

AUGUST 2013

2013

LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Facility Master Plan Update



FANNING HOWEY



Acknowledgements



LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

John McGinnis, President

Diana Craighead, Vice President

Felton Williams, Member

Jon Meyer, Member

Mary Stanton, Member

LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT EXECUTIVE STAFF

Christopher J. Steinhauser, Superintendent of Schools

Christine Dominguez, Deputy Superintendent

James Novak, Chief Business and Financial Officer

Dr. Jill Baker, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary and K-8 Schools
Chief Academic Officer

Peter Davis, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools

Connie L. Jensen, Assistant Superintendent, School Support Services

Ruth Perez Ashley, Assistant Superintendent, HRS and Leadership Development



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	
Table of Contents	1
Index of Spaces	2
District Map	3
Process Graphic	4
Executive Summary	5
Accomplishments to Date (2008-2013)	6-7
Guiding Principles.....	8-11
Challenges	12-13
Recommendations	14-16
Demographic Trends and Programmatic Changes.....	17
District-Wide Projected Student Enrollment by Grade	18
Changes to Facilities Assessment and Costs	19
Construction Costs.....	20
Planning Areas.....	21-31
▪ District-Wide Enrollment	21
▪ District-Wide Site Capacity.....	22
▪ District-Wide Live Births	23-24
▪ Planning Area A: Jordan.....	25
▪ Planning Area B: Lakewood.....	26
▪ Planning Area C: Millikan	27
▪ Planning Area D: Cabrillo	28
▪ Planning Area E. Polytechnic.....	29
▪ Planning Area F: Wilson	30
▪ Planning Area G: Avalon.....	31
Updated Challenges and Recommendations	32-34
Appendices.....	35



Index of Spaces

TABLES

Table 1: Projected Student Enrollment by Grade	18
Table 2: Construction Cost per Square Feet by Construction Type	20
Table 3: Current Enrollment vs. Projection by Planning Area	21
Table 4: Rate of Utilization by Planning Area	22
Table 5: Live Births within the LBUSD Boundary, 2001 - 2010	23
Table 6: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area A	25
Table 7: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area B	26
Table 8: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area C	27
Table 9: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area D	28
Table 10: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area E	29
Table 11: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area F	30
Table 12: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area G	31

MAPS


Map 1: District	3
Map 2: Density of Age 0 - 4 Population by Census Block Group	24
Map 3: Planning Area A: Jordan	25
Map 4: Planning Area B: Lakewood	26
Map 5: Planning Area C: Millikan	27
Map 6: Planning Area D: Cabrillo	28
Map 7: Planning Area E: Polytechnic	29
Map 8: Planning Area F: Wilson	30
Map 9: Planning Area G: Avalon	31

GRAPHIC

Process	4
---------------	---

District Map

Long Beach Unified School District



School Locations
By Type


- ◆ Interim Housing
- ◆ Administration
- ◆ Pre-K
- ◆ ES
- ◆ MS
- ◆ K-8
- ◆ HS
- ◆ K-12



FANNING HOWEY



Process Graphic



Executive Summary

The Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) Facility Master Plan (FMP) was adopted by the Board of Education in January 2008. The FMP has become the guiding resource for the LBUSD facilities improvement and construction program (the Program). The Measure K \$1.2 billion bond approved by the voters of LBUSD in November 2008 is a main source of funding for the Program.



Development of the 2008 Facility Master Plan

During 2006 and 2007, the LBUSD FMP was developed. The intent of the FMP was to provide guidance on how LBUSD schools could be renovated and replaced over a 20-year period. A myriad of enrollment, academic and facility data was collected, analyzed and studied. Broad-based involvement was facilitated through the formation of planning areas, a community advisory committee and an internal executive committee. In addition, a series of community meetings were held. The first round of community meetings focused on the development of standards and guidelines for making school facility recommendations. The second round of community meetings involved gathering input on a series of facility options that could be implemented for each planning area. The final FMP outlined a summary of the data reviewed and provided recommendations to guide renovation and new construction over a 20-year period.

2012 Facility Master Plan Update

Implementation of the FMP has been successful, and accomplishments will be described in subsequent sections. The LBUSD FMP is a living document. To ensure its relevancy, LBUSD reviews and updates the document every 5 years. This Facility Master Plan Update (FMPU) is the first 5-year update. The goals of this FMPU are as follows:

- Revisit the guiding principles, challenges and recommendations of the 2008 FMP.
- Ensure the FMP continues to align with the District's educational goals.
- Identify accomplishments of the 2008 FMP.
- Describe demographical trends and programmatic changes in LBUSD since approval of the 2008 FMP.
- Describe demographic trends in LBUSD's seven planning areas since approval of the 2008 FMP.
- Reassess the condition of facilities to ensure that the Program priorities are in alignment with goals throughout LBUSD.
- Revisit the time horizon for implementing the improvements identified in the FMP. Due to a number of constraints, this time period should be expanded to at least 30 years.
- Identify new and ongoing challenges.
- Update changes to Facilities Assessment and Costs.
- Update live birth data and visually show where births are occurring.
- Update and identify new recommendations based on changes since approval of the 2008 FMP.
- Expand information by including a map of each area that lists all school facilities located within the planning area.

The FMP has been a reliable guide, helping LBUSD to make great strides in its Program. This FMPU will incorporate lessons learned and changes observed in order to ensure that implementation of the FMP is executed in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

Accomplishments to Date (2008 - 2013)

Since approval of the LBUSD FMP in 2008, many accomplishments have occurred and/or will be completed by the fall of 2013. These accomplishments include:

1. MEASURE K BOND PROGRAM

- On November 7, 2008, 72 percent of the residents of Long Beach, Lakewood, Signal Hill and Catalina Island approved Measure K. The \$1.2 billion bond provides the financial framework for the LBUSD to accomplish a portion of the capital facilities improvement goals listed in the FMP.

