

Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) Meeting Minutes, September 5, 2018

Meeting was called to order at 7:55 p.m.

Members present: Sharon Coco, Robert Hou, Irene Shen, Rachelle Currie, Bryan Gebhardt, Dr. Cynthia Kan, Steve Musto, Antonio Birbeck-Herrera, Tarrah Henrie, Andrew Law, Miriam Mustafa, Henry Fung

Members absent: Joyce Recar and Robin Champoux

Others present: Ken Blackstone, PIO Facilities & Construction; John Chwastyk, Director of Facilities & Construction; Judith Wallace, Vanir Construction Management, Inc.; and Liz Fischer, Community Member (who is on the Sept. 26 Board agenda to become a member of this committee)

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance and introductions.

2. Approval of Previous Month's Meeting Notes

Since there was not a quorum at the August meeting, there were no official minutes to approve but the meeting notes were accepted.

3. Oral & Written Communications

No oral or written communications were received.

4. Role of Facilities Advisory Committee

Ken Blackstone briefly reviewed the role of the Facilities Advisory Committee for the group. (This was a recap from of the same agenda item from the Aug. 1 meeting for the benefit of the new members.)

5. Appointment of the Officers and Terms

- Chair – Antonio Birbeck-Herrera made a motion to appoint himself, second by Cynthia Kan, and approved unanimously.
- Vice Chair – Tarrah Henrie made a motion to appoint herself, second by Cynthia Kan, and approved unanimously.
- Secretary – Rachelle Currie made a motion to appoint Sharon Coco. She was approved unanimously.

It was explained that the secretary will work with staff to produce the notes/minutes. These terms are for one-year. However, a member will be able to serve for two consecutive terms.

6. Revisit Facilities Overview – Measure E vs. Non-Bond

John Chwastyk shared information on Bond and Non-Bond projects, Developer Fees, Sale of Site funds, State funding, and Measure E funds. In 2014, the needs were assessed at \$1.6 billion (in 2014 dollars) and the Measure E bond of \$650 funded about one-third of that amount.

Bond projects currently in progress:

- Elementary schools: Three modernization projects at Oliveira, Mission Valley and Grimmer; the construction cost of each is approximately \$2 million, plus-or-minus.
- High school projects: The approximate construction cost for the individual bond projects at each school is approximately \$10 million.
- Middle schools: There is a strong focus due to the district's conversion from junior high schools to middle schools. There has been an approximate 50-percent increase in enrollment creating a dire need for additional capacity. So these are the largest projects with costs for each about \$60 million, plus-or-minus, depending on escalation costs. This is the Board's highest priority.
- Project cost are different from construction costs. Project cost is the all-in number, construction costs are roughly 2/3 of the project costs. For example, of the \$650 million from Measure E, about \$420 million is actual construction cost (in 2014 dollars).
- Of all the bond projects, about one-third is construction costs, another third is project costs, and another third is soft costs, which includes escalation as well as costs for architect, hazmat, inspections, etc.
- Measure E spans 10 years, with an annual escalation of five to six percent. The Implementation Plan determines when the projects get built.

Funding sources for projects:

- Sale-of-Site funds are discretionary and allocated by the Board of Education
- Developer Fees can only be used for growth projects (not bond projects per se)
- State funding (for example, we received \$3.5 million for one nonbond project)
- Measure E

Non-Bond projects:

1. "Horse property" – 33 acres earmarked by the Board for a middle school. No funding source identified. Will likely help to relieve increased enrollment at Centerville and/or Thornton.
2. Williamson site – a joint-use with the City of Fremont, shared cost with City, in the planning phase, by November they will need an architect. Student capacity of 750 is planned. Deadline to build school is June of 2023 (with occupancy in the fall).
3. Lila Bringham Elementary School – Large, two-story building with capacity of 1,100 students. Opening fall 2019.
4. Patterson Ranch – in negotiations for donated parcel, no definitive timeframe, probably a future elementary school due to student growth and existing elementary schools at capacity in that area.
5. Marshall site – will house the Spanish language immersion program.
6. Robertson site – the Board has decided not to move forward with possibly moving this program to the Fremont Adult School due to lack of funding.
7. Rix property – will be used to expand the Glankler program, an architect is working with educators on the program design. Environmental studies have been completed. We are at the next step, acquiring a PEA – Preliminary Environmental Assessment, which includes soil testing, etc. Project cost is a little over \$2 million.

