

**City of Los Altos/Los Altos School District Public Lands Subcommittee Meeting
Wednesday, July 8, 2015
Meeting Notes**

Attendance

LASD Board and Staff attendees: Valdimir Ivanovic, Tamara Logan, Randy Kenyon
City Council and Staff attendees: Jan Pepper, Jeannie Bruins, Marcia Somers

Agenda Items

1. Clarify overall goal/outcome of the Public Lands Subcommittee

The Subcommittee affirmed the purpose statement developed at the June 10 meeting, and clarified that the overarching goal is to conduct a viability assessment of the four public lands under consideration by early September 2015.

2. Review notes of June 10, 2015 meeting

The subcommittee had no additions or changes to the June 10 meeting notes.

4. Advantages/disadvantages of lease option

Advantages for the District include the possibility that a lease option could be less expensive than purchasing land. The disadvantages for the District: They will not own the property title, a full up-front payment of the lease will need to be made, and additional decisions will need to be made at the end of the lease. The advantages for the City: They will continue to hold title, and will receive a full up-front payment of the lease. The subcommittee agreed that the lease option is worth further discussion.

5. Interior/exterior facility requirements and building footprint.

The District provided a handout identifying minimum space requirements for 450, 600, and 900 students, breaking that down between building space and parking/drop off space. The handout did not include field space, which would typically add 2 acres to the minimum space requirements given. The District emphasized the need to be flexible, while saying that as a general guideline, 4 acres is needed as a minimum, with 6-7 acres being preferred.

6. Demographic projections

The District provided a chart with a 5-year enrollment forecast showing that they have been over capacity for several years. The forecast calls for growth to continue or to remain at current levels for the next five years, with the possible exception of a "birth decline" scenario. The projection for the end of the current year is 5,470 students, counting both LASD and Charter School students.

7. Delineated Civic Center map

The City provided a detailed map of the Civic Center, noting that the northern portion of the Civic Center and possibly, the Main Library plots are potential sites. The History House and Museum and the Hillview Community Center and Park are not available for consideration. The City noted that the orchard on the Civic Center site may be an issue for the community because of its historical significance.

8. The subcommittee identified the following criteria for evaluating potential sites:

- 1) Education needs are supported
- 2) Enrollment growth is accommodated (for BCS, long-term solution accommodating 900 students; for District, less than 600 students for elementary school).
- 3) Size of site/acres
- 4) Traffic impacts and accessibility
- 5) Safety
- 6) Cost
- 7) Disruption to current uses (e.g., re-purpose, re-locate)
- 8) Compatibility of shared use
- 9) Disruption for students
- 10) Impacts on near neighbors
- 11) Community acceptability
- 12) Proximity to school population
- 13) Promotes walking, biking (non-vehicle forms of transportation)

9. Preparing for next meeting

The subcommittee agreed to meet next on Wednesday, July 22, 6:00-7:30. The agenda items include:

- Update from the City on rules regarding lease/sale of public land
- Review, weight, and finalize criteria for evaluating sites
- Begin applying criteria to the four sites under consideration

Public Comments

Two members of the public provided comments: Ann Testa and Duncan McVicar.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

ATTACHMENT B

Public Lands Subcommittee: Site Deliberation Matrix

	School Site 1	School Site 2	School Site 3	Civic Center
Educational needs are supported				
Addresses enrollment growth				
Size of site/acres				
Traffic impacts and accessibility				
Safety				
Cost				
Disruption to current uses (e.g. re-locate)				
Compatibility of shared use				
Disruption for students				
Impacts on near neighbors				
Community acceptability				
Proximity to school population				
Promotes walking, biking (non-vehicle transportation)				