2. NEW SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

- In September 2012, the District opened Jesse Elwin Nelson Academy. The Academy is a 6-8 middle school in the City of Signal Hill. The Academy features state-of-the-art technology including handheld devices for all students, a wireless campus, unique art, music, and computer classrooms, and a gymnasium.
- In the fall of 2013, the District plans to open Ernest McBride, Sr. High School, which is a small high school in Long Beach that features three academic pathways: Public Service, Engineering, and Health/Medical.
- In the fall of 2013, a new pool will open at Cabrillo High School.
- Demolition is completed and reconstruction is set to start in fall 2013 for Roosevelt Elementary School.
- Planning is underway for small high schools #2, #3, #4, and #5.

3. RENOVATION PROJECTS

- Construction is projected to start by spring 2014 for the first phases of the renovation of Jordan High School.
- Demolition is completed and reconstruction is set to start in fall 2013 for Newcomb K-8 Academy.

4. BUILDING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

- Boiler replacement projects are underway with a scheduled completion of late fall 2013 at 9 sites.
- Fire alarm, Intercom, and Clock Replacement Phase I at 9 sites (spring-summer 2014).
- Fire Alarm, Intercom, and Clock Replacement Phase II at 11 sites (summer 2014).

5. DEPORTABILIZATION PROJECTS

- In 2011, the District completed Phase I of its Portable Removal Project, which included the demolition of the Department of Housing (DOH) portable classrooms. Portable removal projects will continue, as appropriate for individual school sites with some replacements as necessary.
- Completed Department of Housing (DOH) Portable Removal Projects at 14 sites.
- Completed Lakewood DOH Portable Removal.
- Completed Portable Removal Phase I.
- Construction is complete for the Harte Portable Removal Phase II and Restroom Relocation project.
- Portable Removal Phase II at 14 sites (summer/fall 2013).
- Portable Removal Phase III at 15 sites (summer 2014).





6. STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

- District-Wide Elementary, Middle/K-8 and High School Educational Specifications have been developed. Educational Specifications are standards to guide the renovation and new construction of schools. Updates to each school level will be completed over the coming year.
- Facility Design and Material Standards and Specifications have been developed and continue to be updated on an as-needed basis. These standards show typical layouts that reflect the guidelines provided in the Educational Specifications. Standards and specifications address the needs of specific grade levels and include information regarding furnishings, equipment, and areas for spaces within a school building. The Facility Design and Material Standards & Specifications have also established a protocol for addressing the renovation of facilities that may have historical or cultural significance.

7. INTERIM HOUSING

- The former Butler Middle School site will house Roosevelt Elementary School students from fall 2012 until the Roosevelt construction project is completed.
- The former Keller Elementary School site will house Newcomb K-8 Academy students from fall 2012 until the Newcomb Academy construction project is completed.

8. REUSE

- Burroughs Elementary School was converted to Head Start Administration in 2011.
- Tucker Elementary School was converted to the Student Support Services Building in 2008. The Student Support Services Building houses administration offices and LBUSD's special education program for ages 18-22.
- Long Beach School for Adults was converted to the new Beach High School in 2011.
- Jordan Freshman Academy was converted to the new Jordan Plus in 2012.
- Monroe K-8 school will be converted to office use by the Personnel Commission in fall 2013.

9. TECHNOLOGY

- Completed core switch and uninterruptible power supply replacement on all school campuses.
- In design phase of telephone, intercom, and clock system upgrades on all campuses.
- In design phase of wireless data communications installation on all school campuses.
- Security technology and infrastructure improvements on all high school campuses.

10. ACCESS COMPLIANCE

- Construction completed on ADA Improvement Phase 1 and 2 at Stephens Middle School and King Elementary School.
- District Wide ADA Assessments are underway.

11. DSA CERTIFICATION PROJECTS

- 240 projects out of 392 (61 percent) are "Certified Closed".

12. SITES ARE CLEAR OF OPEN DSA NUMBERS.

13. AB 300 - SEISMIC RETROFIT PROJECTS

- Newcomb K-8 Academy campus replacement by fall 2015.
- In design phase for Bancroft, Hamilton, and Hoover Middle School gymnasium projects.
- In design phase for Polytechnic, Wilson, and Jordan High School auditorium projects.
- Demolition is completed and reconstruction is set to start in summer 2013 for Newcomb K-8 school.

Guiding Principles

The following pages revisit the guiding principles, challenges, and recommendations identified in the 2008 FMP and show how they have contributed to LBUSD's progress toward implementing the FMP.

