students (and teachers), supervision, etc.
Partnering business firms would benefit from tax write-offs for donated equipment, direct access to qualified graduates, and good public relations. Such partnering again would be an economical way to supplement teaching staff.

Despite those challenges, PAUSD stands to benefit from financial and programmatic efficiencies by planning now for future shared use of the Cubberley site. Acreage is more than adequate to accommodate any future school use along with some community service presence.

**CPA Challenges**

In addition to the challenges listed earlier (see section City of Palo Alto Services/Programs), there are uncertain demographic factors. ABAG projections show CPA should expect significant population growth. PAUSD is estimating a 2% annual growth rate in student population out to 2030. The implication is that there will be a similar growth in overall population in CPA of 43% by then (i.e., $1.02^{18}$). It is anticipated there will be a proportional growth in demand for services and programs throughout CPA. However, most of this population growth is expected in southern Palo Alto, based on what has occurred in recent years. Therefore the demand for additional services at a local community center, i.e. Cubberley, may easily exceed 50% by 2030.

Another challenge is the lack of available land for more community services and programs. Palo Alto is largely built out, with little land available to CPA (or PAUSD) short of eminent domain proceedings. Indeed most of the recent population growth in Palo Alto has been in high-density residential developments (apartments, condos). A recent example is the Echelon development in the Charleston corridor. The 8 acres currently owned by CPA at the Cubberley site is probably the last large parcel of real estate left within the city limits for community services, short of converting existing parks and municipal facilities to that purpose.

Another challenge is revenue to support services/programs. CPA is already struggling to meet its budget. It is uncertain whether the projected growth in population will result in sufficient revenue growth to support growth-related expansion of existing services/programs at their present quantity and quality level, much less support additional services such as the senior recreation/stimulation needs or a wellness center.

Another challenge/uncertainty lies in recently proposed major development plans near downtown Palo Alto in exchange for a new municipal theater or possibly a municipal services center. This proposal would affect the need for a full theater facility at Cubberley, and/or revenue needed to pay infrastructure improvement bonds.

**Joint Challenge**
Both CPA and PAUSD will need to issue bonds for capital construction and maintenance of future facilities at Cubberley. Voter approval is far more likely if PAUSD and CPA cooperate and share the Cubberley site, demonstrating to voters that strong efforts have been made to provide the needed and desired services/programs, while minimizing overall costs for construction, maintenance, and operation.

**Opportunities**

The challenges provide opportunities. PAUSD has an opportunity to build a modern junior and/or high school on the Cubberley site. It has an opportunity to partner with CPA and other community organizations to minimize costs and improve instruction, as well as to be seen as more reactive and responsive to community needs. CPA has an opportunity to build a modern community center on the Cubberley site, while being more involved in meeting PAUSD needs. It also has an opportunity to be more proactive in identifying its policies and priorities for guiding current and future community services and programs.

Other opportunities arise for both PAUSD and CPA for more involvement with Stanford University. Stanford is not an explicit participant in considering the Cubberley site, but it certainly is an implicit one. Many of the PAUSD students come via Stanford staff and married students. Although Stanford has the greatest impact on nearby schools, such as Palo Alto H.S., its staff and students are spread all over Palo Alto, and development of the Cubberley site will affect them. Stanford can certainly inform PAUSD regarding anticipated technology and teaching changes that will affect future schools. Likewise recent newly constructed facilities at Stanford can inform the process of designing, constructing, and equipping school facilities at Cubberley, once the needs have been established. PAUSD already deals with Stanford regarding school sites and locations, and this arrangement could be expanded to help inform the process for the Cubberley site. Likewise, CPA can utilize the anticipated technology, and examples of facilities, for a future community center at Cubberley, as well as for some currently planned infrastructure improvements. One opportunity for Stanford University with CPA arises from Stanford Hospital being a premier hospital in terms of medical care. However, after patients are discharged, they often require extended rehabilitation and ongoing wellness services. Many of those patients live in Palo Alto and surrounding areas. Construction of a Wellness and Health Center at the Cubberley Community Center would facilitate patient recovery, while permitting Stanford Hospital and Health Services to readily follow up on long-term benefits of the treatments received by local patients. The new Affordable Health Care Act (“Obama Care”) likely will push all medical delivery systems in this direction.

**Impact on Facilities desired at Cubberley site**

It is clear that CPA and PAUSD will need facilities at the Cubberley site by about 2030, and perhaps sooner. Each entity will need facilities dedicated to its
There is good potential for shared facilities as well, that could result in reduced operating costs and need for construction bonds for both CPA and PAUSD. The sharing may be done by time separation (TS—e.g. after school hours, or scheduled public use during school hours), or may be simultaneous (depending on PAUSD security needs for students).

Outlined below are some of the expected shared and sole use facilities, based on existing services/programs in PAUSD high schools and at Cubberley Community Center, along with some possible future services/programs discussed above. The internal equipment within the facility—computers, audio-visual equipment, smart boards, monitoring and surveillance equipment, etc. is not listed. It is anticipated that PAUSD computer systems, files, etc. would not be available to community users because of confidentiality and security concerns. However, scoreboards, timers and other equipment used for sports might be shared. In addition to facilities, costs for electrical and mechanical infrastructure, operation, and maintenance also could be shared.

**Shared Use**

- Parking (preferably underground)
- Maintenance yard (joint and adjacent sections)
- Equipment storage and Repair (joint and adjacent sections)
- Supplies delivery area/dock/storage area (joint and adjacent sections)
- Electric power, natural gas, water, fuel, sewage common entry/exit area
- Emergency electric power equipment
- Offices for maintenance and repair staff
- Kitchen
- Dining area (indoor and outdoor)
- Outdoor stadium and track (TS)
- Outdoor playing fields (TS)
- Tennis courts (TS)
- Restrooms for track, fields, courts (TS)
- School Gymnasiums (TS)
- Pool and aquatic facility (TS)
- Auditorium (TS)
- Theater (TS)
- Theater rehearsal/makeup/costume rooms (TS)
- Theater set storage, construction rooms (TS)
- Music Recital Room (TS)
- Music Practice Room (for band, orchestra) TS
- Dance Studio, if implemented (TS)
- Fine arts and craft spaces, if implemented TS
- Radio and television broadcast studios, if implemented (TS)
- Lecture rooms (TS)
- Language learning laboratories (TS)
- Some classrooms (TS)
Some audio-visual Rooms (TS)

In addition to facilities, it is anticipated that some staff could be shared as well, reducing overall operational costs for PAUSD and CPA. Staff that might be shared includes:

- Custodial
- Administrative
- Grounds and Maintenance
- Information Technology

**CPA Use**

- Gymnasiums (2 or more)
- Individual Artist studios
- Dance studio(s)
- Pre-School Child Care
- Multipurpose rooms
- Meeting Rooms
- Ballroom
- Lecture Hall
- Auditorium
- Some classrooms
- CPA administration
- Health and Wellness Center

**PAUSD Use**

- PAUSD administration offices--Principal, vice principal, other staff
- Information technology center and offices for staff
- Many classrooms
- Lecture halls
- Study halls
- Gymnasium locker rooms
- Teacher's Offices
- Nurse/medical office
- Science Labs
- School Library
- Cafeteria
- Bicycle storage
- Student Lockers
- Student and Staff Restrooms
Cubberley Existing 35 Acre Land Use

- Fields & Tennis Courts
- Buildings
- Circulation *
- Parking
- Access Roads
- Site **

* Circulation: Covered walk, covered patios connecting buildings
** Site: Landscape, open court yards, amphitheater, outdoor main switchgear, etc.
Finance Subcommittee Documents
CCAC Finance Subcommittee Deliverable #1

Financial analysis of City and School District situation, especially as it relates to Cubberley revenues and expenses. Delivery date: October 1

Important Dates:

1955 – Cubberley is constructed
1979 – Cubberley closed as high school; PAUSD rents space to others
1987 – Utility User Tax is adopted by City voters
1989 – PAUSD leases the entire Cubberley facility to the City
2001 – City acquires ownership of 8 acres of Cubberley buildings in swap for developed property at Terman

December 2013 – Date by which City is to give notice if it does not intend to renew Cubberley lease for next 5 year option period (2014-2019)

August 2014 – Time at which City must submit to County Registrar of Voters ballot measure(s) to finance infrastructure improvements to be voted on at November General Election

The Lease and Covenant Not to Develop:

There are three components to the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop:
1. The lease of the Cubberley Facility – current cost in 2012-2013 = $4.6 million
2. The Covenant Not to Develop – current cost in 2012-2013 = $1.8 million
3. Payment for provision of space at each elementary school for child care – current cost in 2012-2013 = $640 thousand; utilities for child care spaces – current cost in 2012-2013 = $56 thousand

There is an annual CPI adjustment built into the document so that each component increases each year.
**Cubberley Finances:**

Aside from the lease payments, Cubberley has expenses for:

- General operating maintenance: $430,000
- Operations, not including mtce: $1,325,000

Cubberley generates revenues of:

- Tenant leases: $1,620,000
- Hourly rentals: $823,000
- Office space rental by City: $73,000

There is a net revenue from all these sources of approximately $760,000.

According to figures in the IBRC report, the City pays the School District $4/square foot in the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop and collects approximately $1/square foot in rental revenue.

The City has identified a minimum of $3.3 million of capital improvement costs over the next 5 year period:

1. $1.4 million in mechanical/electrical ($0 on City buildings)
2. $1.1 million in electrical upgrades ($750 thousand on City buildings)
3. $1.0 million in roofing projects ($375 on City buildings)

Long term, the City has identified $18.8 million in infrastructure improvements that must be made at Cubberley. Of those, $8.4 million is on City Buildings and $10.4 is on School District Buildings. This would cover infrastructure improvements which would extend the life of the buildings for 25 years but most would need to be accomplished within 10 years. These improvements have not yet been funded.

Foothill College, the longest term and largest tenant, is scheduled to move to a new Sunnyvale campus sometime within the term of the next lease option period. Foothill represents a significant portion of the current tenant lease income.

**General Financial Conditions of City and School District**

The School District has an operating budget of $159 million. Of that, 6% or $9 million is from lease revenue, $7 million of which comes from the City. The operating budget contains three reserve funds:

1. The state-mandated “rainy day” fund
2. The basic aid fund; and
3. The budget cuts fund
Given recent actions by the State, the District has been using the budget cuts fund to balance its budgets. This fund is scheduled to be depleted in the 2013-2014 fiscal year. The School District is counting on robust increases in property tax revenue and the renewal of the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop to balance budgets for the 2014-2019 time frame.

The School District is anxious to hold onto the basic aid reserve because of persistent threats that the State will cut off the small amount of per pupil contribution that it sends to Palo Alto. This reserve would cover that gap for a number of years.

The School District is also concerned about the outcome of the November 2012 statewide election. There are two ballot measures which could significantly impact the finances of the District should either or both fail passage.

Major operating budget gaps are filled most often by school districts by going to the voters for approval of a parcel tax. The PAUSD last did so in 2010. Voters are currently paying approximately $613 per parcel per year. There is a cost of living adjustment built into the current parcel tax so that it increases each year. The current parcel tax will expire in 2016.

The School District has no permanent capital improvement budget. Instead when it needs to make significant improvements to buildings or construct new buildings, it must go to the voters to win approval to issue General Obligation Bonds.

The current bond measure does not contain any funds that can be used to make major improvements at Cubberley as all of the secondary school funds have been expended or encumbered.

As for ongoing maintenance, the General Fund transfers 2.5% of its budget ($4.1 million this year) to the District’s routine maintenance fund. The District also has a planned maintenance budget, coming from bond funds, in the amount of $2.1 million annually.

The City’s $152 million general fund budget currently and looking out to the future has a structural deficit. The Council balanced the 2012-2013 operating budget by instituting over $2 million in structural deficit reductions, over $3 million in one-time savings and by “borrowing” over $300 thousand from reserves. Future projections do not paint a rosier picture. The property tax increases that so heavily benefit the School District make up a small percentage of the City’s tax revenue. The Utility Users Tax which currently raises just short of $11 million annually is flattening as people shift from use of land line phones to cell phones (on which no tax is currently collected). Sales tax revenue has increased recently but is very dependent upon economic conditions.
In the Capital Improvement budget, the IBRC identified a backlog of deferred maintenance projects on the order of $40 million. The Commission also recommended that in order not to fall back into a backlog status, the City would need to budget $32 million annually to keep current. The IBRC also identified approximately $210 million in new infrastructure projects that need to be built. Neither Cubberley nor several other items the Council has discussed in recent times were included in this number.

Summary

There are potentially two remaining 5-year options on the Cubberley lease if mutually agreed upon by the City and the District. The deteriorating condition of some of the buildings and the need to invest in them are powerful factors in forcing the governmental agencies to clarify their mutual goals and interests in the property. The precarious nature of both agencies’ budgets requires that capital investment in the Cubberley site be well-planned, deliberate and suited to a long-term vision for the site.

