

LOS ALTOS SCHOOL DISTRICT

FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUNE 15, 2014

Prepared by

fs3 | Hodges



Executive Summary

Charge of Committee

The Enrollment Growth Task Force concluded there is a need for more facilities at Los Altos School District. Their recommendation was that the District should pursue two additional schools sites; one to house Bullis Charter School, and the other to house LASD students.

This committee's charge is to review the work of the Enrollment Growth Task Force and the preliminary work done by Gelfand Partners on the Facilities Master Plan, and provides input and guidance to District staff to support their recommendation to the Board of Trustees on how to best address current and future facilities needs. The Committee will provide input on District-wide priorities for existing school site needs and input and feedback on various options for growth.

Committee Membership

Jeff Baier, Superintendent
Shannon Coin, Parent
Lisa Gelfand, Gelfand Partners
Tom Hodges, fs3 | Hodges
Alfred Hong, Parent
Randy Kenyon, Asst. Superintendent
Amy King, Teacher
Amy Kuan, Parent

Lori Larson, fs3 | Hodges Libby Murray, Teacher Mrinalini Sharma, Parent Shali Sirkay, Parent Jessica Speiser, Parent Margie Suozzo, Parent Gail Wade, Teacher Wendy Wilson, Parent

Enrollment Growth Task Force

A well represented group of individuals provided recommendations and outcomes in the "Superintendent's Enrollment Growth Task Force – Final Report dated May 24, 2013". The Task Force found that there is a critical need for more school sites in the District in order to maintain LASD's small schools. The District's target capacity is recommended to remain at 560 students for K-6, and 550 students for grades 7-8.

Acquiring two new sites will require financial resources beyond the normal operating budget of the District. Broad community support will also be needed to pass a bond measure, which is not likely without cooperation between BCS, LASD and the City, focusing on a long-term facilities plan that meets all parties needs. The Task Force also cited that coordination between LASD, the Cities of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills and Mountain View will be required to leverage any opportunities for joint-use agreements that will benefit the entire community.

Process

Four meetings were held with the Facilities Advisory Committee between May 1, 2014 and June 11, 2014. During these meetings, background information was provided on the work of the Enrollment Growth Task Force, as well as ongoing work being done on a Facilities Master Plan by Gelfand Partners.

LASD

FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The first two meetings were focused primarily on providing the committee members information on the work done at the individual campuses on their needs, in addition to creative ideas on how future growth may be accommodated on new or existing school sites.

Review of the District's bonding capacity has revealed an ability to issue up to \$150 Million in bonds to fund facilities. This will be the baseline financial consideration as the need to address existing facilities is balanced against the imminent need to address growth, either by acquiring new sites or increasing school size.

Guiding Principles on Facilities and the Facilities Master Plan

In advance of updating the Facilities Master Plan for the District, Gelfand Partners conducted three workshops with K- 2^{nd} grade staff, $3^{rd} - 5^{th}$ grade staff, and $6^{th} - 8^{th}$ grade staff. The result of these workshops was a model school program, which has become the guiding principles Gelfand has used to assess each site and develop conceptual plans for each campus.

Gelfand has since conducted several workshops with staff and community members from each site to review conceptual plans and recommend a single concept to be estimated for project cost. The costs generated for this committee should be considered preliminary, and a 'rough order of magnitude' stage, since the plans are still in flux on several campuses. The cost information presented was a key component for the committee to consider the priorities and options they were providing input on. However, it should be noted that more detailed estimating for each campus will be done prior to completion of the Facilities Master Plan. Exhibits A-1 and A-2 summarize the costs for each campus and priority category.

Priorities

While each campus was providing input to Gelfand Partners at a site level, it is also important to consider district-wide priorities in order to maintain equity across the district and ensure all students are provided with equivalent and excellent education and opportunity. To do this, priority categories were suggested by Gelfand Partners that represented a grouping of priorities that were discussed at the site level.

After reviewing these categories and some examples of what the improvements represent physically, the committee was asked to rank on a district level what they would recommend for level of improvements on the existing campuses. The results of the ranking by the committee are attached as Exhibit B.

It is important to note that these rankings are a guideline for the purposes of allocating costs on a broad level, and that individual campus needs may vary depending on age of current facilities, level of modernization done in the previous bond, or individual site considerations. These variations will be identified and noted for each campus when the final recommended scope and cost is generated for each campus in the Facilities Master Plan.



New School Options and Increasing Capacity

In early meetings, the committee was asked to provide input on various ways the District could meet its needs to accommodate growth. In the final meeting, several options and their potential cost were presented to the committee for input on the advantages and disadvantages of each option. The results of this exercise are attached as Exhibit C to this Summary.

