



School/City Liaison Committee Summary Minutes FINAL



School/City Liaison Committee Meeting Wednesday, June 27, 2007

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

In Attendance:

City of Palo Alto

Bern Beecham, City of Palo Alto, Council Member

Larry Klein, City of Palo Alto, Council Member

Emily Harrison, City of Palo Alto

Kelly Morariu, City of Palo Alto

Dan Firth, City of Palo Alto Fire

Lynne Johnson, City of Palo Alto Police

Dennis Burns, City of Palo Alto Police

Palo Alto Unified School District

Barb Mitchell, Board Member

Mandy Lowell, Board Member

Jerry Matranga, Chief Business Officer

Kathy Durkin, Manager, Auxiliary Services

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

Meeting convened at 8:15 a.m.

1. Oral Communications: None

2. Approval of Minutes from May 2, 2007

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

3. Twenty Year Facility Master Plan:

Mr. Matranga said Mr. Pearne will be reviewing the twenty year Facility Master Plan and Mr. Matranga will then discuss the Bond in June 2008. Mr. Matranga said Larry Tramutola was also present to discuss the Bond and answer questions.

Mr. Pearne said education specifications are very important because they surveyed and spent a lot of time working with the schools on their desired classroom configurations.

Mr. Pearne said Planned Maintenance gives money for high ticket items and allows for remodeling and improvements. Prop 39 would require the District to have an oversight committee to monitor the expenditure of the Planned Maintenance money. Planned Maintenance is a dollar amount that should cover expenses over a ten year plan. Mr. Pearne said another option with Prop 39 is to put in a technology refresh program. It can cover all the computers, servers, networks, and printers; the hardware is going to become obsolete in about four years.

Mr. Pearne said capital improvements needs at the elementary schools include projects that fix some of the things B4E didn't have the funds for. Mr. Pearne said they also did voluntary improvements for seismic purposes. It also includes hardscape (i.e., sidewalks, asphalt playgrounds, and parking lots) and capital landscape. Mr. Pearne said growth is considered in the funding portion. Mr. Pearne said other projects the District is looking at are larger multipurpose rooms at Elementary Schools and flex rooms. Mr. Pearne pointed out the new construction on the Duvenenck Elementary School map and said that most of the new construction at most of the schools is on the multipurpose room.

Mr. Pearne said the Middle Schools are a little more difficult than the Elementary Schools because of the larger dollar items. There is infrastructure, hardscaping, and upgrading from the radiant heating system to the HVAC unit.

Mr. Pearne said all the classrooms at Terman are strange in terms of size and shape. They have been trying to address this issue, but it has been difficult because the District does not own the property adjacent to Terman.

Mr. Pearne said capital improvement needs at Gunn High School include replacing the pool and aquatic center, renovating AD-2, administration building, industrial arts building, and renovating Spangenberg Theatre not only for the students but to encourage rental to improve revenue.

Mr. Beecham asked how much revenue is brought in from Spangenberg? Mr. Matranga said about \$135,000. The District has been working with Paula Davis who runs the Flint Center and the Hoover Historic Center to improve revenue. Ms.

Davis has stated the District should be bringing in about \$400,000 on that facility once it has been renovated. Mr. Matranga said they are dealing with some operational issues in terms of how the clients are served. Also, some upgrades to the facility which is a high priority at the school site. Ms. Harrison said she had discussed this with Mr. Matranga and the City is interested in Spangenberg, but it is after the renovation and we will support it through our Community Services Department.

Ms. Lowell asked what is the City's interest in Spangenberg? Ms. Harrison said they broker the Performing Arts and the City has a high demand for space. Mr. Beecham said there is a perceived large need for meeting and convention space in Palo Alto.

Mr. Pearne said other capital improvements at Gunn High School are the gymnasium, athletic facilities improvements, a new two story classroom building to replace "Titan Village", new second gymnasium, and what the outcome will be on the High School Task Force.

Mr. Pearne said capital improvements at Palo Alto High School are a different scenario because it has greater needs. Mr. Pearne said they would like to renovate the library and the hard part is renovating the Tower building, whether we tear it down or partially renovate it. Replace the 900 building (industrial arts), athletic facilities, removing buildings and placing portables. Mr. Pearne said the girls' gym needs an addition because it only has a basketball court. Mr. Pearne said they would like to add a new theatre to Palo Alto High School. They also have proposed areas for new classrooms.

Mr. Pearne said capital improvements needs for the rest of the District are renovation or replacement of the buildings and grounds, the corporate yard are actually buildings that used to be buggie ships and it has become overcrowded. Also updating Garland site to elementary standards and updating Greendell sites with a new library and multi-purpose building.

Mr. Pearne said bus drivers need to be at the corporate yard ten to twelve hours to maybe get in six hours of work and what they have back there is pretty substandard for anything. The District has tried to figure out how to improve the corporate yard and it comes back to the same thing, tear it down and start over. Mr. Matranga said it might be a place where portables can be used. Mr. Pearne said since he came here, he has tried to put maintenance and modernization together. His opinion is they should be under the same umbrella.

Ms. Lowell said a lot of people wonder why they have the buses parked and facilities in the middle of the Palo Alto High School and when the master planning was done, that wasn't an ideal location. The District approached the City and was asking if there was any space that we could be jointly used? Ms. Lowell said this has been a discussed subject.