Attachments:
1. Graph showing the trendline of Utility User Tax
2. Graph showing growth of Property Tax
3. Spreadsheet of current Cubberley revenues/expenses and projected capital expenses
4. Spreadsheet of projected revenues and expenses for Cubberley
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I. Overview

This CCAC Finance Committee report reviews the existing agreement between the City of Palo Alto (City) and Palo Alto Unified School District (District) referred to as the Lease and Covenant Not to Develop (Cubberley Lease). Some background information and terms are reviewed followed by recommendations and considerations for actions going forward.

II. Lease Overview

The existing arrangement between the City of Palo Alto (City) and Palo Alto Unified School District (District) was put into place 1989 to address issues that were of concern to the Palo Alto community at that time. During the 1980s the District was selling off its parcels of land to raise capital to meet financial demands and the falling school enrollment seemed to support that trend. As land became more scarce, the community sought to prevent further District land sales fearing that future growth in student population would require additional schools and the increasing land scarcity would make that infeasible. The community developed a solution to the land sales, obtaining the District's agreement not to sell additional school properties and in turn the City would provide funds to aid in the District's financial problems. The City obtained funds to pay for the Cubberley Lease as well as other city improvements through a levied Utility Users Tax, to be collected by the City and paid to the District through the Lease and Covenant Not To Develop (Cubberley Lease).

The City and District agreed to enter into an agreement that is now the Lease and Covenant Not To Develop and contains the following major terms:

1) **Cubberley Lease Payment**: A City lease payment to the District for the use of the Cubberley property.

2) **Child Care Facility Lease Payment**: A City lease payment to the District for use of eleven (11) school facilities in order to provide child care services to the community.

3) **Covenant Not to Develop**: A City lease payment to the District in return for the District's commitment to not sell additional District owned land (including Ohlone, Garland, Greendell, JLS, and Jordan).

4) Lease payments are adjusted annually in line with Consumer Price Index changes.

5) The Lease and Covenant Not To Develop terms included one 15 year term (1/1/90-1/31/04), one City optional extension of 10 years (1/1/05-12/31/14) and two mutual optional 5 year extensions (1/1/14-12/31/18 and 1/1/19-12/31/23).

In 1998 the Cubberley Lease was amended to include an agreement to substitute two operating schools for the opening of one "covenanted" site. The list of Covenanted Sites was modified to exclude Ohlone and include Juana Briones and Walter Hays. The list of schools where child care was allowed by the City was expanded to include Ohlone and allowed for future expansion.

In 2002 the Cubberley Lease was amended to account for the land swap where 8 acres of the Cubberley site was deeded to the City in exchange for the District's reclamation of the Terman location and the Cubberley Lease Payment was accordingly reduced by $23,490 per month. The list of Covenanted sites
was modified to exclude the Garland site and include Addison and El Carmelo sites. Also added at that
time was a District Option to open a compact high school at the Cubberley site if necessary, agreeing to
joint use of the gym, cafeteria, theatre, and fields with required 24 months notice.

At this time, the first of the two 5 year extensions is under consideration by both parties with a decision
required by December 31, 2013.

III. Problem Statement

The following issues are a concern at this time regarding the above summarized lease.

1) District Needs
   The District has developed a dependency on the lease payment funds, comprising now approximately
   4.4% of the District's annual budget as revenue. These funds also constitute approximately 4.6% of
   the City's annual budget as an expense.

2) Covenant Not to Develop Now Obsolete
   The lease includes a "Covenant Not To Develop" payment that was intended to safeguard District
   owned properties from being sold. It is the City's promise to pay the District in return for the District
   not selling its land. This is no longer an immediate issue as the school sites identified in the Covenant
   are now all in use.

3) Utility Users Tax
   During the campaign to pass the Utility Users Tax, it was advertised to the public as a District
   financial benefit, creating a belief by the Palo Alto community that one of the major beneficiaries of
   the tax funds collected is the District.

4) Lease Payments per Consumer Price Index vs. Utility Users Tax Revenue
   The Cubberley Lease calculates annual lease payment adjustments using the Consumer Price Index
   which has been steadily increasing over time. The Utility Users Tax revenue which depends on utility
   revenues and is used by the City for lease payments, has been leveling off and/or decreasing in recent
   years. This is an inconsistent correlation of income and expense for the City.

5) Future District Requirements are Vague
   The District is vague on specific dates for future use although clear, using current projections, that at
   some time in the 10-15 year time frame the site or a portion thereof may be necessary for school use.

6) Future City Requirements are Vague
   The City has not articulated clearly the community services necessary to remain on the Cubberley site
   and exactly how much of the site is required to support them.
IV. Lease Modification Options

The following recommendations for modifications to the lease are for the short term period, specifically related to the upcoming renewal of 5 year term (Jan 1, 2014 - Dec. 31, 2018). Mid-term and long-term recommendations are difficult to predict as they would pertain to the conditions and plans in place at that time.

Consideration should be given to renew the lease for 5 years to give the City and District time to plan for future renovations on the site. The following lease modifications may also be considered in the form of an addendum to the existing lease:

1. Recalculate the annual lease payments to align with the Utility Users Tax revenue trend rather than the Consumer Price Index.
2. Remove the Covenant Not To Develop payment as it is no longer pertinent to the current situation.
3. Have the District pay for its share of the projected capital improvements.
4. Have the District contribute to ongoing maintenance and repairs.
5. Increase the amount of child care space leased to the city on elementary schools sites along with a corresponding increase in child care facility lease payments.
1. Overview

This report summarizes funding options for the Palo Alto Unified School District (District) and the City of Palo Alto (City). Funding mechanisms are reviewed that are commonly used by the City and District along with a few others that might be potentials for future use. This is not a comprehensive review of all possible funding mechanisms. Three scenarios for the future of Cubberley facilities are proposed.

Funding mechanisms are methods used to generate revenue streams and/or raise capital. The use of the revenue and duration of the mechanism is determined at the time the mechanism is created and, in most cases, must be approved by voters. Income from the funding mechanisms can be used in basically two ways:

1) Ongoing revenue streams may be used directly to augment an operating budget or pay for supplemental services. Common funding mechanism examples of this type include parcel tax, property tax, utility taxes, etc.

2) Bonds are issued to raise large amounts of capital. In this case a new or existing revenue stream is designated to repay the bonds. Various restrictions apply. In most cases, capital raised is used for new development or capital improvements. Rule of thumb is that $1m/year of revenue for 30 years generates between $10m to $15m of borrowed capital depending on prevailing interest rates. The most commonly used bonds for the City and District are General Obligation Bonds.

2. Funding Mechanisms used by City & District

2.1 Parcel Tax

A parcel tax is a fixed annual tax per parcel of real property that generates an ongoing revenue stream. It requires a 2/3 voter approval. The duration of the tax varies, generally 5-20 years, and renewals can be approved by voters.

**District Parcel Tax History:**
2001 - Parcel tax $493 approved 75% generated $5.5m/year, expired 2011
2010 - Parcel tax $589 approved 79% generates $11.9/year expires 2016 (escalates 2% per year)

**City Parcel Tax History:**
There is currently no parcel tax collected by the city.

2.2 Utility Users Tax

A utility tax is a fixed percentage fee levied on city resident's utility or telephone bills. It requires a 50% voter approval. The duration is determined at the time of approval.

**District History:**
There is currently no Utility Users Tax collected by the District.

**City Utility User Tax History:**
1989 - Utility Users Tax of 5% approved over 50% generates $11m/year, no expiration
2.3 General Obligation Bonds
A general obligation bond (GOB) is a funding mechanism whose revenue stream is a property tax fee per $100,000 of assessed property value. The tax time frame can be anywhere up to 40 years. Historically it has been 30 years. A GOB generates revenue that can only be used for capital improvements. GOB requires a 55% voter approval for school districts and 2/3 voter approval for cities.

District Bond History:
1995 - "Building for Excellence" - $143m bond, tax rate of $35/$100,000 expires in 2024.
2008 - "Strong Schools" - $378m bond passed with tax rate of $44.50/$100,000 expires 2037
2012 - "Strong Schools" increase to $60/$100,000 due to recession to retain 30 year repayment

City Bond History:
2008 - "Measure N" - $78m bond passed with tax rate up to $28.74/$100,000 expires 2037

3. Other Funding Mechanisms for Consideration

3.1 Business License Tax
Tax levied on businesses to generate a revenue stream. Available to City. Majority voter approval required. In 2009 a ballot measure proposition by the city to tax businesses was defeated.

3.2 Sales Tax
Tax levied on sales revenue to generate a revenue stream. Available to City in 1/8% increments. Current restrictions limit maximum of 1% available to City. Majority voter approval required.

3.3 Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) Bonds
A Mello-Roos CFD is formed for a specific community need and requires the formation of a "territory". The territory can be any size, including a whole city, as long as all members benefit from the project funded by the bond. Debt repayment is from revenue collected as a property tax fee per $100,000 of assessed property long term (generally 30 years). The bonds generate capital that can be used for capital improvements and services. A CFD requires a two thirds vote of residents or property owners in the district.

3.4 Certificates of Participation Bond
A Certificate of Participation bond is a general credit of the issuing entity. It is not necessarily backed by a particular revenue source, but a new revenue source or reallocation of existing resources is necessary to support the cost of COP debt. A COP also requires the use of an existing asset as collateral for the debt.

3.5 Utility Revenue Bonds
A Utility Revenue Bond is repaid through Utility rates or charges to customers. Revenue streams from utilities cannot be used to fund General Fund operations or capital improvements.

3.6 Private Funding
Revenue sources may be available from private sources who are interested in participating in city improvements. These could be in the form of private financing, contributions, or participatory funding for joint use.
4. Cubberley Funding Scenarios

Given that no specific plan is in place for the Cubberley Facility and the only "known" requirement is that the District may need it in 10-15 years, planning options are wide open. Three scenarios with possible funding options are presented here for consideration.

4.1 No Development at Facility - Use Cubberley "As-Is"

Option 1 assumes that the City continues the Covenant Not to Develop and Lease for 10 years. After 10 years, the agreement terminates and the District can reopen the high school in the existing facilities. The City and District would have to renegotiate the use of the existing 8 acre parcel owned by the City on which a majority of the classroom space is located. Today the Cubberley Facility rental income covers its operating costs and routine maintenance so those costs are not considered a funding need over the next 10 years, although the loss of the Foothill lease around 2015 may be problematic. Downside is that after 10 years, no community services would be provided by the City.

**OPTION 1: No Change to Cubberley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funds Required</th>
<th>Funding Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$12.3m</td>
<td>Include in 2014 bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>$6.3m</td>
<td>Increase parcel tax and use on a &quot;pay as you go basis&quot; meaning accumulation of funds to build a project instead of creating debt - OR- issue new GO Bonds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Phased Re-Development - City 8 Acres First, District 27 Acres Later

Option 2 assumes that the City continues the Covenant Not to Develop and Lease for 5 years. In the meantime the City and District develop a Memo of Understanding (MOU) to develop joint use facilities on the Cubberley location. In the following 5-10 years, the City builds a Community Center with joint use in mind. After 10-15 years, the District rebuilds the high school. Costs are based on the $200m construction estimate provided by the architects and based on acreage split accordingly, $50m (25%) for City, $150m (75%) for District.

**OPTION 2: Phased Re-development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funds Required</th>
<th>Funding Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$6m</td>
<td>Include in 2014 bond measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Community Center (with joint use MOU)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$50m</td>
<td>Include in 2014 GO bond measure - or - COP through increase of the Utility Users Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>High School (with joint use MOU)</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>$150m</td>
<td>High School Bond in 2024 when &quot;BforE&quot; bond expires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 One Time Re-Development - 35 acres at once

Option 3 assumes that the City continues the Covenant Not to Develop and Lease for 5 or 10 years. In the meantime the City and District develop a Memo of Understanding (MOU) to develop joint use facilities on the Cubberley location. After 5 or 10 years, the City and District together build a Community Center and High School with joint use in mind. Costs are based on the $200m construction estimate provided by the architects.

