

# Facilities Master Planning Issues/New School Site Update

LASD Board Meeting  
January 13, 2020

# Key Issues

- ▶ There are 4 inter-related facility issues the board is currently considering
  - Long term location for Bullis Charter School
  - How to use the newly acquired (10<sup>th</sup>) school site
  - Whether or not to move to a Middle School model
  - Updating the district Facilities Master Plan, based on decisions related to the above 3 items
- ▶ Over the next 6 months we expect the board will consider all 4 issues

# BCS long-term location

- ▶ As part of the Community Engagement Process the board will receive a report from MIG at its January 27 board meeting
- ▶ Subsequent to that report, the board will begin a public process of identifying, narrowing, and vetting possible options
- ▶ Staff believes the board may finalize a decision before end of the school year
- ▶ *More about this topic in a separate agenda item*

# Use of 10<sup>th</sup> Site

- ▶ The board's decision regarding how to use the 10<sup>th</sup> site is intertwined with the outcome of the BCS location process
- ▶ There are a number of facets involved in the development and use of the 10<sup>th</sup> site
- ▶ *Many of these will be addressed later in this presentation*

# Middle School model

- ▶ Board has had many community conversations over the years regarding the educational benefits of a Middle School model
  - Conversion to middle school model will impact how we use our facilities
- ▶ As we consider long term facility use, staff recommends that the board engage in public discussions on this topic over the next few months and seek public input to weigh whether or not to convert to a middle school model
- ▶ As noted earlier, a decision to move to a middle school model will require a revision to the district's Facilities Master Plan

# Facilities Master Plan

- ▶ Staff has shared a Draft Master Plan with the board (December 2 study session)
- ▶ Board has expressed the desire to delay adopting the plan until key facility issues have been resolved
- ▶ Convening a revised Facilities Master Plan Committee (FMPC) is on hold pending resolution of these key facility issues
- ▶ It is expected that the Plan can be updated later this Spring and FMPC convened to review the Plan and provide input to the board

# 10<sup>th</sup> Site Development

»» Issues and Processes

# Topics Covered

- ▶ Site Master Planning
- ▶ CEQA Process
- ▶ State Approval Process
- ▶ Construction Process
- ▶ Tenants
- ▶ TDR Program



# Site Master Planning

- ▶ LASD purchased 11.65 acres for \$155M
  - 2 acres to be sold to City of MV for \$20M and dedicated for a city park (with exclusive use)
- ▶ Joint Use and Funding Agreement, between City and District
  - For outdoor and indoor (gym) recreational spaces
  - City contributed \$23M toward land purchase
- ▶ LASD staff and City staff meeting to “masterplan” the site to determine best location for the 2 acres and the outdoor recreational space

# Site Master Planning (cont.)

- ▶ *Likely to take 9 to 12 months*
- ▶ City and District staff meet together to plan site layout, particularly concerning the location of the 2 acre city park
- ▶ Staffs met once in August, prior to finalization of site purchase
- ▶ Staffs and District architect begin meeting again later this month (January) and throughout the year as needed

# Site Master Planning (cont.)

- ▶ Review required by both City Council and LASD Board
- ▶ Expect to have conceptual/schematic designs completed before year-end
- ▶ Per Joint Use and Funding Agreement with City of MV, construction of the outdoor recreational areas must be completed by August 2024

# CEQA Process

(California Environmental Quality Act)

- ▶ *Typically takes 12 to 18 months*
- ▶ Before constructing a school on the site, we are required to undergo an environmental impact analysis
- ▶ First steps are to select a CEQA consultant to assist us through the process and develop a project description
- ▶ Any adverse environmental impacts must be mitigated

# CEQA Process (cont.)

- ▶ “The Project” to be analyzed may include 1 or 2 alternate plans for use of the site
  - As a starting point, project description needs to take into account the city park and outdoor recreational areas since there is a due date of 2024 for their completion
  - The description can incorporate one or more uses of the site (e.g., as Junior High or as Elementary School), in order to provide flexibility for the district as it determines best use of the site (both now and in future)

# State Approval

- ▶ *Typically takes 9 to 12 months*
- ▶ Before constructing a school project which may receive state funding, we must gain approvals from the CA Department of Education (CDE) (and its ancillary agencies)
- ▶ This process includes:
  - Soils analysis for presence or threat of hazardous materials under the oversight of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), including any site remediation
  - Geological studies to evaluate feasibility of the site project in compliance with CEQA
  - Submittal of DSA-reviewed plans and architectural drawings to CDE