Summary and Conclusions

Exhibits A, B and C summarize the work of the committee to meet their charge to provide input on District-wide priorities for existing school site needs and input and feedback on various options for growth.

For the existing campuses, the top priorities were completing needed modernization and program reconfigurations to existing buildings, and providing new Library and Multipurpose buildings to each site. The next group of needs included a planned maintenance fund, Flex rooms, infrastructure for technology and replacement of portables and aging classrooms. When taken together, these improvements would require over \$100 Million in funding.

In their final comments to District staff, a common theme reinforced the findings of the Enrollment Growth Task Force in their desire to find a permanent solution to house Bullis Charter School, either through a new school on a new site, or making modifications to an existing site. Another common theme was that it was important to put forward a plan that would generate broad community support, and not just meet the needs of a few.



EXHIBIT A-1

Los Altos School District										
Facilities Master Plan										
Initial Draft Master Blan Budgets										
Initial Draft - Master Plan Budgets										
		Exist	ing Campus	Improveme	nts	l.	Į.		Į.	!
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total Priority
Scope Category	Almond	Covington	Gardner Bullis	Loyola	Oak	Santa Rita	Springer	Blach	Egan	Cost (2014\$)
1 Modernization / Program Reconfiguration	4,293,000	18,189,000	545,000	1,992,000	1,029,000	348,000	1,855,000	1,173,000	5,210,000	\$ 34,634,00
2 Classroom Instruction and Collaboration Support	-	1,764,000	-	2,645,000	1,764,000	-	2,645,000	-	-	\$ 8,818,00
3 Extended Day Kindergarten	-	-	2,945,000	1,495,000	3,559,000	1,942,000	1,825,000	-	-	\$ 11,766,00
4 Portable / Classroom Replacement on Ex. Sites	2,935,000	-	4,851,000	331,000	4,494,000	2,242,000	32,000	-	5,542,000	\$ 20,427,00
5 Technology / Data Network Capabilities	372,000	484,000	439,000	520,000	395,000	467,000	472,000	-	-	\$ 3,149,00
6 Flex Rooms / Lab Improvements	1,672,000	-	1,115,000	1,682,000	557,000	1,902,000	1,115,000	1,498,000	-	\$ 9,541,00
7 Library / Learning Center Improvements	0.045.000	-	2,160,000	- 0.045.000	1,869,000	1,869,000	0.000.000	4.050.000	4.500.000	\$ 5,898,00
8 Multipurpose Bldg Improvements	3,015,000	-	650,000	3,015,000	2,632,000	2,632,000	2,632,000	4,659,000	4,563,000	\$ 23,798,00
9 Jr. High Specialty Classrooms	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,242,000	10,754,000	\$ 11,996,00
10 Site Improvements	1,039,000	1,511,000	3,677,000	2,095,000	3,493,000	1,264,000	1,587,000	2,250,000	8,118,000	\$ 25,034,00
11 Administrative Facilities	899,000	857,000	2,825,000	996,000	3,012,000	911,000	1,412,000	1,075,000	2,334,000	\$ 14,321,00
12 Solar (PV) Sytems	741,000	1,353,000	541,000	1,028,000	920,000	866,000	758,000	866,000	2,165,000	\$ 9,238,00
Total Project Cost (2014\$)	14,966,000	24,158,000	19,748,000	15,799,000	23,724,000	14,443,000	14,333,000	12,763,000	38,686,000	\$ 178,620,00
Other Costs not included in Total Project Cost above										
Land Acquisition Costs to Clear Site, Move District Office Furnishings, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E)	132,000	596,000	132,000	599,000	510,000	547,000	564,000	583,000	644,000	\$ - \$ 4,307,00
13 Planned Maintenance Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 6,000,00
Total Other Costs (2014\$)	132,000	596,000	132,000	599,000	510,000	547,000	564,000	583,000	644,000	\$ 10,307,00
Grand Total Project Costs (2014\$)	\$15,098,000	\$24,754,000	\$19,880,000	\$16,398,000	\$24,234,000	\$14,990,000	\$14,897,000	\$13,346,000	\$39,330,000	\$ 188,927,00
· ·										