John concluded by saying one of main reasons for the FAC is to give advice on all projects, not just the bond, and how to they interrelate.

7. Form 700 Requirement

Ken Blackstone explained the Form 700 requirement to disclose any financial interests in Fremont Unified business and that committee members needed to complete and return the form within 30 days. Information on accessing Form 700 was provided. The link will be sent to all members. *(This item was emailed to all FAC members on Sept. 6.)* Mr. Blackstone requested that members complete the form, print, sign and bring the document to the October meeting.

- Bryan Gebhardt made a motion to amend the ending time of the meeting to 9:15 p.m. Tarrah Henrie seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

8. District Global Facilities Issues and Decisions

John Chwastyk shared that the value of the committee is to assist the Board and provide direction for challenging issues such as addressing growth, not just the overall volume, but at which sites it's occurring so we can plan accordingly at these individual sites.

Another challenge is determining the appropriate size (enrollment) of a typical elementary, middle and high school. There are differing opinions. We work with demographers who project demographics out seven years, which is as far as you can realistically forecast. There are lots of data that is used, construction permits pulled, housing and growth, etc. The opening of Lila Bringhurst Elementary School gives us needed capacity at that level but how will we accommodate these students when they get to middle and high schools? What projects do we build first? What are the best options for the scopes of these projects? How large should new schools be? What should we do with the horse property when, right now, there is no money?

The intent of this committee is not to review building colors, materials and hardware, but to help with the bigger picture from a global perspective by advising the Board on these types of questions.

The committee will also help with ideas on prioritizing projects that may be the focus of a potential future bond, such as:

- Focus on high schools (\$50-\$120 million per site)
- Fund middle school on the horse property
- Conversion of Robertson site
- Options for locations and use of solar energy

In response to questions, Mr. Chwastyk said there were no recommendations from staff on the amount of a future bond. This will be developed over the next year. The Board has asked staff to come up with costs for studies and other items necessary to determine the feasibility of a future bond. Regarding the [solar energy presentation going to the Board on Sept. 12](#), it will be available to review online as part of the Board meeting agenda that will be published on Friday, Sept. 7.

9. Thoughts on Future Meeting Topics:

- It was moved and seconded to extend the meeting until 9:23. (Approved unanimously.)

Committee members went around the room and shared topics they would like to see addressed at future meetings, including:

- Solar Presentation
- Bylaws: redefine quorum, rules of order – *(Mr. Blackstone confirmed an answer to a question from the last meeting that a quorum is 50 percent of the total number of member slots.)*
- Funding summary, status and needs of non-bond projects
- School boundary changes related to facilities projects
- Meet monthly (this was suggested as an agenda item for the next meeting)
- How do we advise the Board if information has to be presented to them first?
- Timeline, when decisions go to Board
- Figure out priorities, what topics are urgent
- Have a overview/schedule of all projects, including:
 - Solar
 - Middle schools
 - Horse property
 - Williamson site
 - Workforce housing
 - HS modernizations
 - Glankler/Rix
- Iterate ground rules, how we agendize topics
- Come prepared to discuss agenda items
- Housing developments; how are they assigned to attendance areas
- School size(s)
- What planning documents do we work from? (Such as the quarterly financial reports the CBOC receives)
- Brown Act awareness
- Review in detail the bond timeline
- FAC's role in developing the new Long Range Facilities Plan
- Demographics – need to view latest report as soon as available
- Access to information
- Funding sources

Bryan Gebhardt suggested that a subcommittee be formed to synthesize these topics. This will be on the October meeting agenda.

A motion to adjourn passed unanimously and the meeting ended about 9:23 p.m.