There were six guiding principles that emerged during development of the 2008 FMP. The table below identifies the guiding principles and progress LBUSD has made since passage of the FMP. These guiding principles remain the overarching themes that guide the FMPU and its recommendations. They continue to be a key factor for decisions made relating to the Program.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>Creating learning environments to meet schools for the next generation</p> <p>The Long Beach Unified School District has historically provided a quality educational experience for all students. However, the school facilities that house students have not kept up with educational changes and advances in technology. Many LBUSD schools predate computers, the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), recent advances in energy-efficient systems and equipment and current academic program offerings and delivery methodologies. As a result, many of LBUSD's school facilities are in need of renovation or replacement.</p> <p>The LBUSD is constantly updating educational strategies and restructuring its educational focus to improve academic performance and meet the challenges of changing academic standards and student demography. The primary focus of future facility improvements should be on creating dynamic environments for teaching and learning.</p> <p>District-wide educational specifications by grade level have been developed to guide the design of new buildings and/or the redesign of current buildings. Extensive renovations will be needed to convert many of the current buildings into 21st Century learning environments. The cost effectiveness and efficiency of renovation of older structures and constructing new buildings will need to be determined. The final solution may be a combination of new and renovated schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of Jesse Elwin Nelson Academy. ▪ Construction of Ernest McBride, Sr. High School. ▪ Planning and design of small high school numbers 2 through 5.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>Renovating and replacing aging infrastructure</p> <p>The 1930s and 50s were two defining eras for LBUSD school facilities. As a result of the 1933 earthquake, most of the LBUSD schools were rebuilt. During the 50s, the baby boom led to the construction of many new schools. During these eras, approximately 65 percent of LBUSD’s current building square footage was constructed. This accounts for nearly two-thirds of the current square footage being 50 or more years old. As a result, the majority of the current square footage is in need of major renovation or replacement.</p> <p>Between the 1950s and today there has been a series of facility initiatives to address continued growth in student enrollment for improving and maintaining facilities such as electrical, plumbing, and mechanical. However, the time has come for a major reconstruction program to fully renovate or replace 50+ year old school facilities.</p> <p>The future should indicate that the defining moments for school facilities in LBUSD were the 1930s, 1950s, and 2010s.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-construction of Roosevelt Elementary School. ▪ Re-construction of Newcomb Academy. ▪ Completion of boiler replacement project. ▪ Technology upgrades. ▪ Telecommunication, intercom, clock and bell upgrades. ▪ Deferred maintenance and maintenance repair/ replacement projects. <p>NOTE: All projects are in progress.</p>
<p>Declining enrollment and elimination of portables and bungalows</p> <p>Over 50 years ago the LBUSD established a policy of using portable and bungalow classrooms as a way to manage overcrowding of school facilities. The concept was not to overbuild permanent space but to use temporary space to address short-term capacity issues. Currently, there are more than 1,500 portable and bungalow classrooms in the district. Most of these “temporary” buildings are over 20, 30, and 50 years of age. The LBUSD is currently experiencing declining enrollment. Many of these “temporary” spaces continue to be used to address class size reduction, full-day kindergarten, and pre-kindergarten programs. It is the desire of the LBUSD, in the next reconstruction program, to eliminate portables and bungalows that are beyond their useful life.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of Phase I of Portable Removal Project. ▪ Phase 2 removal scheduled for summer 2013. ▪ Planning is underway for Phase 3 removal.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>Changing the size and type of high schools</p> <p>The six traditional comprehensive high schools have a current enrollment of 3,000 to 4,500 students. Approximately half of the high school students are enrolled in schools outside of their attendance zone. Five of the large high schools [Jordan, Lakewood, Millikan, Polytechnic and Wilson] have between 19 and 42 portables/ bungalows on each site, with a total of over 140 between all five sites. There are over 5,000 students housed in portables and bungalows across all five schools. The current trend across the nation is to create smaller thematic high schools and smaller learning communities at the larger high schools. The district currently has several high schools which are implementing smaller learning communities as “schools within schools.”</p> <p>In the 1950s, the LBUSD made a deliberate decision to create large high schools. The vision at the time was for a high school to be up to 3,000 students. Facilities were built accordingly. Today, most of the high schools have close to 4,000 students with 1,000 students housed in portables and bungalows. The time has come for a new paradigm regarding high schools and high school facilities. The recommendations call for the creation of a series of smaller high schools and reducing the enrollment at the traditional comprehensive high schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of Ernest McBride, Sr. High School (small high school). ▪ Planning for a small high school on the Browning site.
<p>Joint use</p> <p>Long Beach Unified School District has a history of collaborative arrangements. These arrangements allow the district to provide vital services and opportunities for the citizens of Long Beach and consequently provide a benefit for the agencies with which the district partners. These non-profit partnerships and cooperative arrangements with agencies should be further explored. However, clear parameters should be established for community use of school facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Long Beach Unified School District Board of Education revised Board Policy #1330 Use of School Facilities, which was approved on July 3, 2012. ▪ Looking for additional opportunities for joint use across the district.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>School safety and security</p> <p>There is a high interest in maintaining an inviting and de-institutionalized environment, while simultaneously providing a safe environment for students, staff and community residents who use the school facility and adjacent support services. The organization of a school facility will have a major impact on student behavior and safety concerns. School facility security can be addressed in an active or a passive manner: active security is based on program design, building configuration, and community participation. Schools should be based on passive concepts with applied active concepts where necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of Boiler Replacement Project, late fall 2013. ▪ Commencement of technology upgrades to include standardized telephone, clock, public announcement system, bell system, computer network, and security cameras. ▪ Deferred maintenance and maintenance repair/replacement projects.



Challenges

The FMP continues to be an ambitious effort to address the LBUSD infrastructure and aging facility needs. Implementing the FMP remains critical to providing the learning environments that support student achievement and LBUSD educational priorities. There were seven challenges identified in the 2008 FMP. The table below lists the challenges and the progress the Program has made towards addressing the challenges since approval of the 2008 FMP.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>Challenge No. 1: Balance Short-term and Long-term Needs</p> <p>In addition to the funds needed to renovate the LBUSD inventory, additional investment in deferred maintenance and small capital projects will continue, although it will decrease significantly in the coming years. Because of the timeframe required to complete the renovation program, many schools will not be renovated until several years into the future. Schools will require investment in health and safety improvements to extend the ongoing life of building systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LBUSD’s maintenance staff has conducted ongoing work on school campuses, utilizing a combination of funding sources as available. ▪ All schools are receiving technology upgrades.
<p>Challenge No. 2: Location of Sites for New Schools</p> <p>There are very few sites available within Long Beach Unified School District for new construction. Those that are available are very costly, limited in size, and require significant cost for remediation to make useful. Therefore, creative solutions and ongoing planning will be needed in the area of site selection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nelson Academy was constructed on a new site. ▪ New High School No. 2 will be constructed on a new site (Browning).
<p>Challenge No. 3 Finding Interim Housing for Students</p> <p>There are various options for housing students during the construction process, including both on-site and off-site housing. In order to accomplish this, an interim housing plan will need to be established.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Combination of on-site interim housing and reuse of existing inventory to save the cost and disruption of adding leased portable classrooms. ▪ Use of the Keller Elementary School site for Newcomb students during construction. ▪ Use of the Butler Middle School site for Roosevelt students during construction.
<p>Challenge No. 4: Funding the Facility Master Plan</p> <p>The cost to address school facilities in the Long Beach Unified School District is too high to be addressed simultaneously. Projects will need to be phased over time. It is suggested that this Plan be completed in a 20 - 25 year time frame. The cost of construction will continue to increase. Therefore, the longer the time frame, the greater the cost will be to complete the projects. Identifying the resources, receiving approval for the funding, and completing the projects in a timely manner will indeed be challenging.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Passage of Measure K School Bond. ▪ Participation in the State’s School Facility Program to identify matching funding. ▪ Receipt of the State’s Career Technical Education (CTE) funding for Ernest McBride Sr. High School and continued applications for future funding. ▪ E-Rate funding for technology.