Ms. Harrison said the City has the same constraints with the municipal services center it is undersized and they have moved part of their utilities department to

another location and being out in the bay lands, she doesn't see the City expanding that location.

Mr. Pearne said second to the last page is the overview of the budget for all the projects and where the District is allocating money.

Mr. Beecham asked about how long the time frame is for these projects? Mr. Matranga said it's set for a twenty-five year time period with multiple bond authorizations. The District can realistically spend maybe 30 to 40 million dollars because it is only able to manage a certain amount of projects.

Mr. Matranga said in California we have the traditional 2/3 bond and it may only be used for real property improvements. Mr. Matranga said with Prop 39 you can pass an election with 55% votes, but there are certain restrictions and that is, you have to be specific on how you spend the money. Mr. Matranga said it does require a citizen oversight committee with various community members. There are also regular financial audits, performance audits, and it also requires regular reports to the community from the independent oversight committee. Mr. Matranga said in order to have a Prop 39 bond it has to take place during a general election and June of 2008, works logistically. The District has a parcel tax authorization goes for another six years and at the end of those six years the District would have to start preparing to go again for the parcel tax bond.

Mr. Matranga turns it over to Mr. Tramutola to discuss the campaign timing. Mr. Tramutola said in 2008 there are three elections possibilities for the District, there is February which is the presidential primary, June, and there is November which is the presidential election. Each of those elections will have different turnouts. The highest would be November of 2008, the next would be February and the lowest turnout would be June. Mr. Tramutola said February is difficult because it is not known what the turnout would be. Looking at November, past elections for PAUSD has passed them with extraordinary efforts from volunteers. Mr. Tramutola said when there is competition with the presidential election, the volunteers go elsewhere and the voters will be distracted by other events. June seems to be the best choice for PAUSD. Mr. Tramutola said there would be a 70% turnout in February, higher in November and 30% to 40% in June. PAUSD has had three successful elections in June and one unsuccessful in November. Mr. Tramutola said the other thing to keep in mind is the parcel tax election which will expire in 2011 and it will go to ballot again in 2010. The parcel tax is an important and critical source of revenue to the District and you never want to put that at risk.

Ms. Lowell asked Mr. Tramutola if he could discuss and comment on the Prop 39 bond, there was some discussion as to it being a no cost bond, are any of these dates affected by expiration dates on any of our existing bonds? Mr. Tramutola said no, basically when the final size of this bond is determined; the tax rate will be affected by that. Mr. Tramutola said generally in the planning because of the assessed value and growth in Palo Alto it is possible for the District to sell additional bonds without increasing the tax rate but the length of time would be increased. Mr.

Tramutola said it will not affect timing at all. Mr. Tramutola said with Prop 39 there is an opportunity to go several times with small bonds, not that this will be a small bond but you do have that option.

Mr. Klein asked Mr. Tramutola, assuming the City had their bond election in June along with the District, would the bond issues be perceived as competing? Mr. Tramutola said voters are pretty smart and they will be able to distinguish between the two agencies. The real advantage even though it may seem complex, the District has two advantages that the City doesn't have: one, the District can pass with 55% and the City's is 2/3 which is a huge difference; two, the District's advantage is we can make it clear that it is a no tax increase; it is an extension, where as the libraries and police majors aren't.

Ms. Harrison said Council is considering two \$50 million bond measures or one bond measure that goes together. A Blue Ribbon Committee composed of a cross section of the community spent about six months going through everything, quizzing staff, visiting other facilities, talking to the architects, talking to other members of the community with concerns and came back with a recommendation to the Council. The group found that the current building does not meet safety needs and it is not what is called an essential services facility, which means in the event of an major emergency we would not have that as a base of operations for our emergency dispatch and our EOC would be out of commission. There are safety inadequacies due to space, equipment, wiring, and we are at risk in some of our chain of evidence because we have no way to secure it. Ms. Harrison said the City has some safety issues with employees as to what we do with some of the evidence.

Ms. Harrison said this is a key facility because we can't interview children or victims in a secure area and we have to interview them out in the police department lobby because there is no space. The City is required by law to keep people separate and we are very much challenged to do that when doing the witnessing. Ms. Harrison said there is also a safety issue when transferring prisoners that are brought in to the police garage and are bringing them into the building; there isn't what they call a bay area to do that safely.

Ms. Harrison said the Blue Ribbon Task Force looked carefully at what staff had proposed in terms of the facility and working with an architect, paired that down significantly by looking at multiple use of the spaces, looking at other facilities and what we really needed to have and brought down to 49,000 square feet. The EIR is being done for the building right now and will be done in November or December. Ms. Harrison said the Library Community Center is in design right now and that won't be done until December.

Ms. Harrison said the Council is in the process of retaining an outreach consultant and we're intending to do focus groups in the community to discuss key issue messages in July. The City will be looking at validating project sizing in December. If we wait for new council is seated to decide on a new date and put on ballot until February, it will be an extraordinary short for something that requires as much outreach. We will speak with Council again in September about what is called 35% design on the Library building.

Future Meetings and Agenda Items:

Bond Measures

Sustainability

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.