



Putting
Children
First

Facilities Committee Meeting

SCUSD Maintenance Yard
425 1st Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95818

Minutes September 16, 2019

1.0 Welcome/Call to Order –11:48AM

2.0 Roll Call/Establish Quorum

Members Present: Members Pritchett, Vang, Garcia

Members Absent: N/A

Staff Present: Cathy Allen, Nathaniel Browning, Anna Javed

Quorum established.

3.0 Public Comment

4.0 Approval of Agenda

Motion by: Member Vang

Second by: Member Garcia

All in favor.

5.0 Approval of Minutes

June 27, 2019 – Regular Meeting

Motion by: Member Garcia

Second by: Member Vang

All in favor.

6.0 Safety and Security

- **Fencing**
- **Locks**
- **Ownership of Fields**
- **Afterhours and Access**
-

SCUSD sold \$10m out of Measure Q 2 years ago for safety and security at the school sites. The District was required to spend the funds within 3 years. The District is in the process of purchasing interior door locks for its school sites. SCUSD will install classroom locks at all sites. This project will cost approximately \$5m. The balance \$5m will go towards fencing at some of the sites. Most likely at the elementary sites.

Cathy Allen would like for every campus to be able to lock up their sites during the school day and in addition, on off hours. At this time 21 SCUSD sites are able to completely close/lock up. There are another 19 sites that have adjoining parks and no fencing in between.

Member Pritchett would like for the sites to have the ability to lock up during the school day but to also have the option of keeping the sites open after hours for the community. Many of SCUSDs sites are in areas that do not have parks available nearby for the community to use.

Member Garcia agrees and would like to know if fencing and locking up SCUSDs sites after hours is a District policy and what is/was the decision-making process. Cathy Allen confirmed that it is not a District policy.

The District did research and fact finding regarding the safety needs of the campuses. The two items that kept coming up were locks and the fencing.

Member Garcia: What drove this? Vandalism? Facility upgrades? Security? Answer: Security.

Member Pritchett: In the meantime the District and the City of Sacramento had formed a joint committee to discuss open spaces. The two main points of this committee are 1. Can we open the sites after the school day and 2. Who will be responsible for the care, vandalism, the homeless, etc?

There is a district in San Francisco that has started a program that pays, for example, campus monitors to come to work early and clean up the sites as needed from the evening before.

Member Vang: Is there a follow up joint meeting scheduled? No. Not at this time.

Member Garcia believes that the fencing conversation is premature until it is established what the partnership with the City will look like.

Member Pritchett expressed that the fencing conversation could continue as long as discussion of opening up the sites after school hours for the communities continued.

The fencing and locks decision has already gone to the Board.

Cathy Allen would like consistency throughout the District.

Member Garcia pointed out that SCUSD schools have different needs. There needs to be flexibility when looking for a standard.

Member Pritchett would like assessments for each site. Price tag per site? Based on use?

Member Garcia is having a hard time understanding why if a site is essentially in a safe area, pretty secure, with no vandalism, why would the District fence that particular site if there is no need for all of these reasons? The District has limited resources and perhaps should prioritize areas where safety is a bigger issue than at other sites.

Member Pritchett believes this would not go over well if the District fences in all of the schools in our poorer areas but then leave better schools open to the public.

Member Garcia would like further conversation on this subject and would like additional information in terms of the assessments. She does not believe that the District fencing up all of the school sites is a solution.

Member Garcia and the committee would like some research conducted as to what the uses are at each site. After school? Weekends? What is currently at each school site? And to revisit the conversation with the City prior to making capital investments.

Member Pritchett pointed out that even with fencing, the sites can be assessable.

This subject will be brought back to the committee.

The committee would like to know which of the sites have fencing. This information is available. And they would like to know the criteria for establishing the priority list. This has not been created as of yet.

The subject of "Ownership of Fields" has come up with city council. There are a couple of fields that they would like to take over, care cost, revenue, etc.

Member Vang: Shouldn't the joint use committee be driving this conversation? Yes.

7.0 Transportation Yard Update

Staff prepared a Board Communication that will be emailed to the Board for review. The community is discouraged with the transportation yard being located near their homes. The District has held a few community meetings to address their concerns and complaints and to try and solve as much as possible. Communication will continue.

Throughout the process of the building of the new transportation facility, proper studies and notifications and Board adoption were adhered to.

Member Garcia pointed out that all of the above was conducted prior to the facility being built and in operation.

8.0 Bond Oversight Committee Requests to the Facilities Committee (Standing Item)

Brian Hill of the Bond Oversight Committee was present and wanted the let the committee members know that the BOC would like to lend more support to the community and the Board.

9.0 Facilities Master Plan Update/Schedule

The District is near conclusion of the FCA (Facilities Condition Assessments). DLR Group is the firm that SCUSD has hired to conduct the assessments. SCUSD is starting the conversation around educational specifications and involving the curriculum side of things.

The new Facilities Master Plan will be paid out of bond. The last master plan was completed in 2012.

This will be in preparation of a November 2020 bond. We are nearing the end of the Q and R bonds.

There are two parts to the Facilities Master Plan. 1. Assessing the buildings. 2. Creating the educational specifications.

The District will be holding community meetings. One at each high school.

10.0 Old Marshall

Staff met with the Mogavero/Bardis team and the Railyards' Developers. They are willing to entertain the idea of an earlier land swap.

The District reached out to School Site Solutions. They conduct property acquisitions for school districts. SCUSD will start identifying studies fairly quickly to hopefully gain approval from the California Department of Education (CDE).

Public Comment: Louis Demas and Tom Quasebarth – Marshall New Era. Concerned about the lack of transparency. They are concerned that there may be “demolition by neglect” for the building. They would like for more than one option to be pursued so if one fails, the other has momentum.

Member Pritchett: We have a couple of options and are headed that way.

There are three options available at this time that can move forward simultaneously.

Real property negotiations start out in the closed session setting and end up in open session at Board meetings.

Ton Quasebarth is concerned that over the last few years nothing has changed/happened that can be seen and the lack of communication.

Member Garcia: The Board and the District is sharing as much information as it has. If the larger group would like to have a Board member and District staff attend a neighborhood meeting, it can be arranged.

Staff will be able to acquire a timeline to share in the near future.

11.0 Repurposed Sites (Standing Item)

The Board should be ready to have the conversation of allowing La Familia to acquire Maple Elementary.

Member Pritchett: Have studies been conducted showing that the District will never need that site to reopen as a school site again? Studies will have to take place. At this point, the conversation is just beginning.

Member Vang wants the district to explore a partnership with Paratransit. They are interested in 24th and Florin.

Member Vang would like to know what the best way would be to have Paratransit acquire the facility. By purchasing it.

Lozano Smith created a flowchart of the process of how a District can sell property, etc. It will be provided to the Facilities Committee. A recent updated version exists.

Fruit Ridge: Social Good Fund (Michael Pace) would like to stay on as the fiscal agent through his term.

12.0 Future Business: *Next Meeting Date/Location – October 21, 2019 -425 1st Avenue, Sacramento, CA*