2008 Facility Master Planning Principles	Progress as of 2013 Update
<p>Challenge No. 5: Capacity to Implement Projects</p> <p>The Facility Master Plan will require an increased level of school construction within the LBUSD. The internal staffing and utilization of consultants' capacity to plan, design, and manage projects will need to be addressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A group of consultants with expertise in various disciplines have been hired to assist with implementation of the Measure K School Bond Program.
<p>Challenge No. 6: Operational Staffing Impact</p> <p>Development of the LBUSD Facility Master Plan is a positive step towards equalizing school building conditions district-wide. There is a staffing and operational component that must be evaluated and addressed as facilities are removed and/or added. Careful consideration and study will need to be devoted to evaluating and assessing the financial impact of school building improvements on staffing and operational costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The operational impact is an ongoing effort that is monitored through the district's budget and finance office.
<p>Challenge No. 7: School Boundary and Consolidation Planning Committee</p> <p>The LBUSD is experiencing declining enrollment attributed to a variety of factors. As a result, difficult financial decisions will need to be made that ensure quality and appropriate learning environments are provided for students and teachers. To facilitate a transparent and inclusive decision-making process, a school boundary and consolidation planning committee should be formed. The committee's roles and responsibilities could include developing criteria and standards for which school boundaries and consolidations are made, reviewing and confirming analyses from which school recommendations are formed, and assisting in the community involvement aspect of school consolidations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School closures has been successful to provide housing solutions in the areas of administrative space, interim housing, and special programs.

Recommendations

2008 FACILITY MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROGRESS TO DATE

The District conducted a rigorous process to collect feedback from the communities it serves as part of the preparation of the 2008 Facility Master Plan. The end result was the identification of 16 recommendations through the Community Advisory Committee (CAC). The table below identifies these recommendations and the ways those recommendations have been implemented in the five years since the adoption of the FMP.

2008 Facility Master Plan Recommendations	Progress as of 2013 Facility Master Plan Update
1. The CAC recommends that the LBUSD Board of Education adopt this Facility Master Plan as a guide to renovate and replace school and other administrative facilities in the district.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LBUSD Board of Education approved the Facility Master Plan in January 2008.
2. The CAC recommends student needs and academic achievements are a high priority of focus for facility improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extensive administrative and academic staff involvement has been part of the renovation and new school projects as of this 2013 Facility Master Plan Update.
3. The CAC recommends that the following projects and prioritization be included in the LBUSD Facility Master Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A prioritized grouping of school improvement projects was part of the Facility Master Plan approved by the Board of Education in January 2008 and continues to be revisited on a regular basis.
4. The CAC recommends the phasing of projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Projects continue to be phased based on criteria stated in the FMP, such as health and safety, accessibility requirements, code compliance ability to house students efficiently, the impact of projects on one another, available funding, and the ability to provide interim housing.
5. The CAC recommends reducing or eliminating portables and bungalows as enrollment continues to decline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Phase I of the portable removal project is completed and planning for future phases has begun.
6. The CAC recommends that the number of students enrolled at LBUSD comprehensive high schools be reduced and smaller thematic high schools be established.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LBUSD has constructed one small high school and at least four more are in the planning process.

2008 Facility Master Plan Recommendations	Progress as of 2013 Facility Master Plan Update
<p>7. The CAC recommends that the LBUSD continue to have an on-going maintenance and component replacement program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance projects continue to be completed to the extent that funding has been available.
<p>8. The CAC recommends the development of an interim housing plan during the renovation or construction of school projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creation of interim housing site at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keller Elementary School for Newcomb • Butler Middle School for Roosevelt • Jordan (portables, joint use, Jordan Plus site) • A combination of on-site and off-site interim plans continue to be developed.
<p>9. The CAC recommends that sustainable design practices be followed for renovations and new construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All new and renovated temporary housing shall minimally meet CHPS requirements per the Board of Education Resolution 012208-B. ▪ Updated Facility Design and Material Standards.
<p>10. The CAC recommends that LBUSD incorporate green space and landscaping into the overall plan for school improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Powell and Lindsey Schools are receiving new field space ▪ Green space and landscaping are being incorporated into new construction projects where feasible, including some sites where portable buildings are removed.
<p>11. The CAC recommends that projects be accomplished in a timely manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilities staff has worked with design professionals to ensure that projects are completed as expeditiously as possible, providing necessary funding is available.
<p>12. The CAC recommends the Facilities Branch develop the internal capacity and authorize the professional services needed to implement the LBUSD Facility Master Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilities Branch has cost effectively hired consultants to assist with various aspects of the implementation of the Facility Master Plan resulting from passage of the Measure K School Bond Program.

2008 Facility Master Plan Recommendations	Progress as of 2013 Facility Master Plan Update
<p>13. The CAC recommends the district continue to adjust attendance boundaries to continue to balance enrollments and optimize the efficiencies of operations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attendance boundaries continue to be assessed and adjusted as other facility-related changes are made.
<p>14. The CAC recommends that the district-wide elementary, middle and high school educational specifications as well as recently developed construction standards be formally approved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District-Wide Elementary, Middle, and High School Educational Specifications were approved as part of the Facility Master Plan in January 2008 and will be updated over the coming year.
<p>15. The CAC recommends the LBUSD update this Plan every five years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Facility Master Plan was approved in 2008. An update will be provided to the Board of Education in August 2013.
<p>16. The CAC recommends that the community is continually involved in the planning and implementation of these recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Citizens' Oversight Committee (COC) was formed by LBUSD Board of Education. The COC is an independent committee charged with the oversight of the Measure K funds, reviewing Measure K expenditures and developing an annual report to the Board of Education on the progress of funds spent. The COC is comprised of seven members appointed by the Board of Education. ▪ The Facilities Branch continues to conduct community meetings for renovation and new construction projects.

Demographic Trends and Programmatic Changes

LBUSD has a total enrollment of slightly over 82,000 students, which represents a decline of approximately 13,000 students since 2002. One of the intentions of the FMP is to ensure that the Program is flexible. In this section, information regarding education, enrollment, and live births will be discussed based on the changes that have occurred since approval of the 2008 FMP. The table below summarizes some changes in demographic trends and educational programs that have occurred since 2008.