EXHIBIT A-2

Los Altos School District											
Facilities Master Plan											
Cost of Improvements - By Priority											
Cost of Improvements - By Priority											
Existing Campus Improvements											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total Priority	Cummulative
P Scope Category	Almond	Covington	Gardner Bullis	Loyola	Oak	Santa Rita	Springer	Blach	Egan	Cost (2014\$)	Cost (2014\$)
Modernization / Program Reconfiguration 1a Life Safety / Seismic Upgrades 1b Building Shell Performance 1c MEP Systems, Energy & Water Conservation	4,293,000	18,189,000	545,000	1,992,000	1,029,000	348,000	1,855,000	1,173,000	5,210,000	\$ 34,634,000	\$ 34,634,000
9 Jr. High Specialty Classrooms	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,242,000	10,754,000	\$ 11,996,000	\$ 46,630,000
7 Library / Learning Center Improvements	-	-	2,160,000	-	1,869,000	1,869,000	-	-	-	\$ 5,898,000	\$ 52,528,000
8 Multipurpose Bldg Improvements	3,015,000	-	650,000	3,015,000	2,632,000	2,632,000	2,632,000	4,659,000	4,563,000	\$ 23,798,000	\$ 76,326,000
13 Planned Maintenance Fund										6,000,000	\$ 82,326,000
6 Flex Rooms / Lab Improvements	1,672,000	-	1,115,000	1,682,000	557,000	1,902,000	1,115,000	1,498,000	-	\$ 9,541,000	\$ 91,867,000
5 Technology / Data Network Capabilities 5a Technology Infrastructure	372,000	484,000	439,000	520,000	395,000	467,000	472,000	-	-	\$ 3,149,000	\$ 95,016,000
4 Portable / Classroom Replacement on Ex. Sites	2,935,000	-	4,851,000	331,000	4,494,000	2,242,000	32,000	-	5,542,000	\$ 20,427,000	\$ 115,443,000
12 Solar (PV) Sytems	741,000	1,353,000	541,000	1,028,000	920,000	866,000	758,000	866,000	2,165,000	\$ 9,238,000	\$ 124,681,000
3 Extended Day Kindergarten 3a New Classrooms 3b K-Play Improvements & Expansion	-	-	2,945,000	1,495,000	3,559,000	1,942,000	1,825,000	-		\$ 11,766,000	\$ 136,447,000
Classroom Instruction and Collaboration Support 2a Furnishings, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E)	132,000	1,764,000 596,000	132,000	2,645,000 599,000	1,764,000 510,000	- 547,000	2,645,000 564,000	583,000	644,000	\$ 8,818,000 \$ 4,307,000	\$ 145,265,000 \$ 149,572,000
Costs to Clear Site, Move District Office 10a Outdoor Learning / Landscape & Hardscape 10b Playfields / Hardcourts / Site Fencing 10c Parking & Drop Off Improvements 10d Jr. High Athletic Field Improvements	1,039,000	1,511,000	3,677,000	2,095,000	3,493,000	1,264,000	1,587,000	2,250,000	8,118,000	\$ 25,034,000	\$ 174,606,000
11 Administrative Facilities 11a Teacher Collaboration Improvements 11b Office / Meeting Improvements 11c PTA Space 11d Servery Improvements	899,000	857,000	2,825,000	996,000	3,012,000	911,000	1,412,000	1,075,000	2,334,000	\$ 14,321,000	\$ 188,927,000
Total Project Cost (2014\$)	15,098,000	24,754,000	19,880,000	16,398,000	24,234,000	14,990,000	14,897,000	13,346,000	39,330,000	\$ 188,927,000	



EXHIBIT B

Los Altos School District

Prioritization Rankings

May 29, 2014

Way 25, 2014		Cost Range				
Cost and Priority Category		District-Wide	Total	Rank	High	Low
A Growth						
A1 New Elementary School & Additional Classrooms	\$	50,000,000				
1 Modernize Existing Building Systems						
1a Life Safety / Seismic Upgrades	\$	20,000,000	4.60	T-1	5	3
1b Building Shell Performance	\$	25,000,000	4.60	T-1	5	3
1c MEP Systems, Energy & Water Conservation	\$	4,500,000	4.50	T-6	5	3
2 Classroom Instruction and Collaboration Support						
2a Classroom Flexibility / Furnishings	\$	6,500,000	3.70	T-11	5	2
3 Extended Day Kindergarten						
3a New Classrooms	\$	11,200,000	3.70	T-11	5	2
3b K-Play Improvements & Expansion	\$	600,000	3.70	T-11	5	2
4 Portable Replacement on Existing Campuses	\$	12,000,000	3.95	9	5	2
		, ,				
5 Technology / Data Network Capabilities	_			_	_	
5a Technology Infrastructure	\$	2,000,000	4.30	8	5	3
5b Technology Refresh	\$	3,000,000	3.60	14	5	2
6 Flex Rooms / Lab Improvements	\$	11,700,000	4.50	T-6	5	3
7 Library / Learning Center Improvements	\$	8,400,000	4.60	T-1	5	4
8 Multipurpose Bldg Improvements	\$	20,000,000	4.60	T-1	5	4
9 Jr. High Specialty Classrooms	In	Modernization				
10 Site Improvements 10a Outdoor Learning / Landscape & Hardscape 10b Playfields / Hardcourts / Site Fencing 10c Parking & Drop Off Improvements 10d Jr. High Athletic Field Improvements	\$	7,500,000	3.40	15	5	2
11 Administrative Support 11a Teacher Collaboration Improvements 11b Office / Meeting Improvements 11c PTA Space 11d Servery Improvements	\$	9,000,000	3.30	16	4	1
12 Solar (PV) Systems	\$	10,000,000	3.90	10	5	1
13 Planned Maintenance Fund	\$	6,000,000	4.55	5	5	3