**OPTION 2: One-Time Re-development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funds Required</th>
<th>Funding Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>$6m</td>
<td>Include in 2014 bond measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Community Center and High School (with joint use MOU)</td>
<td>City &amp; District</td>
<td>$200m</td>
<td>High School General Obligation Bond with optional funding from City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. References

California Debt Issuance Primer  

Partnership for Joint Use, Research Report by Jeffrey M. Vincent  
# Appendix A: Funding Options (Financing Mechanisms)

* Note that GO and Mello-Roos bonds can be thought of as “revenue raising” instruments in that their approval by voters implements taxes to repay bond holders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Vehicle/Instrument to Issue Bonds</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GME Requirement (Nov. 2012)</th>
<th>Vote Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation (GO) Bond*</td>
<td>Property Tax based on % of assessed value</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>See accompanying chart for list of upcoming regular and mailed ballot election dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Participation (COPs)</td>
<td>Similar to Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Must have identified revenue stream for repayment e.g. new tax such as Business License Tax or increase in current tax such as sales tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>Repaid from Utility Rates</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Must have identified revenue stream for repayment. Utility bonds cannot be used to fund General Fund operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mello-Roos District Bonds*</td>
<td>Special Tax Levy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>Special Tax Levy used to repay bonds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Funding Options (New or Increased Taxes)

*General taxes can be coupled with an advisory measure expressing voters’ preference that tax be used for particular purpose. If the ballot language itself expressly limits use of tax to infrastructure or other specific uses, it becomes a Special Tax. Special taxes require a 2/3 vote, but need not be placed on a GME ballot.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New or Increased Taxes to Support Financing Vehicles (e.g., COPs)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GME Requirement (Nov. 2014)</th>
<th>Vote Requirement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business License tax</td>
<td>Tax on businesses</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8¢ Sales Tax</td>
<td>General Tax</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>▪ Must be voted on at GME ▪ Currently, there is a 1.0% transactions and use tax in Santa Clara County. The cap on these taxes is 2%. (R&amp;T 7251.1). Therefore PA has the capacity to impose a tax of up to 1%. Note these taxes may be imposed only in multiples of 1/8%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Tax</td>
<td>Tax on utility charges</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Tax (See comment)</td>
<td>Property tax based on flat rate per parcel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>▪ Parcel tax cannot be pledged toward bond payments. Can be used to support programs and operating expenses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- Table continues...
Appendix C: Comparison of GOB, Mello-Roos, and Parcel Taxes

Separate document attached provided by Jones Hall dated September 2012.
Finance Deliverable #3

Research existing joint use facilities in other communities for lessons learned and guidance for our effort.

Due Date: Oct. 19th

Outline/Process

• Gathered available documentation on Joint Use projects
• Choose 3 examples to study in depth – based on similarity to Cubberley
  – Wadsworth, Ohio High School & Community Campus
  – Emeryville, CA Center for Community Life
  – Livermore, CA School Upgrades, City Library & Youth Community Center
• Gathered data
  – Partners
  – Facilities (including sq. ft)
  – Total Cost and Funding Mechanisms
  – Implementation Timeline
• Common Threads and Lessons Learned
• References
Emeryville Center for Community Life

Partners:
• Emery USD
• City of Emeryville

Facility Overview
• 9-12 High School > 750 students
• K-8 Lower School
• School Multi-Purpose Room
• Admin for School & Community
• Community/School Library
• Community Pool
• Community Dance/Aerobic Space
• Community Multi-Purpose Room
• Community Amphitheatre
• 3 level design w/Terraces
• Security Control Points
• Phase 2 – theatre, gym, classrooms

ECCL has Phase 2 plan and Defined Boundaries

Approx. 7.6 acres
115,100 sq. ft facility
Emeryville Funding and Timeframe

- **Cost / Funding**
  - Phase 1: $80M (w/ $10M flex)
    - School will use a $48M 55% General Obligation Bond
    - City will provide $21M in State Redevelopment $s.

- **Timeline**
  - In planning for 10 years- program plan first issued in 2003
  - Currently on 3rd MOU
  - Approved the conceptual design March 2012
  - Move in date is currently estimated August 2015

---

ECCL is still in development and concern is being raised over the state commitment of redevelopment funds.
Facility Overview

- 9-12 High School (1629 students)
- Recreation Facility
- Senior Center
- Health & Wellness Center
- Outdoor and Indoor Pools
- Pediatrics and Dentistry
- Media / Public Library
- Existing Middle school on site (782 students)

Approx 65 acres
450,000 sq. ft.

Partners:
- Wadsworth Schools
- City of Wadsworth
- Public Library
- Private Health System
Wadsworth Funding and Timeframe

• Cost / Funding - $105M
  - $65M from a General Obligation Bond by the Schools
  - $24M from Ohio Schools Facility Commission (37% of GOB)
  - $16M city commitment for Community Center
    • Partners and capital corporate campaign

• Timeline – 4 years!!
  - Presented to community in May 2008
  - Bond approval in November 2008
  - School opened in Fall 2012
  - Community Center opening scheduled for December 2012

Taking advantage of state funds available pushed the community to take action.

Livermore, CA

Partners:
• Livermore Valley USD
• City of Livermore
• Livermore Area Park & Recreation District

Facility Overview – 3 projects
• Modernize 7 of 20 schools
• Youth Community Center
  71,000 sq.ft indoor
  45,000 sq. ft. aquatic center
• Civic Center Library
  56,000 sq.ft
Livermore Funding and Timeframe

- Cost / Funding - $150M thru a General Obligation Bond led by the school
  - $110M for school upgrades
  - $20M Civic Center Library
    - LVJUSD received special legislation (EC 18104) authorizing joint use library to be built on other public entity land within 1 mile of site.
  - $20M Youth Community Center

- Timeline – 5 - 10 years
  - Two failed votes in the early ’90s (School Parcel Tax and Parks GOB)
  - 1975 Tax override set to expire in 2000 gave impetus for action
  - Community Survey March 1998
  - Bond approval in March 1999 (passed with 82% of the vote)
  - Library opened in 2004
  - Community Center opened March 2005
  - School funds exhausted June 2008

This joint effort was done primarily to save election expenses and to provide a compelling opportunity that voters would support.

7 Steps to Effective Joint-Use Partnership\(^1\)

from document published by Berkeley’s Center for Cities and Schools

DONE

1. Identify a local need that a joint use partnership might address

DONE

2. Identify essential joint use partners

IN PROGRESS

3. Develop a positive, trusting relationship with partners
4. Build political support
5. Build a joint use partnership within the context of the local community
6. Formalize the partnership with an MOU
7. Foster ongoing communication and monitor the progress and impact
Type of Funding for Joint-Use Projects through School Districts

- **State General Obligation Bonds**: These funds are voted on by the entire state. They can be directed one or several areas such as education, transportation, and parks. As of June 2008, there was $1.3 million left from Prop. 47, $8.2 million from Prop. 39, and $4.8 million from Prop. 1D, for a total of $12.1 million. So not a strong prospect for us to pursue.

- **Local General Obligation Bonds**: School districts use these bond funds to match the state required contribution for school construction projects. Local bonds must be approved by 55% of the vote within the district. They are repaid using local property tax revenue. Local bonds have raised $41 billion in the past decade.

- **Developers Fees**: School districts are allowed to levy fees on new residential, commercial, or industrial developments for school construction projects. These fees can provide a moderate amount but vary significantly by community depending on local development.

- **Special Bond Funds**: Known as “Mello-Roos” Bonds, these funds allow school districts to form special districts to sell bonds for school construction projects. These bonds require 2/3 voter approval and are paid off by the property owners in the special district. These bond funds have produced $3.7 billion in the past 10 years.

Very little state money is available and PA isn’t a strong candidate so local options are our best bet.

Potential Challenges to Joint Use

- **Aligning Partnership Goals**: The long-term nature of the partnership requires parties to develop similar goals and objectives for the funding and management of the project.

- **Operations and Maintenance**: The hours of use, security, and cost maintenance should be addressed upfront to avoid confusion and misunderstandings.

- **Regulatory Constraints**: Construction projects have various levels of regulation depending on the community and the environment. The Field Act contains higher construction standards for school facilities. Therefore, if community centers and buildings are to be used by school districts, they must also comply with the Field Act. These types of differences should be reconciled among partners before the project advances.

- **Joint-Use Fund Restrictions**: Requirements set forth in SB 50 state that projects using state school construction funding must be on property owned by school districts.

- **Restrictions on Private-Public Partnerships**: There are currently limited opportunities for public-private joint use partnerships.

- **Long-Term Commitment**: School districts and their partners have stated concerns about joint-use projects and the long-term costs associated with them. Liability issues may also arise.
Major Takeaways

- Joint Use projects are being done all over in all forms
- It takes time to pull the projects together - Project of our scope...
  - 2-5 years in Ohio
  - 5-10 years in California
- Successful projects have communities that embraced them
  - Key tools used: Community surveys, Community advisory committees, community forums
- Funding comes from a variety of sources but typically the school takes the lead
  - Most successful examples have either outside funds they want to leverage or a transition in a local tax
- Significant up front work needs to be done on MOU or Joint Use Agreement to define structure of the project and the relationship of the entities involved
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There are a number of options for the financing and operating of a joint use facility on the Cubberley campus. One of those options is to create a Joint Powers Agency or Authority.

A Joint Powers Agency (JPA) is an entity authorized to be created under Section 6500 of the California State Government Code (the “Joint Powers Law”) whereby two or more public entities can operate collectively. “Joint Powers” is a term used to describe governmental agencies that have agreed to combine their powers and resources to work on solving their common problems.

Joint powers are exercised when the public officials of two or more agencies agree to create another legal entity or establish a joint approach to work on a common problem, fund a project or act as a representative body for a specific activity.

The initials JPA can mean two different things. The first is Joint Powers Agreement, which is a formal, legal agreement between two or more agencies that want to jointly implement programs, build facilities or deliver services. Governmental agencies are called member agencies. One member agency agrees to be responsible for delivery of service on behalf of the other(s). A Joint Powers Agreement has no specified term but rather may be short-term, long-term or perpetual.

The second use of the initials is for Joint Powers Agency or Joint Powers Authority. In this case, the Joint Powers Law is used to establish a new, separate governmental organization created by its member agencies, but operating at the members’ direction. Typically, the JPA has numbers of officials from the member agencies on its governing board.

In the second case, the JPA is distinct from its member agencies. It has its own board of directors. Once created, the JPA has two types of powers: 1) it has the powers common to the member agencies which created it; and 2) it has the powers conferred on it by the California Legislature under Article 4 of the Joint Powers Law, including the power to issue bonds for public capital improvements. The term, membership and standing orders of the board of the JPA must be specified in the agreement. The JPA may employ staff and establish policies independent of the constituent agencies.

A JPA can be formed by action of the governing boards of the participating agencies; there is no public election needed.

JPA’s can be formed specifically to arrange capital financing by selling bonds. The bonds create the capital needed to finance construction of public facilities. In some instances the agency can issue revenue bonds which do not require a vote of the electorate. It is unclear whether a future Cubberley project would generate enough
revenue to be able to qualify to issue this kind of debt. It would be more likely that the improvements would need to be funded by the issuance of General Obligation bonds issued by either the school district or the City (not by the JPA) which in either case would require a public vote. Another alternative would be for the JPA to issue lease revenue bonds. Lease Revenue bonds are bonds where the proceeds are used to build or improve reals property and where the property to be acquired or improved (and in the case of an asset transfer, an unrelated piece of real property) is leased to one or more member agencies. The payments to be made by the member agency(ies) under the Lease create a stream of revenue that serves as the security for the JPA’s Bonds.

Advantages and Disadvantages of a JPA:

Advantages:
- JPA’s are flexible and easy to form
- JPA’s may be more efficient than separate governments
- JPA’s have powers which are different from those of the school district and City, and those powers may be used to finance the construction of facilities; and purchase of equipment/
- A JPA for Cubberley would cover the entire area that would benefit from the construction and operation of a joint use facility
- A JPA for Cubberley might help attract either private capital or grants because it would show both agencies’ commitment to work together on a shared facility

Disadvantages:
- JPA’s require mutual trust
- JPA’s can be hard to keep together for the long-term
- JPA’s can be hard for the public to understand and may be perceived as another layer of government

Resources:
Section 6500 of the California State Government Code
## ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET

Data from Lease & Covenant Revenues and Expenses (Budget 2013 column) and rounded

### OPERATING INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Itemized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Leases</td>
<td>1,617,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Foothill = approx $930k, all other = approx $690k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Rentals</td>
<td>823,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Office Rental</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSE

- Cubberly Lease: 4,600,000
- Covenant: 1,830,000
- Child Care: 640,000
- Child Care Utilities: 56,000
- Payments to PAUSD: 7,126,000
- Lease Management & Maintenance: 430,000
- Non-maintenance Operating: 1,325,000
- **Total Operating Costs (Total):** 1,755,000

### Annual Totals

- **Total Income:** 2,513,000
- **Total Expenses:** 8,881,000
- **Total NET:** 6,368,000

---

### LONG TERM CAPITAL UPRGRADATIONS

**Next 5 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium Roof</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Electrical Upgrades</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Upgrades</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Maintenance</td>
<td>426,000</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Planned Improvements (5 year)</strong></td>
<td>3,276,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRENT BUDGETED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS** (per City of PA 2013 Capital Budget) need to clarify if this is part of IBRC identified work:

- Removed from 2013 capital budget

### LONG TERM MAINTENANCE (PER IBRC p. 146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements (next 5 years)</td>
<td>10,200,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,040,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements (years 5-10)</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements (years 11-25)</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18,800,000</td>
<td>2,093,500</td>
<td>2,296,000</td>
<td>3,697,000</td>
<td>2,296,000</td>
<td>3,093,500</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
## COMPARISON OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, MELLO-ROOS AND PARCEL TAXES FOR CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Mello-Roos CFDs ¹</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote Required?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Electors</td>
<td>Registered voters residing in city.</td>
<td>Registered voters in district, if 12 or more voters reside in district. If fewer than 12 registered voters reside in district, vote is of landowners, one vote per acre.</td>
<td>Registered voters residing in city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary of Area to be Taxed</td>
<td>City.</td>
<td>Territory of district, as defined by city council. District could be entire city or a portion of city, including non-contiguous areas.</td>
<td>City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Tax</td>
<td>Assessed value of property.</td>
<td>Any reasonable method except assessed value.</td>
<td>Fixed annual tax amount per parcel, which may escalate annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Tax Collection</td>
<td>Annual property tax bill.</td>
<td>Annual property tax bill or direct billing.</td>
<td>Annual property tax bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Seniors be Exempt from Tax?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes, so long as there is a rational basis for the exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Use of Technique</td>
<td>Finance capital improvements.</td>
<td>Finance capital improvements and certain annual services.</td>
<td>Augment operating budget or pay for supplemental services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Community Facilities Districts
## COMPARISON OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, MELLO-ROOS AND PARCEL TAXES FOR CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Mello-Roos CFDs</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Eligible for Financing</strong></td>
<td>Purchase or improvement of real property (purchase of land or construction of buildings).</td>
<td>Any facility with useful life of five years or more (including furnishings and vehicles).</td>
<td>Any purpose specified in the ballot, without limitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can Furnishings and Equipment be Financed?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, provided the equipment has a useful life of five years or longer.</td>
<td>Yes, without limitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can Tax Revenues be Used for Purposes Other than Debt Service on Bonds?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes. Pay-as-you-go capital costs, administrative expenses, and limited services (set forth in the Act).</td>
<td>Yes. Any purposes authorized in the ballot measure, including operating expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are Operating Expenses Eligible for Financing with Tax?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Certain municipal services, including police, fire, storm drainage, park, recreation, library, and hazardous waste removal services. Also, annual cost of administering the bonds and the district.</td>
<td>Yes. Most common use of parcel taxes is to supplement operating revenues to maintain current service level or improve level of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separate Authority Required to Issue Bonds?</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes. Typically, general fund lease revenue bonds or COPs authorized by city council, and proceeds of parcel tax levy “reimburses” the general fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Bond Sale</strong></td>
<td>Competitive sale only, unless charter city.</td>
<td>Negotiated or competitive sale.</td>
<td>Negotiated or competitive sale, depending on separate bonding authority used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>Mello-Roos CFDs*</td>
<td>Parcel Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Limit</td>
<td>Amount of bonds outstanding at any time cannot exceed 15% of total assessed value.</td>
<td>Value of property in the district subject to special tax must be at least three times the amount of outstanding bonds. Under certain conditions, the city council can approve an amount of bonds exceeding this limit.</td>
<td>No limitation for COPs or lease revenue bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Security</td>
<td>City’s unrestricted ability to raise property taxes to meet debt service requirements. Property tax is a lien on property. County has authority to foreclose on lien for payment of delinquent taxes.</td>
<td>Special taxes levied and secured by a lien on property. City has authority to initiate accelerated foreclosure on property for payment of delinquent taxes, so long as bonds have been issued by the district.</td>
<td>City’s general fund. There is no State law authority to pledge proceeds of parcel taxes to the payment of debt services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Term of Tax Levy</td>
<td>As long as necessary to repay bonds authorized by voters.</td>
<td>As long as necessary to repay bonds or to pay directly for facilities authorized by voters. Final year of tax must be specified.</td>
<td>As specified in the ballot measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Term of Bonds</td>
<td>Up to 40 years.</td>
<td>Up to 40 years.</td>
<td>Generally, up to useful life of facility being financed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPARISON OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, MELLO-ROOS AND PARCEL TAXES FOR CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Mello-Roos CFDs*</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Date</td>
<td>Statewide Election Dates*</td>
<td>Statewide Election Dates* or a special election on a date specified by the city council to occur between 90 days and 180 days following the adoption of the Resolution of Formation for the district.</td>
<td>Statewide Election Dates*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Election Code Section 1001
## COMPARISON OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, MELLO-ROOS AND PARCEL TAXES FOR CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Mello-Roos CFDs</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar to voters.</td>
<td>Finance facilities with bonds or directly by pay-as-you-go.</td>
<td>No limitation on use of tax proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less time required to develop financing plan and put before voters.</td>
<td>Wide range of items eligible for bond financing, including facilities, furnishings, and equipment.</td>
<td>Can be used for facilities and annual service expenditures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower cost financing (lower bond interest rates and bond issuance costs).</td>
<td>Can be used to pay for many annual, recurring services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If city has a large commercial property tax base, a large portion of tax burden could be borne by non-residential property.</td>
<td>Ability to tailor tax and area to be taxed in a manner to enhance voter approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for landowner vote if CFD has fewer than 12 registered voters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPARISON OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, MELLO-ROOS AND PARCEL TAXES FOR CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>General Obligation Bonds</th>
<th>Mello-Roos CFDs</th>
<th>Parcel Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Disadvantages** | • Citywide vote and supermajority approval required.  
• Facilities eligible for bond financing are limited to real property improvements, such as the purchase of land and construction of buildings.  
• Assessed value method of taxation spreads tax burden on basis of property value rather than by direct benefits received from facilities constructed with bond proceeds.  
• All property owners in city pay additional tax.  
• Bond financing technique only, no ability for pay-as-you-go. | • Supermajority vote required.  
• More time required to develop financing plan and put before voters.  
• Higher cost financing (higher bond interest rates and bond issuance costs).  
• Unfamiliar to voters.  
• More complex method of taxation.  
• Higher district formation costs and annual administration costs (need to hire a separate consultant). | • Citywide vote and supermajority approval required.  
• Must have periodic elections to renew appropriations limit if used for operating expenses.  
• No independent authority to issue bonds—separate authority needed. |
Cubberley Tenant and Long-Term Renters Survey Presentation
Meeting No. 14, 11/28/2012
Cubberley Community Center

Tenant & Long Term Renters Survey

November 28, 2012

Background

Cubberley Master plan 1990
1. Neighborhood Concept
2. Cubberley Master Plan amended 1996 to provide greater flexibility potential users
3. Grouping Tenants based on similar use:
   a. Performing Arts
   b. Child Care
   c. Outdoor Sports
   d. Indoor Sports and Health
   e. Visual Arts
   f. Education
   g. Music / Theater
   h. Other Non-Profits and City Services
   i. Hourly Rental Space
The Survey

Purpose - who uses Cubberley Community Center?

Sample Questions asked:

1. How many people do you serve?
2. How many participants are Palo Alto residents?
3. Do you have a waitlist?
4. What times of day do you actively use the space?
5. What are the community benefits your program or service provides?
6. Does your group currently share space?
7. How would you rate current fees for use of space?
8. Do you have specialized facility or equipment needs?
9. What age group does your program serve?
10. If Cubberley Community Center was no longer available what would you do?

*43 of 70 Tenants responded to survey

Individual Organizations that responded to the survey

Acme Education Group
Adult School gardening class Senior Friendship Day
Bay Area Arabic School
California Law Revision Commission
Cardiac Therapy Association
Cubberley Artists in Residence
Dance Connection
Dance Kaisa/Wilfred Mark
DanceVisions
Dutch School Silicon Valley
El Camino Youth Symphony
Friday Night Dancers
Good Neighbor Montessori
Guru Shadha
Hua Kuang Chinese Reading Room
Middlefield Campus/Foothill College
Palo Alto AYSO
Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra
Palo Alto Girls Softball
Palo Alto Philharmonic
Palo Alto Soccer Club
Peninsula Piano School
Peninsula Women’s Chorus
Raices de Mexico Ballet Folklorico
Saturday Night Ballroom Dancing
The Children’s Pre-School Center
The Red Thistle Dancers
Traditional Wushu
Zohar Dance Company & Studio
Performing Arts - Dance

- Dance Connection
- Dance Kaiso/Wilfred Mark
- Dance Visions
- Friday Night Dancers
- Guru Shadha
- Raices de Mexico Ballet Folklorico
- Saturday Night Ballroom Dancing
- The Red Thistle Dancers
- Zohar Dance Company & Studio
Performing Arts - Dance

- **Participation** – The dance studios currently have 1650 students enrolled (70% residents); and the combined Friday and Saturday night ballroom dancing groups serve between 200 and 300 dancers per week (residency unknown).

- **Use of space** – 7 days a week, mornings, afternoons and evenings; most activity occurs during afternoon, evening & weekend hours.

- **Community Benefits** – High level and diverse dance training and performance opportunities for youth and adults. Also, cultural enrichment and awareness through instruction and performance of ethnic dance disciplines. Sense of community, belonging and social anchor.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – Most would attempt to relocate to a nearby site at an equally low cost. Due to market conditions, that would probably be outside Palo Alto.

Child Care / Early Education

- **Good Neighbor Montessori**
- **The Children’s Preschool Center**
Child Care / Early Education

- **Participation** – The two early childhood education facilities bring 200 young children and their families to Cubberley each weekday. 65% of families live or work in Palo Alto.

- **Use of space** – This space is being utilized on weekdays from 7:00am to 6:15pm.

- **Community Benefits** – They support working families with high quality early childhood care and education, and provide families with parenting workshops and resources for raising children.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – Finding affordable facilities for early childhood care and education is next to impossible in Palo Alto. These providers would be forced to relocate outside of our community.
Outdoor Sports

Fields:
• Palo Alto AYSO
• Palo Alto Soccer Club
• Stanford Soccer Club
• Silicon Valley Adult Sports
• Palo Alto Adult Soccer Club
• Palo Alto Girls Softball
• Various league tournaments
• Drop in public Use

Tennis:
• Gunn High School
• Castilleja School
• Girls Middle School
• USTA Leagues
• Palo Alto Tennis Club
• Drop in public Use
Outdoor Sports

- **Participation** – Organized field users account for roughly 7000 participants a year and although not all play is done at Cubberley, fields at Cubberley are used 7 days a week for most of the year. Residency is estimated to be 70%+.

- **Use of space** – Weekdays after school until dark, and all day on Saturdays and Sundays.

- **Community Benefits** – Opportunity to participate in team sports; chance for youth and adults to develop their athletic skills; physical fitness and is a social outlet.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – These groups would shift usage to other fields within Palo Alto, however the City could not continue to support the current number of programs since sufficient field space would not be available to accommodate all.

Indoor Sports and Health

- Traditional Wushu
- Cardiac Therapy Assoc.
- Adult Volleyball
- Youth – Sports Camps
- YMCA Basketball
- Palo Alto Midnight basketball
- National Junior Basketball
- SSC Futsal
- SVK Self Defense
- Tri City Youth Group
- Cheuk Fung Yi Chuang
- Futsal – (indoor soccer)
- Martial Arts
- Stroke
- Aerobics
- REACH: A Program For Post-Stroke
- 101 Basketball
- Bay Area 3 on 3
- Special Olympics
- Palo Alto Elite Volleyball
- Senior Table Tennis Club
- Belly Rumba with Sol
Indoor Sports and Health

- **Participation** – Indoor gym space and health fitness is reserved by multiple organizations and groups serving all ages. These groups account for roughly 1,800 participants. Residency unknown.

- **Use of space** – Indoor space is used 7 days a week, at varies times, with the heaviest use during morning hours and after 5pm.

- **Community Benefits** – Recreation activities, exercise, health and wellbeing, social outlet.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – Some of the non-profit health groups would go out of business due to the inability to afford or find alternative space. Would try to relocate, however indoor gym space is very limited, Palo Alto has no community gymnasiums.
### Visual Arts / Artists in Residence (22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Arts / Artists Residents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. ANDERSON</td>
<td>I. INFANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. BOUCHARD</td>
<td>S. INGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. DELARIOS</td>
<td>S. KISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. EDWARDS</td>
<td>M. LETTIERI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. FLETCHER</td>
<td>A. McMILLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. FOLEY</td>
<td>J. NELSON-GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. GASS</td>
<td>M. PAUKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. GAVISH</td>
<td>N. RAGGIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. GUNThER</td>
<td>C. SULLIVAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. HANNAWAY</td>
<td>N. WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. HIBBS - vacated</td>
<td>C. VALASQUEZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of Visual Arts / Artists Residents in Palo Alto](image-url)
Artists in Residence

- **Participation** – 22 Artists occupy 17 studio spaces (50% residents). Artists who teach classes in their studios average 20-30 students per quarter (65% residency); visitors to the annual Open Studios events vary; average 500 visitors per studio per year.