2008 Facility Master Plan	Changes as of 2013 Facility Master Plan Update
<p>Grade Arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ K-5, K-8, 6-8, 10-12, 9 -12 and K-12 	<p>Grade Arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remains the same, but added more K-8 schools ▪ Added Transitional Kindergarten Program which is designed to meet the needs of students who turn 5 between September 1 and December 2. This program provides one year of Transitional Kindergarten followed by one year of standard Kindergarten. ▪ The District continues to study the possibility of expanding pre-school programs.
<p>FMP Class Size by Grade Level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elementary 25 ▪ Middle 30 ▪ High 30 	<p>FMP Class Size by Grade Level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elementary 30 ▪ Middle 35 ▪ High 35
<p>Technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creating computer rooms and limited wireless access points at school sites 	<p>Technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for Electronic Assessments online by 2014. ▪ Wireless Initiative.
<p>Educational Specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District - Wide High, Middle / K-8 and Elementary Educational Specifications were developed 	<p>Educational Specifications Lessons Learned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create flexible labs larger than standard sized classrooms. ▪ Standard classroom sizes for grades 6 - 12. ▪ Flexible classrooms rely upon flexible furniture and equipment (F&E). ▪ F&E sizes, configuration, and layout in classes by grade level may differ. ▪ A number of campuses will need additional facilities to accommodate needs.
<p>Total Student Enrollment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Projected to decline from 92,975 to 78,827 students by year of update 	<p>Total Student Enrollment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enrollment did not decline as rapidly as projected. Student enrollment is 82,085.
<p>Live Births</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Declining birth rate 	<p>Live Births</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Declined at a slower pace than trends showed during development of 2008 FMP.

District-Wide Projected Student Enrollment by Grade

Enrollment in the Long Beach Unified School District is projected to decline by approximately 850 students, or approximately one percent, between the 2012 and 2017 school years. Enrollment in grades K-5 is projected to increase by slightly more than 1,800 students, which represents a five percent increase through 2017. Enrollment is projected to decline by approximately 600 students which represents a three percent decline through 2017 for grades 6 - 8. Enrollment is projected to decline in grades 9 - 12 by more than 2,000 students. This represents a decrease of approximately eight percent through 2017 for grades 9 - 12. Comparatively, projected student enrollment in the 2008 FMP indicated a greater decline than has occurred. It is believed that since the passage of the FMP in 2008, LBUSD-instituted educational programs and initiatives have contributed to the retention of students and therefore slowed the rate at which total student enrollment was projected to decline.

Table 1: Projected Student Enrollment by Grade

Grade	2012 <i>Actual</i>	2013 <i>Projected</i>	2014 <i>Projected</i>	2015 <i>Projected</i>	2016 <i>Projected</i>	2017 <i>Projected</i>
K	5,835	5,835	5,982	6,647	6,708	6,575
1	6,004	5,945	5,935	6,094	6,764	6,822
2	5,902	5,793	5,727	5,729	5,876	6,641
3	6,053	5,914	5,803	5,742	5,738	5,879
4	5,821	5,936	5,798	5,704	5,637	5,685
5	5,752	5,694	5,808	5,685	5,590	5,578
K - 5 Subtotal	35,367	35,117	35,053	35,601	36,313	37,180
6	5,754	5,680	5,621	5,761	5,638	5,551
7	5,817	5,711	5,635	5,588	5,719	5,616
8	5,912	5,805	5,701	5,632	5,583	5,714
6 - 8 Subtotal	17,483	17,196	16,957	16,981	16,940	16,881
9	6,251	6,208	6,136	6,064	5,976	5,925
10	6,322	6,016	5,968	5,914	5,842	5,863
11	6,291	6,162	5,857	5,823	5,763	5,766
12	6,498	6,365	6,232	5,928	5,890	5,793
9 - 12 Subtotal	25,362	24,751	24,193	23,729	23,471	23,347
Subtotals:	78,212	77,064	76,203	76,311	76,724	77,408
SDC:	2,933	2,902	2,860	2,868	2,872	2,884
Totals:	81,145	79,966	79,063	79,179	79,596	80,292

Source: Enrollment (2012-2017) -- All Data Provided by DecisionInSite

Changes to Facilities Assessments and Costs

A major component of the FMP was the assessment of District facilities to determine the level of work that needs to be accomplished at each school site. Facilities' needs were placed into one of six categories:

- New Construction/Building Addition
- Reconstruction
- Major Renovation
- Moderate Renovation
- Minor Renovation/Deferred Maintenance
- General Maintenance

The FMP assessment determined that approximately 74 percent of the District's facilities were in need of major or moderate renovation. Please see the FMP for a more detailed description of the criteria used to determine the placement of a facility into one of the above categories.

To ensure that the assessments from 2008 are still viable, the District commissioned a follow-up assessment of seven sample sites. The assessments included visual, non-destructive testing, and focused on architectural and utilities systems.

The overall conclusion of the updated assessment is that conditions are substantially similar to those encountered during assessments done in 2008. Therefore, there are no changes to the condition assessments from the 2008 FMP.

While changes to the condition of facilities over the last five years have not caused significant change to the category into which each facility is placed, other factors such as classroom size and demographics have caused some facilities to change categories, with respect to whether an expansion is necessary.



Construction Costs

The 2008 FMP established estimated costs per square foot which have been used for budgeting purposes. The cost per square foot varies based on the type of construction to be performed. Because of the economy and the deflated construction market, costs per square foot have changed only slightly since 2008, although all indications are that they will continue to rise as the economy improves. Table 2 shows the cost per square foot by construction type in 2008 vs. 2012.

**Table 2: Construction Cost per Square Foot by Construction Type
2008 vs. 2012 (Construction Only - No Soft Costs)**

School Level and Type	2008 Cost Estimate	2012 Cost Estimate*
Elementary		
New Construction	\$310 per SF	\$323 per SF
Major Renovation	\$186 per SF	\$194 per SF
Moderate Renovation	\$124 per SF	\$129 per SF
Minor Renovation	\$62 per SF	\$65 per SF
Middle		
New Construction	\$320 per SF	\$333 per SF
Major Renovation	\$192 per SF	\$200 per SF
Moderate Renovation	\$128 per SF	\$133 per SF
Minor Renovation	\$64 per SF	\$67 per SF
High		
New Construction	\$400 per SF	\$392 per SF
Major Renovation	\$240 per SF	\$235 per SF
Moderate Renovation	\$160 per SF	\$157 per SF
Minor Renovation	\$80 per SF	\$78 per SF

* Source: Davis Langdon, based on actual LBUSD bids through 2012

Planning Areas

The FMP divided LBUSD into seven planning areas, which are aligned with the six comprehensive high school attendance boundaries and Catalina Island. These planning areas have proven to be good levels of geographic study, both because of their alignment with high school boundaries and their consistency with respect to demographics.