# School Construction: Design Phase

- ▶ *Process takes 18 to 24 months*
- ▶ Once a decision is made on how to use the site, then the design phase begins
- ▶ Design phase includes conceptual drawings, review by stakeholders, detail drawings, review by state (DSA), revisions based on DSA review
- ▶ District's Construction Review Committee will be involved throughout the process

# School Construction: Construction Phase

- ▶ *Process takes another 18 to 24 months*
- ▶ District needs to decide on project delivery method
  - Construction Review Committee will be asked to make recommendations
- ▶ Contractor selection process needed
- ▶ Construction involves procurement of materials, mobilization of work force, oversight by DSA inspector, etc.
- ▶ Use of modular buildings can reduce time of construction
- ▶ *Construction Review Committee will be involved throughout the process*



# Tenants

- ▶ Tenants on 10<sup>th</sup> site have been allowed to stay for up to 3 years, ending December 2022
- ▶ Federal Realty (previous owner of the property) will be acting as property manager on behalf of the district
- ▶ Net tenant rental income estimated at \$2.5M annually

# TDR Program

(Transfer of Development Rights)

- ▶ City of Mountain View created a program which enables us to sell unused development rights to other developers within the city for expansion of their projects
- ▶ We have Letters of Intent from developers on 8 different projects, totaling 610,000 SF of development rights (or, \$79.3M)
- ▶ We are in process of negotiating TDR purchase agreements with each developer
  - Also involves City since they are authorizers of the transfer of rights

# TDR Program (cont.)

- ▶ Transfer of rights are not consummated until each project receives discretionary entitlements from the City of MV
  - Funds are not transferred to LASD until that time
- ▶ The projects are in different stages of development and entitlement, with the earliest projects expected to be entitled some time in 2020
- ▶ Projects can change before entitlement and City must authorize and finalize TDR entitlements
  - District has been diligent in seeking additional potential buyers (secondary market) to ensure full financial benefit of the TDR program

# TDR Program: Buyers

Developer	MV Plan Area	SF	Price (@ \$130/SF)	Expected Entitlement
Summerhill Homes	E. Whisman	10,000	\$1,300,000	Q2 2020
The Sobrato Organization	E. Whisman	80,000	\$10,400,000	Q2 2020
Miramar Capital	E. Whisman	72,000	\$9,360,000	Q3 2020
Merlone Geier Partners	San Antonio	150,000	\$19,500,000	Q4 2020
Rockwood	Ferry Morse	125,000	\$16,250,000	Q4 2020

# TDR Program: Buyers

Developer	MV Plan Area	SF	Price (@ \$130/SF)	Expected Entitlement
Sand Hill (Property 1)	E. Whisman	28,000	\$3,640,000	Q1 2021
Vanni Properties	E. Whisman	100,000	\$13,000,000	Q4 2021
Sand Hill (Property 2)	E. Whisman	45,000	\$5,850,000	Q4 2021
Totals		610,000	\$79,300,000	

# Timeline/Key Milestones



# Key Issues: January – June 2020

## ▶ BCS Location

- Report from MIG (Jan 27)
- Board to narrow options
- Board to analyze narrowed options using Guiding Principles
- Board to propose long term location and solicit public input
- Board to consider final decision

# Key Issues: January – June 2020

- ▶ Middle School model
  - Board to discuss educational advantages of model
  - Staff to present program model and costs
  - Board to provide direction re whether or not to convert to middle school model
  - After BCS location issue settled, board to set implementation timeline



# Key Issues: January – June 2020

## ► Facilities Master Plan

- Staff/architect to update draft plan based on feedback from board at Dec 2 study session (Jan)
- Board to review updated draft plan
- Plan to be revised to incorporate board direction re other key issues (BCS location, middle school model, use of 10<sup>th</sup> site)
- Board to appoint Facilities Master Plan Committee (FMPC) members
- FMPC meet to discuss plan in general and priorities; provide input to board
- Board to adopt plan

# Key Issues: January – June 2020

## ▶ 10<sup>th</sup> Site

- City and District staffs meet to masterplan the site
- CEQA consultant selected; project description developed
- Consultant to develop Initial Study (of environmental impacts as required under CEQA)
- Soils testing to begin
- TDR purchase agreements negotiated with developers

# 10<sup>th</sup> Site Long Range Timeline

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Site master planning	By end of Q4	Design Process (incl. DSA review)		Outdoor play space constructed (due by Q3 2024)		
CEQA Process	By end of Q4 2021					
State Approval	By end of Q2 2022					
TDR Program funding	By Q4–2 projects	By Q4 2022–other projects				
Tenants	3 year extended lease period					
School		Design Process (incl. DSA review)		Construction		School opens

Note: This timeline assumes a decision re site use is made before end of 2020.