Total Improvements for Existing Campuses \$ 157,400,000

Total Improvements for New Campuses \$ 50,000,000

Note: These are rough order of magnitude estimates on a District-wide basis. Final budgets for each individual campus TBD



Cons

Facilities Advisory Committee June 11, 2014

EXHIBIT C

Options for Two New Schools

Option 1 – Two new schools on new, non-District owned sites

Pros

\$137,862,000, including estimated land cost

 Land availability and cost
 Great impact on ability to improve existing
sites
 Likely will require boundary changes
 Impact of introducing a new school on
established neighborhoods
- Potential traffic impacts
 Will require modification of existing site to
accommodate Bullis Charter School

Option 2 – Two new schools, one on new, non-District owned site and another on public land made available to LASD

\$107,862,000, including estimated land cost	
Pros - Reduced land cost from Option 1 - Equivalent to existing schools - Little effect to existing schools - Potential boundary change opportunity - Secures growth in future - Buy land now - Increases District assets	Cons - Land availability and cost - Great impact on ability to improve existing sites - Likely will require boundary changes - Impact of introducing a new school on established neighborhoods - Potential traffic impacts
- Preserves neighborhood schools	

Option 3 - Two new schools on existing, District owned sites (Egan & Blach)

\$65,862,000

<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
 Equivalent to existing schools 	- Likely will require boundary changes
- Saves land cost	- Increased traffic impacts at those sites
 Potential boundary change opportunity 	- May reduce neighborhood school feel
- Secures growth in future	- May limit ability for growth in the future
 Leverages existing school infrastructure 	- Resistance to moving toward a larger campus
 Middle school support to 6th graders 	- Parity among elementary campuses decreased
 Ability to flex grade groupings on campus 	- Will require modification of existing site to
	accommodate Bullis Charter School



Option 4 – One new K-5 school on existing District owned site (Egan or Blach) and Conversion to Middle School Model

\$52,764,000

Pros

- Saves land cost
- Reduced need for boundary change
- Leverages existing school infrastructure
- Larger size school gives potential to enrich MS program

Cons

- Will severely impact one of the MS sites and likely require 2 story construction
- Increased traffic impacts at MS sites
- May limit ability for growth in the future
- Possible resistance to moving toward a Middle School model
- Parity among elementary campuses decreased
- Will require modification of existing site to accommodate Bullis Charter School

Option 5 – One new K-5 school on new non-District owned site and Conversion to Middle School Model

\$82,764,000, including estimated land cost

Pros

- Reduced need for boundary change
- Potential boundary change opportunity
- Larger size school gives potential to enrich MS program
- Improves growth capacity in future
- Buy land now
- Increases District assets

Cons

- Land availability and cost
- Increased traffic impacts at MS sites
- May limit ability for growth in the future
- Possible resistance to moving toward a Middle School model
- Parity among elementary campuses decreased
- Will require modification of existing site to accommodate Bullis Charter School

Option 6 - One new K-5 school on public land made available to LASD and Conversion to Middle School Model

\$52,764,000

Pros

- Saves land cost
- Reduced need for boundary change
- Leverages existing school infrastructure
- Larger size school gives potential to enrich MS program
- Reduces impact on MS sites
- Preserves neighborhood schools

Cons

- Increased traffic impacts at MS sites
- May limit ability for growth in the future
- Possible resistance to moving toward a Middle School model
- Parity among elementary campuses decreased

Option 7 - One new K-8 school on new non-District owned site and Conversion to Middle School Model

\$99,061,000, including estimated land cost

Pros

- Provides new home for Bullis
- No boundary change required
- Larger size school gives potential to enrich MS program

Cons

- Land availability and cost
- Increased traffic impacts at MS sites
- May limit ability for growth in the future
- Possible resistance to moving toward a Middle School model