DISTRICT-WIDE ENROLLMENT

Table 3 details the changes in district-wide enrollment over the last five years versus projections from the FMP. The enrollment decline throughout LBUSD is reflected in each of the planning areas, although each planning area has declined at a different rate relative to projections. Table 3 compares the 2012-13 enrollment in each planning area to the projected enrollment from the FMP.

Table 3: Current Enrollment vs. Projection by Planning Area

Planning Area	2005-06 Enrollment	2012-13 Projected Enrollment	2012-13 Actual Enrollment	Difference from 2005-06	Difference from Projection
Area A - Jordan	17,269	14,278	13,681	-3,588	-597
Area B - Lakewood	12,739	11,675	10,979	-1,760	-696
Area C - Millikan	12,711	11,149	10,579	-2,132	-570
Area D - Cabrillo	12,739	10,372	10,568	-2,171	196
Area E - Polytechnic	20,559	16,733	18,155	-2,404	1,422
Area F - Wilson	16,239	14,034	14,132	-2,107	98
Area G - Avalon	719	586	639	-80	53
Totals	92,975	78,827	78,733	-14,242	-94

Source: DecisionInsite

Enrollment is impacted both by the number of students that live within a given planning area and the number of students who attend schools outside of their planning area. LBUSD is an open enrollment school district and, as such, the number of students who live in one school's attendance area while attending another school has a potentially significant impact on projected enrollment.

DISTRICT-WIDE SITE CAPACITY

Based on the number and size of school facilities, as well as loading factors, each planning area currently has excess capacity due to the decline in enrollment previously discussed. To best measure this excess capacity, the FMPU examines rates of utilization which compare 2012-13 enrollment to total facilities capacity. Facilities capacity is based on 85 percent of total permanent and portable seats at each school (the additional 15 percent of capacity is reserved for non-academic programs that may be required at each school, as well as room to accommodate potential enrollment growth). Greater than 75 percent utilization is considered ideal. Utilization between 60 and 75 percent, while not ideal, is still considered to be efficient. Utilization below 60 percent is considered inefficient and will be watched closely to see what measures can be taken to increase efficiency. Table 4 shows the average rate of utilization of facilities by Planning Area.

Table 4: Rate of Utilization by Planning Area

Planning Area	Rate of Utilization
Area A - Jordan	65 percent
Area B - Lakewood	66 percent
Area C - Millikan	74 percent
Area D - Cabrillo	65 percent
Area E - Polytechnic	82 percent
Area F - Wilson	71 percent
Area G - Avalon	84 percent

Source: LBUSD and DecisionInsite

Each planning area is described in detail, beginning on page 25.

DISTRICT-WIDE LIVE BIRTHS

Since 2001, live births have steadily declined within the LBUUSD boundaries (See Table below). This may result in fewer students entering Long Beach schools at the kindergarten level, which may also further impact the decline in district-wide student enrollment. The trend of declining birth rates has remained consistent.


Table 5: Live Births within the LBUUSD Boundary, 2001 - 2010

Year	Number of Live Births within the Long Beach Unified School District
2001	10,247
2002	9,952
2003	10,122
2004	9,986
2005	9,972
2006	9,966
2007	9,698
2008	9,626
2009	9,124
2010	8,809

Source: California Department of Health

Despite the overall drop in live births, the Jordan and Polytechnic Planning Areas of Long Beach are still experiencing a high volume of live births relative to adjacent zip codes and planning areas (see Map 2). Within the Polytechnic Planning Area, the downtown core has witnessed a large number of live births in the past ten years. In these areas, this may be an indication that schools will continue to be at or above capacity. Therefore, students in these areas may enroll at schools outside of their attendance boundary, due to a lack of available space at their home school.

Map 2 - Density of Age 0 - 4 Population by Census Block Group



PLANNING AREA A - JORDAN


Planning Area A is located in the northwest portion of LBUSD and is commonly referred to as North Long Beach.

Map 3: Planning Area A: Jordan

Planning Area A contains a total of 13 schools:

- Addams ES
- Harte ES
- King ES
- McKinley ES
- Grant ES
- Barton ES
- Dooley ES
- Powell K-8
- Hamilton MS
- Lindsey MS
- Lindbergh MS
- Jordan HS
- Jordan Plus

Please see map 3 for a more detailed look at Planning Area A.



Planning Area A has the second largest student population among the seven planning areas. It is also an area where 83 percent of the enrollment lives within the planning area. While long range projections show a continued decline in Planning Area A, there is a younger population with a significant number of children in the 0-4 age range (please see Table 5 and Map 2). Table 6 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area A.

Table 6: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area A

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	6,290	67 percent
K-8	1,313	86 percent
Middle (6-8)	2,472	51 percent
High (9-12)	3,606	71 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area A has a high live-in population and is only slightly affected by open enrollment. It may have proportionately larger kindergarten classes and slower enrollment decline over the next five years in relation to other planning areas because of the number of 0-4 year olds in that area. Current utilization at the middle school level (54 percent) is inefficient and should be watched closely for possible changes in the next five years.


PLANNING AREA B - LAKEWOOD

Planning Area B is located in the northeast portion of LBUSD and is mostly comprised of the City of Lakewood.

Map 4: Planning Area B: Lakewood

Planning Area B contains a total of 12 schools:

- Cleveland ES
- Holmes ES
- MacArthur ES
- Madison ES
- Riley ES
- Twain ES
- Gompers K-8
- Henry K-8
- Monroe K-8
- Bancroft MS
- Hoover MS
- Lakewood HS



Please see map 4 for a more detailed look at Planning Area B.