- **Use of space** – Responses varied greatly; some artists actively utilize their space 7 days a week, up to 12 hours a day, while others may use their space 25 hours per week. Most respondents are using their space 4-7 days a week for approximately 5-8 hours a day.

- **Community Benefits** – The Program is intended to establish a community of visual artists who support, collaborate, and exchange ideas with one another and the community.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – Most artists indicated that they would disperse and relocate out of the Palo Alto area due to lack of affordable space in this area.

Education

- **Acme Education Group**
- **Bay Area Arabic School**
- **Dutch School Silicon Valley**
- **Hua Kuang Chinese Reading Room**
- **Middlefield Campus/Foothill College**
- **Museo Italo Americano**
- **Kumon Math and Reading**
Education

- **Participation** — Enrollment in these programs, which includes Foothill College, brings almost 4,200 students to the Cubberley campus annually, and the Reading Room adds another 10-15 people per day. (70% residency - Excluding Foothill College).

- **Use of space** — With the exception of the Hua Kuang Reading Room that is open weekdays from 10am to 3pm, most providers offer their programs during after school, evening and weekend hours.

- **Community Benefits** — Importance of lifelong learning, language instruction and cultural exchange, the entire community benefits from their programs. Complements public schools.

- **If Cubberley were not available** — Most indicated they would relocate but it would be difficult if not impossible to find equivalent facilities in Palo Alto, therefore services would be lost to our community.
Music & Theater

• El Camino Youth Symphony
• Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra
• Palo Alto Philharmonic
• Peninsula Piano School
• Peninsula Women’s Chorus
• Bats Improv
• Peninsula Youth Theater

• Jayendra Kalakendra
• Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra
• Shiva Murugan Temple
• Nuber Folk Dance
• Shri Krupa
• Sankalpa Dance Foundation
• Vaidica Vidyarthi Ganapathy Center
• Heritage Music Festivals
Music & Theater

- Participation – These programs show enrollment of 500 or more students/participants at any given time (residency 45%). Audience accounts for 150-300 visitors for 100 rentals annually.

- Use of space – With the exception of the Peninsula Piano School who uses their space 6 days a week from 10am to 7pm, most providers schedule programming during after school, evening and weekend hours.

- Community Benefits – A majority of these programs are targeted at youth, these programs complement music and theater opportunities available within the school settings.

- If Cubberley were not available – Providers would have to find alternate rehearsal and performance space that would probably entail raising rates for participants or moving out of Palo Alto.

Other Non-Profit Support and City Services

- California Law Revision Commission
- Adult School gardening class & Senior Friendship Day
- Friends of the Palo Alto Library
- Temporary Teen Center
- Temporary Library
- Office of Emergency Services PAFD
- Palo Alto Mediation
- Cardiac Therapy Assoc. Administration
Non-Profits and Other City Services

- **Participation** – Temporary Library (261,000 annual visitors, open 8 hours day); FOPAL (155 volunteers contributing more than 23,800 hours annually and raised well over a million dollars to improve Palo Alto libraries in recent years); OES weekly training of PAFD and PAPD.

- **Use of space** – Normal business hours; Monday through Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

- **Community Benefits** – Support for the City of Palo Alto augment the lack of public space to house critical services.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – Groups would need to find other office space, however options are very limited, no specific solution was given.
Hourly Rental Space/Users

- Neighbors Abroad
- Youth Community Services
- Liga Hispano Americano De Futbol - meetings
- Palentir Technologies – gym use
- International School of the Peninsula – gym use
- Grossman Academy Training
- Gideon Hausner – Jewish Day School – gym use
- Waldorf School of the Peninsula – theater rental
- Home Owner Association
- Vineyard - Faith
- Christ Temple Church - Faith
- Palo Alto Soccer Club - meetings
- Common Wealth Club - meetings
- Palo Alto Girls Softball - meetings
- Whole Foods Market - meetings
- Palo Alto Housing Corporation
- Pre-school Family
- Bay Area Amphibian and Reptile Society - meetings
- SCC Registrar Voters
- SCV Audubon Society - meetings
- National MS Society - meetings
- Palo Alto Menlo Park Mothers Club – meetings
- Earth Day Film Festival – theater
Overall Feedback

- **Participation/Visitors** – Estimate 600k+ annual
  - 44% all ages
  - 22% youth
  - 17% adults
  - 17% seniors

- **Use of space** – 6am to 10pm

- **Community Benefits** – Community Needs Committee
  – “What’s special about Cubberley Community Center”. A vibrant thriving community center meeting social, cultural, health and educational needs to thousands.

- **If Cubberley were not available** – 25% would no longer be in operation the remainder would relocate most of which would move out of Palo Alto due to affordability of rental rates.
Discussion

Q&A
PAUSD Minutes
6/28/2011
Call to Order

The Board of Education of Palo Alto Unified School District held a Regular Meeting in the Board Room at 25 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, California. Baten Caswell, President, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present:
- Ms. Melissa Baten Caswell, President
- Ms. Camille Townsend, Vice President
- Ms. Barbara Klausner
- Ms. Barb Mitchell
- Mr. Dana Tom

Staff present:
- Dr. Kevin Skelly, Superintendent
- Mrs. Ginni Davis, Associate Superintendent
- Dr. Scott Bowers, Assistant Superintendent
- Dr. Robert Golton, Co Chief Business Official
- Mrs. Cathy Mak, Co Chief Business Official

Closed Session

The Board adjourned to closed session pursuant to Government Code 54957, for Employee Evaluation regarding the Superintendent; pursuant to Government Code 54957, for Employee Evaluation regarding Administrators, pursuant to Government Code 54957, for Liability Claims student vs. PAUSD and Gaona-Mendoza vs. PAUSD; pursuant to Government Code 54957.6, Conference with Labor Negotiator, Dr. Scott Bowers, regarding PAEA, CSEA, and Non-represented groups; pursuant to Government Code 54956 for Conference with Real Property Negotiators: Dr. Kevin Skelly, Dr. Robert Golton, Mrs. Cathy Mak, re: Cubberley; 4000 Middlefield Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94301

Approval of Agenda Order

The Board reconvened in open session at 6:34 p.m. Baten Caswell announced the Board voted 5-0 to approve the liability claim for Qumer vs. PAUSD and voted 5-0 to reject the liability claims for student vs. PAUSD and Gaona-Mendoza vs. PAUSD in closed session.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the agenda order.

Superintendent’s Report

Board members gave appreciation to the student board representatives, Sophie Keller and Pierre Bourbonnais, and presented them with gifts. Skelly recognized Keller and Bourbonnais’ parents for their support. Keller and Bourbonnais thanked the Board for the opportunity to both learn and serve and unwrapped the books they received.

Skelly introduced a new staff appointment to the District, Judy Argumedo as Coordinator of Academic Success. Argumedo thanked the District and staff for the opportunity.

Consent Calendar

MOTION: It was moved by Tom, seconded by Townsend, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the consent calendar including the certificated and classified personnel actions, approval of warrants, approval of minutes, Uniform Complaint (Williams Settlement and Valenzuela/CAHSEE Lawsuit Settlement) Quarterly Report, PAMA Memorandum of Understanding, Establishment of Tax Rate for District Bonds for the 2011-12 Fiscal Year, Renewal of Student Nutrition Services Consultant Contract for 2011-12, Budget Realignment for Strong Schools Bond and Building Projects Fund, Authorization to Issue Addendum No. 6 to AEDIS Architecture and Planning for Additional Services at J.L. Stanford Middle School, Annual Request to Submit an Application for Consolidated Categorical Aid, Ratification of Tentative Agreement with the Palo Alto Educators Association, Initial Negotiating Proposals Submitted by California Service Employees Association, Initial Proposals of the Board of Education for Negotiations with California Service Employees Association, Initial Negotiating Proposals Submitted by Palo Alto Educators Association, and Initial Proposals of the Board of Education for Negotiations with Palo Alto Educators Association.

Information

Bowers noted 601 years of service represented by the retirees. He mentioned that Judy Buttrell from Gunn also retired and was not included in the list.

Board members appreciated the service of the many employees and encouraged continued sharing from alumni staff.

Jan Parker Substitute Award

Bowers shared the history of the award. John Parker presented Connie Daly with the award. Arthur Kinyanjui was
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honored, but not present.

Board members appreciated the service of the winners of the award and thanked John Parker for enabling the award to be given.

Mak mentioned that the only change to the budget from the June 14, 2011 meeting is the inclusion of the state form and updates from the state budget, including $4 billion in new tax revenue anticipated. Mak presented a PowerPoint presentation including the following slides:

- 2011-12 State Budget Update
- Details of New Budget Deal
- Potential Impact of Mid Year Cuts to PAUSD
- Next Steps

Board questions included: which indicators can be followed regarding the budget between now and December; a status of the vote on the California state budget; steps required by the basic aid reserve policy; what to expect for the September update; and flexibility in the budget once property taxes are projected in September.

Board comments included thanks for the high quality work by the Business Services staff and appreciation for transparency and desire for it to continue through regular budget updates.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom; seconded by Mitchell; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the Proposed Budget for 2011-12.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the following resolutions: Resolution 2010-11.18, Non Compliance with Balanced Budget Policy; Resolution 2010-11.19; Year-End Budget Transfer Authorization; Resolution 2010-11.20, Budget Transfer of Funds for the Fiscal Year 2011-12; Resolution 2010-11.21, Interfund Borrowing Fiscal Year 2011-12; and Resolution 2010-11.22, Establish Fund Balance Policies as Required by GASB 54

Skelly presented a PowerPoint presentation on the following topics:

- Mission
- Strategic Plan Areas
- 2010-11 Academic Excellence and Learning
- Select Board Updates and Actions
- 2010-11 Staff Recruitment and Development
- PAUSD Key Senior Hires
- 2010-11 Budget Trends and Infrastructure
- Select Board Updates and Actions
- 2010-11 Governance and Communication
- Select Board Updates and Actions
- DRAFT 2011-12 Major Themes & Values
- Strategic Plan Goals
- DRAFT 2011-12 Focused Goals
- Timeline for Decision on 2011-12 Focused Goals

Board member comments included: acknowledgment of the thousands of individual experiences that families have in the District; clarifications of the language used in the draft focused goals; appreciation for the superintendent’s work to stabilize the District, model its culture and values and bring out the best in staff; thanks to members of the public who attended the Board retreat; acknowledgment that the focused goals are terse in order to have senior staff elaborate; examples of how particular goals might be implemented; appreciation of Board members for their thoughts and feedback; encouragement of feedback from the community; their deep sense of responsibility to students; positive feedback on the timing of the Board retreat; the need to allocate appropriate resources when adding new goals/foci; and an explanation of the process for setting goals.

Public Comments

Ken Dauber thanked the Board and staff for their work on homework stress, counseling and the social-emotional health of students. He spoke about balancing academic with social-emotional needs, counseling disparities and a-g completion.

This item will return as a discussion item at the August 23, 2011 regular board meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom; seconded by Mitchell; and the motion carried 5-0 to certify and adopt Algebra 2, Common Core Edition.

Board member comments included: thanking Kathy Hawes from Gunn for her contribution at the June 13, 2011 meeting;
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Action
Certification and Adoption of English Books – Gunn and Palo Alto High Schools

appreciation for teacher input and a text with compelling online resources; and a request for information shared to be included in the Board report.

Davis mentioned the enthusiasm and thorough presentation by staff about the books at the June 13, 2011 meeting.

Board member comments included: thanking the teachers from Gunn and Paly for sharing the reasons for selecting the books; acknowledgement that reading for pleasure is an important developmental asset; an appreciation of diverse experiences represented by the books; and appreciation for Davis’ work as this was her last Board meeting before retirement.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom; seconded by Townsend; and the motion carried 5-0 to certify and adopt And Then There Were None by Agatha Christie, Vocabulary From Latin and Greek Roots: A Study of Word Families by Elizabeth Osborne, The Blind Side by Michael Lewis and Interpreter of Maladies by Jumpha Lahiri.

Open Forum

No public comments were made.

Discussion
District Interests Regarding Potential Sale of Cubberley

Golton mentioned the relative prosperity of both Palo Alto and Santa Clara County in support of population growth projections. He said that growth is highest among elementary age students. He presented PowerPoint slides on the following topics:

- Plan for Elementary (K-5) Growth
- Plan for Middle and High School Growth
- Maps of the Cubberley Property
- City Council Motion (DRAFT)

Skelly shared items from the City report on the topic, notes from meetings held on possible uses of Cubberley and a letter he wrote to the City Manager. He said his concerns were enrollment growth and how Foothill-De Anza would coexist with future PAUSD uses of the Cubberley site.

Public Comments

Erin Mershon encouraged class sizes to be kept at current levels and that Cubberley be part of the District’s enrollment growth planning.