Planning Area B has a moderate student population that has declined by approximately seven point seven percent over the last 5-6 years. A majority of the enrollment (52 percent) in Planning Area B lives outside the planning area. Long-range projections show a continued decline in Planning Area B. This area has an aging population, with 29 percent of its residents at age 55 and older. Table 7 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area B.

Table 7: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area B

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	3,019	51 percent
K-8	2,226	68 percent
Middle (6-8)	1,901	70 percent
High (9-12)	3,833	82 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area B has a high enrollment that lives outside of its attendance boundary and is likely to be more affected by open enrollment if factors like transportation cuts begin impacting the District. The aging population suggests future housing turnover, which may lead to new families and enrollment increases, although the timeline for this is difficult to determine with certainty. Current utilization at the elementary school level (55 percent) is inefficient and should be watched closely for possible changes in the next five years.

PLANNING AREA C - MILLIKAN

Planning Area C is located in the central/eastern portion of LBUSD, mostly north of the 405 freeway.

Planning Area C contains a total of 11 schools:

- Carver ES
- Emerson ES
- Prisk ES
- Burcham K-8
- Cubberley K-8
- Keller
- Newcomb K-8
- Marshall MS
- Stanford MS
- McBride HS
- Millikan HS



Please see map 5 for a more detailed look at Planning Area C.

Planning Area C has a moderate student population which has declined at a rate of 16.1 percent over the last 5-6 years. A large majority of the enrollment, 64 percent, resides outside of Planning Area C. Long-range projections show a continued decline in Planning Area C. This area has an aging population, with 33 percent of its residents at age 55 and older. Table 8 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area C.

Table 8: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area C

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	1,761	63 percent
K-8	2,755	75 percent
Middle (6-8)	2,072	65 percent
High (9-12)	3,991	87 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area C has a low live-in population and is likely affected by open enrollment, especially at the elementary school level, if factors like transportation cuts begin impacting the District. The aging population suggests future housing turnover which may lead to new families and enrollment increases, although the timeline for this is uncertain. Current utilization is fairly efficient at all school levels except high school, which is very efficient.

PLANNING AREA D - CABRILLO

Planning Area D comprises the southwestern portion of LBUUSD, including the I-710 corridor south of I-405 and the Port of Long Beach area.

Planning Area D contains a total of 11 schools:

- Chavez ES
- Edison ES
- Garfield ES
- Lafayette ES
- Webster ES
- Hudson K-8
- Muir K-8
- Stephens MS
- Washington MS
- Cabrillo HS
- Reid Continuation HS

Please see map 6 for a more detailed look at Planning Area D.



Map 6: Planning Area D: Cabrillo

Planning Area D has a moderate student population which has declined at a rate of 16.4 percent over the last 5-6 years. A large majority of the enrollment, 70 percent, resides within the Planning Area D. Long-range projections show a continued decline in Planning Area D. Table 9 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area D.

Table 9: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area D

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	3,621	63 percent
K-8	1,950	67 percent
Middle (6-8)	1,964	60 percent
High (9-12)	3,033	67 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area D has a high live-in population and is only slightly affected by open enrollment, most likely at the elementary school level, if factors like transportation cuts begin impacting the District. Current utilization is fairly efficient at all school levels except middle school, which should be watched closely for possible changes in the next five years.


PLANNING AREA E - POLYTECHNIC

Planning Area E comprises the center of LBUSD, including portions of Central Long Beach, Bixby Knolls area, the City of Signal Hill, and the Long Beach downtown area.

Planning Area E contains a total of 19 schools:

- Alvarado ES
- Birney ES
- Burnett ES
- International ES
- Lincoln ES
- Longfellow ES
- Los Cerritos ES
- Roosevelt ES
- Signal Hill ES
- Stevenson ES
- Whittier ES
- Robinson K-8
- Butler MS
- Franklin MS
- Hughes MS
- Nelson MS
- Poly Academy of Achievers and Leaders (PAAL)
- Polytechnic HS
- Renaissance HS

Please see map 7 for a more detailed look at Planning Area E.



Map 7: Planning Area E: Polytechnic

Planning Area E has the largest student population in LBUSD, and enrollment has declined by slightly more than 12 percent over the last 5-6 years. A large majority of the enrollment, 73 percent, resides within Planning Area E. Long-range projections show a very moderate decline in Planning Area E, with the largest projected decline at the high school level. Table 10 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area E.

Table 10: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area E

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	8,662	80 percent
K-8	979	88 percent
Middle (6-8)	3,390	82 percent
High (9-12)	5,124	91 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area E has a high live-in population, but may be affected by open enrollment if more resident students attend Planning Area E schools and factors like transportation cuts begin impacting the District. Current utilization is efficient at all school levels, especially the high school level, which is currently utilized at a rate of 93 percent. A high number of students between the ages of 0-4 suggest a possible growth at the elementary school level in the coming years. Because of these factors, Planning Area E is a strong candidate for additional capacity via expansion or new construction in the future.


PLANNING AREA F - WILSON

Planning Area F comprises the southeast portion of LBUSD, including portions of Central Long Beach, the California State University Long Beach area, Long Beach downtown area, and the waterfront communities of Naples and Belmont Shores.

Planning Area F contains a total of 20 schools:

- Buffum PK
- Bixby ES
- Bryant ES
- Burbank ES
- Fremont ES
- Gant ES
- Kettering ES
- Lee ES
- Lowell ES
- Mann ES
- Naples ES
- Tucker ES
- Willard ES
- Tincher K-8
- Hill MS
- Jefferson MS
- Rogers MS
- Beach HS
- Browning HS
- Wilson HS

Please see map 8 for a more detailed look at Planning Area F.



Planning Area F has a fairly large student population, and enrollment has declined by 11 percent over the last 5-6 years. A large majority of the enrollment, 70 percent, resides within Planning Area F. Long range projections show a very moderate enrollment decline in Planning Area F. Table 11 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area F.

Table 11: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area F

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
Elementary (K-5)	6,383	78 percent
K-8	952	61 percent
Middle (6-8)	2,682	76 percent
High (9-12)	4,115	89 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area F has a high live-in population and may be slightly affected by open enrollment if factors like transportation cuts begin impacting the District. Current utilization is efficient at all school levels, especially the high school level, which is currently utilized at a rate of 89 percent.

PLANNING AREA G - AVALON


Planning Area G comprises Catalina Island.