Susie Richardson encouraged the City, District and Foothill-De Anza to work together to create a new state-of-the-art educational center.

Ken Horowitz spoke about Foothill’s alternative programs that can meet the needs of district students and encouraged a view of education in Palo Alto that includes post-secondary programs.

Claire Kimer asked what the District will do to accommodate enrollment growth.

Penny Elson said that purchase of Cubberley by Foothill will affect the District’s control and flexibility regarding the site. She encouraged a long-term District-wide plan for growth and open communication regarding priorities for the site.

Carolyn Tucker asked the District to clarify its intentions for the Cubberley property and encouraged the District retain it for use of future students.

Diane Reklis described the history of the District in terms of prosperity and school properties. She encouraged a committee form to address the issue.

Mike Cobb said that the Cubberley site can accommodate only two of the three interests: Foothill, community services and elementary-secondary students. He encouraged the District to exert its right of first refusal.

Lanie Wheeler encouraged the District to exert its right of first refusal as quickly as possible.

Board member questions included: how demographers made specific projections; whether demographers take new housing developments into account; the acreage of current high school properties; how Foothill-De Anza would use District property to accommodate its parking needs; what synergies have been identified between Foothill-De Anza and the City; how will Foothill-De Anza coexist with PAUSD needs; what decision the City has made regarding selling its portion of the Cubberley property; and what planning horizon the City is using in making its decision.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m.

Board member comments included: thanking members of the public for speaking on the topic; the importance and irrevocability of the decision; a description of the history that led to the current situation; noting projections that school capacity will be exhausted in 2022; a negative view of selling public lands in Palo Alto; desire to work together with the City; noting that current students’ and future generations of students’ interests come first; noting that enrollment growth in the District continues despite negative economic conditions; noting the scarcity of available land; noting that the City’s discussion of Cubberley was thoughtful; noting the importance of the Cubberley property to the community’s connectedness; noting the differences between the K-12 student population and college/adult-age students; noting the greater need for school space in the South cluster, a lack of support for selling Cubberley; the potential for working together as a way to yield better results for the City and District; the lack of space at Cubberley if the City sells its property to accommodate a full size high school; the District mandate to provide a free public education for children in grades K-12; noting that current high schools are being expanded to their full capacities; a need to be transparent about school and City
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Economic needs; a desire to send a message that the District needs the entire Cubberley property on a rolling basis; support for a motion to oppose the sale of the City portion of Cubberley unless a solution regarding future need for space can be found; and a need for planning to reflect District values regarding school/space design.

MOTION: It was moved by Klausner; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to waive the two-meeting rule.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 in support of the following statements:

1. We believe that future Palo Alto residents and PAUSD trustees will need the 35-acre contiguous Cubberley site to provide high quality and comparable K-12 educational services to all students in all neighborhoods.

2. We also believe that working together with the City of Palo Alto to define and address our joint Cubberley interests will produce effective and mutually beneficial decisions for the residents we serve.

Bruce Swenson from Foothill-De Anza thanked the board for their open discussion and welcomed continued good communication.

Mak said that independent, citizen oversight is required to monitor the Parcel Tax Expenditure Plan. She said that an independent auditor confirmed all the data in the plan and explained the process going forward.

This item will return as an action item on August 23, 2011.

Board comments included appreciation for the clarity and transparency of the item.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:30 p.m.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 3-2 (with Klausner and Mitchell voting no) to:

1. Approve the schematic design for Duveneck Elementary School and authorize staff to proceed to the design development phase for this project.

2. Approve a new project budget for Duveneck Elementary School in the amount of $11,088,757, funded in the amount shown in Table 1 from the Elementary Reserve and Elementary Classroom Improvements project funds.

3. Approve Addendum No. 11 to Gelfand Partners to provide design services for the Duveneck Elementary School expansion project and deduct for Elementary Classroom Improvements project for a net amount of $512,847.

4. Authorize staff to file a Notice of Exemption for the Duveneck Elementary School project.

5. Approve a contract with OCMI in an amount not to exceed $618,695 to perform project and construction management services for the Duveneck Elementary School project.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to authorize staff to solicit bids for the modular building installations at Jordan Middle School.

This item will return on the consent calendar for the July 19, 2011 Board meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:45 p.m.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 3-2 (with Klausner and Mitchell voting no) to:

1. Approve the schematic design for Duveneck Elementary School and authorize staff to proceed to the design development phase for this project.

2. Approve a new project budget for Duveneck Elementary School in the amount of $11,088,757, funded in the amount shown in Table 1 from the Elementary Reserve and Elementary Classroom Improvements project funds.

3. Approve Addendum No. 11 to Gelfand Partners to provide design services for the Duveneck Elementary School expansion project and deduct for Elementary Classroom Improvements project for a net amount of $512,847.

4. Authorize staff to file a Notice of Exemption for the Duveneck Elementary School project.

5. Approve a contract with OCMI in an amount not to exceed $618,695 to perform project and construction management services for the Duveneck Elementary School project.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to authorize staff to solicit bids for the modular building installations at Jordan Middle School.

This item will return on the consent calendar for the July 19, 2011 Board meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:45 p.m.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to authorize staff to solicit bids for the modular building installations at Jordan Middle School.

This item will return on the consent calendar for the July 19, 2011 Board meeting.

Board member questions included: does capacity increase at Jordan through use of the modulars and what are the benefits of leasing versus buying modulars.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to authorize staff to solicit bids for the modular building installations at Jordan Middle School.

This item will return on the consent calendar for the July 19, 2011 Board meeting.

MOTION: It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:45 p.m.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to authorize staff to solicit bids for the modular building installations at Jordan Middle School.

This item will return on the consent calendar for the July 19, 2011 Board meeting.

Board member questions included: is this the first design-built project at PAUSD and clarification for how the bleachers will be bid and approved.
### Action
#### Creation of Los Altos Hills Town Council (LAHTC) / PAUSD Liaison Committee and Nomination of Representative

**MOTION:** It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Mitchell; and the motion carried 5-0 to create the Los Altos Hills Town Council (LAHTC) / PAUSD Liaison Committee and nominate Barbara Klausner as representative for the 2011 calendar year.

One change was made from the original Board enclosure. Barbara Klausner is assigned to Jordan Middle School.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the Assignment of Board Members to Schools, Special Programs and Parent Groups.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Townsend; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the contract for Cathy Mak, effective July 1, 2011.

Bowers said that Mak shares her CBO title with Bob Golton and is supported by Fiscal Manager, Yancy Hawkins. However, Skelly said that Golton’s title may change from Co-CBO at end of his two-year contract.

Bowers said that all terms within the contract remain the same. Board members expressed their appreciation for Dr. Skelly’s work.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Townsend; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the amendment to the Superintendent’s Employment Contract to extend the term of the contract to June 30, 2015.

Mitchell said that she will send the most recent minutes for the Rail Corridor Task Force committee; the July meeting was cancelled.

Skelly recommended Board meetings on July 12 and 19 to begin construction projects during the summer while students are not on campus. Board members will send their availability to staff.

Klausner asked for notes from the year-end Project Safety Net meeting to be shared.

### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.
PAUSD Minutes
9/4/2012
### Call to Order

The Board of Education of Palo Alto Unified School District held a Regular Meeting in the Board Room at 25 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, California. Townsend, President, called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

Members present:
- Ms. Camille Townsend, President
- Mr. Dana Tom, Vice President
- Ms. Melissa Baten Caswell—arrived at 8:15 p.m.
- Ms. Barbara Klausner
- Ms. Barb Mitchell

Staff present:
- Dr. Kevin Skelly, Superintendent
- Dr. Charles Young, Associate Superintendent
- Dr. Scott Bowers, Assistant Superintendent
- Dr. Robert Golton, Bond Program Manager
- Mrs. Cathy Mak, Chief Business Official

### Approval of Agenda Order

Townsend announced the Board took two actions, 5-0 to place a classified employee on the 39-month reemployment list and 5-0 to place a certificated employee on the 39-month reemployment list.

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mitchell, seconded by Klausner, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the agenda order.

### Superintendent’s Report

Skelly noted Gunn High School junior Cadence Lee’s myriad wrestling accomplishments and Gunn High School Director of Bands Todd Summer’s election as President of the California Music Educators Association Bay Section.

Skelly introduced Wendy Goodridge as new Mental Health Supervisor for the district. Goodridge spoke about changes to how mental health services are delivered to students and challenges. Board members welcomed Goodridge to the district.

Villanueva spoke about freshman elections, Club Day on September 14, and introduced Paly ASB officers. Jessica Tam, Paly ASB President, spoke about the annual theme of integration and inclusion. Villanueva also spoke about back-to-school night, longer library hours, Crucible auditions and sports scrimmages.

Dubey spoke about varsity football and volleyball success, back-to-school night, the back-to-school dance, the homecoming theme “California Dreaming,” and library hours.

Skelly said he hoped to have the enrollment update at the September 18 Board meeting. He mentioned the upcoming Paly-Gunn little “Big Game” on September 21.

Townsend mentioned how the Palo Alto Black and White Ball will support District activities.

### Consent Calendar

**MOTION:** It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the consent calendar including the classified and certificated personnel actions, approval of minutes, and Appointment of Three Members to the Citizens’ Oversight Committee for the Strong Schools Bond.

### Discussion

- **2011-12 Ending Balance and Budget Update for 2012-13:**
- **Resolution #2012-13.05: Adoption of Appropriation Limits for 2011-12 and 2012-13**

  - Budget Development/Financial Reporting Calendar for the 2012-13 & 2013-14 Budget
  - Summary
  - 2011-12 Ending Fund Balance
  - Property Tax Close Out for 2011-12
  - Property Tax Current Year 2012-13
  - Property Tax Growth
  - Revenue Trends – Per Student Funding
  - Change In Property Tax Revenue Amount and Percentage
  - Change In Enrollment # of Students and Percentage
  - Change In Property Tax Revenue Per Student
- Amount and Percentage
- Downside Risk
- Upside Potential
- Tax Initiatives – November Election
- Managing Employment Related Liabilities
- Pension Reform

Board member questions and comments included: whether growth was better or worse than projected; whether bond issues will benefit from higher assessed values; noting the District’s ability to weather financial difficulties; clarification on total funding, including that is allocated by school sites versus by the central district office; how much money is controlled by the district centrally; how much discretionary spending is available; clarification on the guidelines for a Basic Aid district for its reserve; noting local property tax growth and potential loss of State funding; noting the impact of PIE funding; noting crowding in classrooms; and praise for the work of Mak and her staff.

Student Board members commented on the magnitude of the budget problem and asked whether students would feel the effect of an approximately $450 cut per student.

Mak commented on how the District aims to keep cuts out of the classrooms as much as possible.

This item will return for action at the September 18, 2012 regular meeting.

- A Board member clarified why she was abstaining and encouraged voters to research the two measures. Other Board members gave support for the measure as they saw no better alternative to fund schools in the short term.

MOTION: It was moved by Tom; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 3-0 with one abstention (Mitchell) and one Board member absent (Baten Caswell) to adopt Resolution 2012-13.04 to Support Propositions 30 and 38.

Skelly recommended simpler language proposed to clarify the work of the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee (CCAC) and presented the following slides:

- PAUSD Interests
- Suggested simpler language for PAUSD Interests
- Direction from the Board to the CPAC and the CCAC
- Seven alternative questions
- Additional Request to the Board – Regarding a Fourth Middle School Site

Board member questions and comments included appreciation for the questions posed to the CCAC and rewording/clarification around some of the questions.

Public Comments
Wynn Hausser encouraged active engagement between the school district and the City on the preservation of Cubberley as a community resource.

Mandy Lowell shared discussion and questions from the last CCAC meeting.

Further Board member questions and comments included: uncertainty around whether the District would scrape the current Cubberley buildings and completely rebuild in the future; desire for all buildings to be DSA compliant to have maximum flexibility for the future; desire for questions to be broad and non-direct for the CAC; desire for a scenario that reflects the common interests of the City Council and the School District; and a request for further clarification on the City’s collective interests.

Skelly said he thought that the facilities at Cubberley have some life left in them. He said that he would provide the information to the CAC at their meeting the next evening.

MOTION: It was moved by Mitchell; seconded by Baten Caswell; and the motion carried 5-0 to affirm the PAUSD interests and Direction from the Board to the CPAC and CCAC as noted below and to authorize staff to explore potential sites for a fourth middle school other than the Cubberley site and engage services to support this effort.

PAUSD Interests
- In the near term, the District has an interest to renew the lease for an additional five year period when it expires on December 31, 2014.
- In the long term, the District wishes to preserve its option to reopen Cubberley for a future school or schools.
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Questions to Guide the work of the CCAC

1. What are the current community uses?
2. What are the desired combined/shared uses if Cubberley is to serve as both a school site and a community resource?
3. What criteria should be used to prioritize uses?
4. What criteria should be used to determine site/use capacity?
5. What are infrastructure maintenance priorities at Cubberley?
6. What are the options for funding these infrastructure maintenance priorities?
7. What lease renewal alternatives match the interests of the City and PAUSD?

Skelly described work on the item since the last meeting. Young and Skelly made a PowerPoint presentation including the following slides:

- Goal Setting Framework
- Focus Goal #1
- Goal A1 Outcomes
- Goal A1 Activities
- Focus Goal #2
- Goal A2 Outcomes
- Goal A2 Activities
- Focus Goal #3
- Goal A3 Outcomes
- Goal A3 Activities
- Focus Goal #4
- Goal A4 Outcomes
- Goal A4 Activities
- Focus Goal #5
- Goal A5 Outcomes
- Goal A5 Activities
- Budget Trends and Infrastructure
- Governance and Communication

Public Comments

Wynn Hausser gave feedback on the goals involving homework and guidance at Gunn and asked that overlapping project/test deadline reduction and Schoology adoption be added to the focused goals.

Rajiv Bhateja asked that homework and grade data from teachers be made available online and that adoption of Schoology or a similar tool be made a condition of employment in the District.

Kathy Sharp made suggestions regarding metrics and baseline service delivery methods for the guidance annual focused goal.

Ken Dauber gave feedback on the goal involving guidance and asked that reducing overlapping project/test deadlines and adoption of Schoology be focused goals for the year.

Skelly said that test/project deadlines and Schoology were not good topics for this year’s focused goals, but would be addressed in other ways. He also asked the Board to avoid prescribing grade weightings for homework or specific ways in which late homework should be addressed. He said a better approach for the District is to find ways to reduce the number of D and F grades. He said the District is confident that it can achieve comparability on the delivery of guidance/counseling services at the two high schools.

Board member questions and comments included: appreciation for staff work; desire for more information about Schoology and noting some of its problems; opposition to a District-level directive on homework weighting; desire for plans to address obstacles to students completing the A-G requirements once they are identified; praise for Schoology as a tool to help implement the Homework policy; desire for an implementation date for Goal A3; desire for a numerical goal for A4; a need for a baseline and way of measuring improvements to Board productivity; desire to hear about changes at SPSAs from each school on how stress has been reduced; a better description of Schoology; desire to assure the community that Gunn is having an opportunity to make changes to its guidance system; praise for the improved version of the District’s goals documentation; desire to have a Board policy on counseling to guide work; and desire to improve satisfaction with guidance.

Student Board members asked for clarification on the goal about guidance/counseling at the high schools (Goal A3).

Skelly said a presentation on Schoology will be made at an upcoming Board meeting. He noted that the new graduation requirements do not begin until 2016. He reworded the A3 goal on counseling and said that the BPRC will examine the current counseling policy.
MOTION: It was moved by Baten Caswell; seconded by Tom; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:30 p.m.

Further Board member comments included: desire to clarify that outcomes are measured by satisfaction with service levels; desire to use accuracy of time estimations for Board meetings to determine success; noting that Board meeting time is a limited resource; and clarification that lowering Ds and Fs is not grade inflation.

Skelly confirmed the following changes to the text of the Annual Focused Goals and Outcomes, Activities and Owners documents:

- Change Goal A3 to “Create a plan to improve guidance programs at both high schools to assure comparable high quality services and outcomes for the 2013-14 school year, while implementing improvements this school year.”
- Add “quality” to Goal A3 outcome to read: “Report comparable and higher quality services and outcomes in 2013 Strategic Plan survey re: counseling services at high schools.”
- Add “by at least three percent” to Goal A4 Outcome to read: “Report higher results of social-emotional-physical health and connectedness in Strategic Plan survey results and latest CHKS data by at least three percent.”
- Cut “Develop policies and processes to” from Goal C1 to read: “Anchor strategic priorities in annual budget development planning.”

MOTION: It was moved by Baten Caswell; seconded by Klausner; and the motion carried 5-0 to adopt the 2012-2013 Annual Focused Goals as amended.

Open Forum

Ken Dauber shared concerns of working parents to attend meetings regarding improving guidance at Gunn. He asked that parents from feeder schools be included and more of them involved.

Srinivasan Subramanian asked for a greater focus on the quality of teaching in the District’s goals.

Information

Summary of Progress on Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2 and 3

Wilmot made a PowerPoint presentation including the following slides:

- Agenda
- Summary Points: CST Scores 2008 to 2012
- Strategic Plan Goal 1: On Grade Level
- Goal 1: On Grade Level Definition
- Goal 1: ELA On Grade Level
- More students moving to Advanced ELA Proficiency (3rd-8th grade)
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 1: ELA Proficiency across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: ELA Proficiency, 2008 to 2012
- Closing the Opportunity Gap: ELA Proficiency, 2008 to 2012
- Goal 1: Math on Grade Level (3rd-8th grade)
- Understanding the context: Algebra 1 Data
- Goal 1: Math on Grade Level (3rd-7th grade)
- More students moving to Advanced Math Proficiency (3rd-7th grade)
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 1: Math Proficiency across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Math Proficiency, 2008 to 2012
- Closing the Opportunity Gap: Math Proficiency, 2008 to 2012
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress Definition
- Strategic Plan Goal 2 –Year’s Progress
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress From 2011 to 2012 Grades 3-8 in ELA
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress in ELA
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 2: Year’s Progress in ELA across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Year’s Progress in ELA, 2008 to 2012
- Closing the Opportunity Gap: Year’s Progress in ELA, 2008 to 2012
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress From 2011 to 2012 Grades 3-8 in Math
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress in Math (without 8th Graders)
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 2: Year’s Progress in Math across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Year’s Progress in Math, 2008 to 2012
- Closing the Opportunity Gap: Year’s Progress in Math, 2008 to 2012
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress in Math
- Goal 2: Year’s Progress Definition
- Strategic Plan Goal 3: Reduce Not Yet Proficient
- Goal 3: Reduce Not Yet Proficient Definition
- Goal 3: Not Yet Proficient in ELA
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 3: Reducing NYP in ELA across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Reducing NYP in ELA, 2008 to 2012
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2012

- Closing the Opportunity Gap: Reducing NYP in ELA, 2008 to 2012
- Goal 3: Not Yet Proficient in Math
- Goal 3: Not Yet Proficient in Math (without 8th graders)
- Has there been growth in meeting Goal 3: Reducing NYP in Math across subgroups?
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Reducing NYP in Math, 2008 to 2012
- Closing the Opportunity Gap: Reducing NYP in Math, 2008 to 2012
- Summary Points

Public Comment
Ken Dauber said it would be useful to look at certain data in light of race. He complimented Wilmot for her work.

Susan Usman noted how positive the data was and congratulated District staff for reducing the achievement gap.

Sara Woodham expressed concern about a drop off in African American students taking the CST tests and asked that the base year for comparing data be changed.

Skelly gave a possible explanation for why fewer African American students were taking the CSTs. He noted that the 3rd grade test is very difficult. Skelly said that the DRA is used for helping with learning, not to assess learning. Wilmot said with the new Common Core Standards, proficiency beyond grade level will be better measured. She also noted SPSAs will be significantly changed this year.

MOTION: It was moved by Klausner; seconded by Baten Caswell; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 11:50 p.m.

Board member questions/comments included: desire for more information on students that moved from advanced to proficient in terms of patterns; interest in programmatic implications of the testing numbers; whether students go on to take Algebra 1 in high school and can their progress be tracked; how the data can be further disaggregated; which students would like to be targeted by teachers; praise for Wilmot, teachers and all staff that work with students; and a request to remove “noise” in the data.

MOTION: It was moved by Klausner; seconded by Baten Caswell; and the motion carried 5-0 to extend the meeting to 12:00 a.m.

Discussion
Variable Term Waiver for Library Media Teacher
This item will return on the consent calendar at the September 18, 2012 regular meeting.

Renewal of Student Teaching and Intern Agreements
This item will return on the consent calendar at the September 18, 2012 regular meeting.

Board Operations/Members’ Reports
The upcoming Board Policy Review Committee meeting was noted. Klausner and Baten Caswell attended the Regional Housing Mandate Committee meeting and said they would share information with the Board.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 a.m.

Secretary to the Board
School Needs Subcommittee Conclusions:

1. District is unlikely/unable to give rights for more than 10 years,
2. We agree with that position.

Will enrollment growth really require Cubberley lands?

- Demographics
- Palo Alto – new housing units?
- Education / technology options
- Other lands owned by District
December, 2012 Demographers Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals: 3503 3574 3636 3782 3866 4166 4295 4459 4553 4680 4475

Per Ctg: 2% 17% 4% 22% 6% 3% 4% 3% 2% 1% 0%

Totals: 3503 3574 3636 3782 3866 4166 4295 4459 4553 4680 4475

Capacity: 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600 4600

Open Seats: 1097 1026 964 816 734 492 305 141 47 120 125

---

December, 2012 Demographers Report

Student Generation from Planned Housing Developments
The following 11 projects have received some level of planning approval from the City of Palo Alto. Our demographers have estimated the number of students that will be generated from each project based on past experience with similar developments. Developments with more than one type of housing are listed once for each type. In addition to the planned housing listed below, several housing developments have been proposed but not yet approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3085 Page Mill and 3046 Park Blvd</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567-565 Maybell Avenue</td>
<td>S D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alme Housing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alme Plaza</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alme Plaza</td>
<td>S D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry's Location</td>
<td>S D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmoor Terrace</td>
<td>S A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Mill</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Mayfield Development</td>
<td>S A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement-Calf</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Mayfield Development Agreement-El Camino</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 203 61 56 194 126 0 0 0 0 0 374

KEY: M=Multi-family, S=Single-Family Detached, S A= Single Family Attached
Demographics
- Geographic dispersion
- ABAG
- Long term growth rate – 2%?

Education / technology options
- Virtual classrooms
- Extended hours
- Extended months
Maybe – but not now
Other locations? Yes but nowhere near the room for an additional high school. Sell Cubberley to City and buy elsewhere?
And about the 8 acres, ....

And about maintenance, ...

School Needs Subcommittee
Conclusions:
1. District is unlikely/unable to give rights for more than 10 years,
2. District credibly believes it will need 35 acres for academic use.
Cubberley Community Center

“Let’s take a closer look….”

A Report of the Community Needs Subcommittee

January 24, 2012

Background

Cubberley Master Plan – 1991

Neighborhood Concept – clusters of related programs and services:

1. Education – Preschool through Adults
2. Indoor Sports and Health
3. Outdoor Sports
4. Artists in Residence
5. Music & Theater
6. Dance
7. Hourly Rental Space
Education

- Good Neighbor Montessori
- The Children’s Pre-School Center
- Acme Education Group
- Bay Area Arabic School
- Dutch School Silicon Valley
- Hua Kuang Chinese Reading Room
- Middlefield Campus/Foothill College
- Museo Italo Americano
- Kumon Math and Reading
Education

- **Participation** — Enrollment in these programs, which includes Foothill College, brings almost 4,400 students to the Cubberley campus annually, (70% residency - Excluding Foothill College).

- **Community Benefits** —
  - Excellent early child care and education is part of the infrastructure of any vibrant city
  - Value Lifelong Learning
  - Language instruction
  - Cultural exchange
  - Complements public schools

Indoor Sports and Health

- Traditional Wushu
- Cardiac Therapy Assoc.
- Adult Volleyball
- Youth – Sports Camps
- YMCA Basketball
- Palo Alto Midnight basketball
- National Junior Basketball
- SSC Futsal
- SVK Self Defense
- Tri City Youth Group
- Cheuk Fung Yi Chuang

- Futsal – (indoor soccer)
- Martial Arts
- Stroke
- Aerobics
- REACH: A Program For Post-Stroke
- 101 Basketball
- Bay Area 3 on 3
- Special Olympics
- Palo Alto Elite Volleyball
- Senior Table Tennis Club
- Belly Rumba with Sol
Indoor Sports and Health

- **Participation** – Indoor gym space and health fitness is reserved by multiple organizations and groups serving all ages; 1,800-2,000 participants. Residency varies.

- **Community Benefits** –
  - Wide variety of Recreational activities
  - Exercise, health
  - Wellbeing, social outlet
  - Special needs
Outdoor Sports

Fields:
- Palo Alto AYSO
- Palo Alto Soccer Club
- Stanford Soccer Club
- Silicon Valley Adult Sports
- Palo Alto Adult Soccer Club
- Palo Alto Girls Softball
- League tournaments
- Drop-in public Use

Tennis:
- Gunn High School
- Castilleja School
- Girls Middle School
- USTA Leagues
- Palo Alto Tennis Club
- Drop-in public Use
Outdoor Sports

- **Participation** – Organized field users account for approximately 7,000 participants a year (although not all play occurs at Cubberley fields). Play occurs 7 days a week for most of the year. Residency is estimated to be 70%+.

- **Community Benefits** –
  - Opportunity to participate in team sports
  - Chance for youth and adults to develop their athletic skills
  - Physical fitness and health
  - Social outlet

---

Visual Arts / Artists in Residence (22)

L. ANDERSON     I. INFANTE
L. BOUCHARD     S. INGLE
U. DELARIOS     S. KISER
K. EDWARDS      M. LETTIERI
M. FLETCHER     A. McMILLAN
P. FOLEY        J. NELSON-GAL
L. GASS         M. PAUKER
M. GAVISH       N. RAGGIO
B. GUNTHER      C. SULLIVAN
P. HANNAWAY     N. WHITE
A. HIBBS - vacated C. VALASQUEZ
Artists in Residence

- **Participation** – 22 Artists occupy 17 studio spaces (50% residents). Artists who teach classes in their studios average 20-30 students per quarter (65% residency); visitors to the annual Open Studios events vary; average 500 visitors per studio per year.

- **Community Benefits** –
  - The Program is intended to establish a community of visual artists who support, collaborate, and exchange ideas with one another and the community.
Music & Theater

- El Camino Youth Symphony
- Palo Alto Chamber Orchestra
- Palo Alto Philharmonic
- Peninsula Piano School
- Peninsula Women’s Chorus
- Bats Improv
- Peninsula Youth Theater
- Jayendra Kalakendra
- Shiva Murugan Temple
- Nuber Folk Dance
- Shri Krupa
- Sankalpa Dance Foundation
- Vaidica Vidhya Ganapathi Center
- Heritage Music Festivals

City of Palo Alto
Music & Theater

- **Participation** – These programs show enrollment of 500 or more students/participants at any given time (residency 45%). Approximately 100 theater events, audience participation 20,000+ annually.

- **Community Benefits** –
  - A majority of these programs are targeted at youth
  - These programs complement music and theater opportunities available within the school settings.

Performing Arts - Dance

- Dance Connection
- Dance Kaiso/Wilfred Mark
- Dance Visions
- Friday Night Dancers
- Guru Shadha
- Raices de Mexico Ballet Folklorico
- Saturday Night Ballroom Dancing
- The Red Thistle Dancers
- Zohar Dance Company & Studio
Performing Arts - Dance

- **Participation** – The dance studios currently serve 1,650 students (70% are residents); and the combined Friday and Saturday night ballroom dancing groups serve between 200 and 300 dancers per week (residency unknown).

- **Community Benefits** –
  - High level and diverse dance training and performance opportunities for youth and adults.
  - Cultural enrichment and awareness through instruction and performance of ethnic dance disciplines
  - Sense of community, belonging and social anchor
Hourly Rental Space/Users

- Neighbors Abroad
- Youth Community Services
- Liga Hispano Americano De Futbol - meetings
- Palentir Technologies – gym use
- International School of the Peninsula – gym use
- Grossman Academy Training
- Gideon Hausner – Jewish Day School – gym use
- Waldorf School of the Peninsula – theater rental
- Home Owner Association
- Vineyard - Faith
- Christ Temple Church - Faith
- Palo Alto Soccer Club - meetings
- Common Wealth Club - meetings
- Palo Alto Girls Softball - meetings
- Whole Foods Market - meetings
- Palo Alto Housing Corporation
- Pre-school Family
- Bay Area Amphibian and Reptile Society - meetings
- SCC Registrar Voters
- SCV Audubon Society - meetings
- National MS Society - meetings
- Palo Alto Menlo Park Mothers Club – meetings
- Earth Day Film Festival – theater
Conclusions

- **Participation/Visitors** – Estimate 450-600k annually
- **Use of space** – 6am to 10pm
- **Residency** - Over 50% of people that use Cubberley appear to be residents, the number varies by program or service.
- **Community Benefits** – A vibrant thriving community center that is meeting social, cultural, health and educational needs to thousands of people.
- **If Cubberley were not available** – 25% of current tenants would no longer be in operation. Most would relocate out of Palo Alto due to lack of alternative or affordable space.

Community Needs Strong Schools

- Employers demand good schools for children
- **Future doctors, lawyers, scientists, and poets deserve best schools possible**
- Long history of top schools in Palo Alto
- **Property values**
Schools Need Strong Community

- Support for schools is high – school taxes pass handily, volunteers flood classrooms
- Student learning depends on:
  - Opportunities in the classrooms and out
  - Strong healthy bodies and minds
  - Connectedness to others (all ages, cultures, and interests)

The Vision for Cubberley

- Offer a multi-cultural learning environment.
- Support social, emotional and physical health for all ages and all abilities.
- Provide flexibility for the ever changing needs of the School District and Palo Alto.
The Current Reality

- Cubberley is a unique community center serving all of Palo Alto. It is not just a temporary use of unwanted space but rather is an essential part of the fabric of city.

City Owns 8 of 35 acres here

- This ownership represents a guarantee to our citizens that community services can continue.
Increasing Diversity

- Our community is becoming more diverse.
- Festivals, music, art, and recreation all provide opportunities for our community members to thrive while getting to know each other better.
We don’t have to choose

- We can preserve and expand on what we have at Cubberley and still have space for a modern school when the district is ready to open one at this site.
- We can do both if we have the political will to work together to come up with creative solutions that will serve us now and into the future.

Fallback alternative

- If we had to, we could construct buildings on 8 acres with same number of square feet as on entire site today and provide parking.
- Everyone would be better off if school district and city come together to plan exciting efficient space that meets vision for today and into the future.
Benefits if PAUSD and City Share

- Synergy between community center providers and the district would enhance programs.
- Shared facilities save costly resources.
- A joint City/PAUSD vision will attract future funding more effectively than separate projects.

Costs if We Fail to Act Together

- The loss of Cubberley to everyone besides students is unthinkable:
  - Business and residential growth prohibit relocation of a cohesive community center – this is the LAST large space in town!
  - Cost to PAUSD of buying back the City’s 8 acres is high and will increase.
- Without a plan, buildings will consume scarce resources to maintain the status quo rather than to serve our current and future needs.
The Good News

- We can preserve programs and expand services for future City and School District needs.
- A more efficient site layout would allow space for all of the current community center activities plus meeting potential school needs.
- We can and we must work together to achieve this goal.

Community Needs Sub-Committee

Thank you!
The Last 35 Acres
Planning Cubberley’s Future

Cubberley “As Is”
Community Needs

- Excellent k-12 Schools with capacity for increased enrollment.
- Maintain or increase valued community service facilities for growing and changing population.
- Additional playing field space.

Preserve Cubberley “As-Is” for PAUSD

- Costs:
  - $2.21 million annual expenses
  - $330,000 current annual maintenance
  - $18.8 million planned CIP & deferred maintenance through 2036
  - Unknown cost of renovating for eventual PAUSD use.
Options Over Time - Opportunity Costs of Long Term Preservation “As-Is”

When PAUSD moves back in:

• **Playing fields closed for most community use.**
• **Cubberley services and programs closed.**
• Purchasing new real estate for community services in alternate locations is already cost prohibitive.
• Alternate site options for community facility development and fields reduce over time.
• The longer we wait, the more options we lose.

---

The Last 35 Acres
Planning Cubberley’s Future
EXISTING CUBBERLEY LAND USE

- Fields & Tennis Courts: 13 Acres
- Site: 7.8 Acres
- Buildings: 4 Acres
- Circulation: 2.7 Acres
- Access Roads: 2 Acres
- Parking Lots: 5.5 Acres
ABOVE GRADE PARKING

Site 3.9 Acres

Repurposed Land 3.9 Acres
Of Site Currently
Under Utilized

Repurposed Land
5.5 Acres Over
Underground Parking

IMPROVED "SITE" EFFICIENCY
Repurposed Land
9.4 Acres

That could equal:
9 Softball Fields
6 Football Fields
Over 300,000 Net Sq Ft Building
Co-locate Community & PAUSD Uses

- Optimize use of prime public land that is ideally located for community members served by both CPA and PAUSD.
- Improve PAUSD and CPA flexibility to respond to the “enrollment roller coaster.”
- Provide certainty of future use by the city—justifying CPA investment in the aging facility.
- Provide space for 9-12 education, community services, and playing field facility needs of a growing population.
- Maximize potential for cost efficiencies through synergies of shared or co-located facilities.
**Key Community Need**

Partnership commitment by PAUSD & CPA (MOU) to work cooperatively to identify a future co-located or shared use of Cubberley that best serves the community.

- A 21st century school facility
- Community facility and playing field space adequate to meet need
- Commitment to Developmental Assets reflected in CPA & PAUSD policy and major facility decisions.

---

**Possible Next Steps**

- **Short Term Lease Agreement:**
  - Provide short-term revenue stream for PAUSD
  - Provide incentives, schedule, and specific tasks for phased planning.
  - Provide shared maintenance during planning period.

- **5-year Phased Planning should include:**
  - Comprehensive, quantitative study of community service, playing field, and PAUSD needs to inform building design program.
    - Quantify the demand for and supply of services in PA and nearby communities.
    - Study joint use opportunities
  - Building Program/Design/Public Outreach
Overview of Tasks

- Provided the Committee with a series of reports
  - Financial conditions
  - Financing options
  - Governance issues
Report #1

- Financial analysis of the current financial condition of both PAUSD and the City of Palo Alto
  - Provided general overview
  - Provided specifics as relates to the finances surrounding Cubberley: costs to manage, maintain, capital expenditures required

Report #2

- A primer on the current Lease and Covenant Not to Develop
  - Outlined the three major components of the current document
  - Provided the Committee with options for its extension/modification
Report #3

• Funding options
  – Provided the committee with possible options to finance the construction of a new or remodeled facility
  – Discussed options that could be used to fund operations

Report #4

• Joint use
  – Shared with the Committee several examples of major joint use undertakings that involved Cities and School Districts in locations ranging from the SF Bay Area to other areas of the country
Report #5

• Governance
  – Discussed the potential use of Joint Powers agreements or formation of a Joint Powers Authority/Agency to provide a means of governing a joint use facility

• Subcommittee provided background and options – made no recommendations
• Much work in this area remains to be done after basic decision to work together on long-term joint use of the site.
Minority Report

*Bern Beecham, Mandy Lowell*
Cubberley Community Advisory Committee

Minority Supplemental Comments

March 2013

Mandy Lowell, Bern Beecham
There's been talk about being at a crisis point and not wanting to "kick the can down the road" regarding Cubberley's future. But this talk misses these facts: 1. no District-driven change is likely to happen at Cubberley for more than a decade and 2. Cubberley's future use as a community center and high school are compatible.

The single largest tenant, Foothill College, will be vacating significant Cubberley space in the next two to three years. As their former classrooms open up to additional Palo Alto community activities, there will be no significant shortage of space in the foreseeable future. Although existing facilities are not state of the art, Community services are being adequately provided in these buildings with tenants paying significantly below-market rents.

A new well-designed site can accommodate new high school classrooms, facilities and shared field space as well as all the existing square footage now being used by the various community services and activities. Community services can be retained and enhanced on the City's eight acres.

While much of the CCAC report focuses on "community" needs, more work must be done to determine academic requirements of the new high school, including a confirmation of whether it should be a comprehensive or specialty high school and whether it should be based on traditional designs or incorporate forthcoming methodologies such as online, electronic media and presence or others yet to be defined. But this work ought not be done too far in advance of the actual need.

Although it's expected that the School District will need a new high school at Cubberley, the date is uncertain and not close at hand. If student enrollment continues as it has in the past, Cubberley won't likely be needed until the latter 2020's. Until the School District needs to build its new high school, the community has full use of all its existing Cubberley buildings and fields. And in any case, the City's rights to future use of its eight acres are preserved.

The City and School District have several key issues to face regarding the terms of the lease extension.

Term: although it is uncertain when the District will need the Cubberley site for construction of a high school, the philosophy of the lease should be that it will continue, with renewals as may be necessary,
until that time. Artificial deadlines to "force" the City and District to take specific actions are unrealistic and unwise.

Maintenance: similarly, the City should plan to maintain the facilities for community use for a likely economic life of 10-15 years.

Master plan: a number of CCAC recommendations address the need for a master plan. We agree that a master plan is necessary and have concerns only on its timing and, in particular, that it not be forced too soon. We suggest that the first step of the District and City be to develop a master process, keyed off a high school opening date of 2028, arbitrary but, we believe, realistic.

This master process will, in a sense, lay out a strategic plan for accomplishing a new community center and high school at Cubberley. Without doubt, that process and plan will define the requirements and timing for conducting needs assessments and master plans and their relationship to bond measures or other financing options.

But an early issue must be to analyze the values and constraints of a future Cubberley designed as a shared facility versus shared site. We believe the information available to date is insufficient to conclude a jointly shared and/or managed facility is wisest or most efficient. Many of the benefits of joint use derive from proximity.