Planning Area G contains two schools:

- Avalon K-12
- Two Harbors ES

Please see map 9 for a more detailed look at Planning Area G.

Map 9: Planning Area G: Avalon



Planning Area G is very unique, in that its enrollment is comprised entirely of students who live on Catalina Island. As such, the student population is very small and enrollment has declined by 42.8 percent over the last 5-6 years. All students reside within Planning Area G. Long-range projections show a moderate enrollment decline in Planning Area G. Table 12 shows enrollment and utilization rates for each school level in Planning Area G.

Table 12: Enrollment and Utilization - Planning Area G

School Level	2012-13 Enrollment	Utilization Rate
K-12	639	84 percent

Source: DecisionInsite, LBUSD

Summary of Findings

Planning Area G has a 100 percent live-in population and is unaffected by open enrollment.

Updated Challenges and Recommendations

Based on the information contained in this FMPU, new and updated challenges and recommendations have been identified. These challenges and recommendations will serve to inform facilities decisions for at least the next five years.

CHALLENGES

The 2008 FMP challenges, identified previously, included:

- Balance short-term and long-term needs
- Location of sites for new schools
- Finding interim housing for students during construction projects
- Funding the Facility Master Plan
- Capacity to implement projects
- Operational staffing impact
- School Boundary and Consolidation Planning Committee

Each of these challenges remains a consideration that factors into decisions related to facilities. Additionally, the following challenges are newly identified for the FMPU.

- **DSA closeout and review of projects**

For a number of reasons, the District has many projects that were never properly closed out with the Division of the State Architect (DSA). This causes problems for review and approval of new projects, because this closeout is a prerequisite for additional DSA review. LBUSD continues to make progress toward these project closeouts. However, much work remains to be done and this continues to be a high priority.

- **Removal of portable classrooms versus the need for flexibility**

Enrollment has been declining in the District for nearly a decade. Declining enrollment has caused a number of difficult decisions to be made with regard to facility closures and consolidations. However, it has also allowed for the removal of almost 100 outdated portable classrooms, with a number of portable classrooms scheduled over the next 2-3 years. The ongoing challenge will be to anticipate the degree and duration of the enrollment decline, and other programmatic changes that may affect classroom space. We must continue to ensure that portable classrooms that are in good condition with substantial useful life remaining continue to be used and that we have classroom space at all campuses for all students. Therefore, LBUSD will need to continue to be strategic regarding its portable removal process.

- **Transportation cuts**

One of the biggest consequences of LBUSD's ongoing budget crisis has been the elimination of most transportation for regular education students. As an open enrollment district, LBUSD parents have long relied on school buses to get their students to schools throughout LBUSD. While it is too early to see all of the results of the transportation cuts, LBUSD must be prepared for much less day-to-day mobility of its student population, which may lead to more crowded schools in the impacted areas of the District, especially in the downtown area. The greatest impact is likely to be felt at the elementary school level, where home to school transportation is most needed. As the changes driven by the transportation cuts become more apparent in the coming years, LBUSD will need to be prepared to adapt its facilities accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although much has been accomplished since 2008, work still needs to be done with respect to each of the recommendations. There are also new recommendations that should be considered as the District proceeds with its construction program:

Recommendation No. 4 (Revision)

Projects will be phased in groups

As part of the preparation of the 2008 FMP, projects were prioritized based mostly on facility age and condition. The Board has periodically reviewed these priorities with respect to factors such as site efficiency, safety, bond cash flow, and availability of State funding. Additionally, the list of projects to be funded by Measure K continues to change based on many of the factors listed above. Table 13 shows projects currently identified or under consideration for funding under the Measure K Program. A complete prioritized list of major projects can be found in Appendix D and District-wide projects in Appendix E.

Recommendation No. 17 (New)

Evaluate Administrative/Support Facility needs

Much like the school facilities, LBUSD's administrative facilities continue to age and the facilities needs of the District's administrative employees continue to evolve. LBUSD needs to begin to look more closely at its administrative facilities and how they can be improved through consolidations, closures, and capital improvements. Please see Exhibit C for more information.

Recommendation No. 18 (New)

Evaluate the potential need for school closures and consolidations, and the reuse of closed facilities

Enrollment continues to decline in LBUSD. This decline continues to force the need to reevaluate how efficiently facilities are being used. It is likely more tough decisions will need to be made regarding the consolidation and closure of certain school facilities. As these decisions are made, LBUSD staff will need to consider that enrollment decline will not last forever and enrollment may actually grow again in the future, though not likely to the levels seen in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Therefore, important strategic decisions will need to be made regarding the management of assets created by the closure of school facilities.

Recommendation No. 19 (New)

Identify and evaluate cultural resources as part of current and future FMP projects

Within the next 6-12 months, the Board will adopt a Cultural Resources Assessment, which will aid the District in identifying sites that may qualify for cultural resources and provide guidelines evaluating such sites with respect to environmental review and preservation of character defining features.

TABLE 13
Measure K Projects As of January 29, 2013

Major Projects to be Funded Primarily by Measure K	Major Projects that <i>May</i> be Funded by Measure K*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New HS #1 (McBride) ▪ New MS #1 (Nelson) ▪ Roosevelt ES ▪ Cabrillo HS-Pool ▪ Jordan HS (Phase 1,2) ▪ AB 300 Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Newcomb K-8 ▸ Bancroft MS Gymnasium ▸ Hoover MS Gymnasium ▪ New High School # 2 (Browning Site) ▪ New High School #3 (Jordan Plus) ▪ New High School #4 (Butler Site) ▪ New High School #5 (TBD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jordan (Phases 3,5,6) ▪ AB 300 Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ Hamilton MS Gymnasium ▸ Hill MS Gymnasium ▸ Polytechnic HS Auditorium ▸ Wilson HS Auditorium ▸ Jordan HS Auditorium (Phase 4) ▪ Willard ES ▪ Renaissance High School for the Arts ▪ Bancroft MS ▪ Hill MS ▪ Hamilton MS ▪ Millikan HS ▪ Avalon K-12
District-Wide Projects to be Funded Primarily by Measure K	District-Wide Projects that <i>May</i> be Funded by Measure K
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core Switch and UPS Replacement ▪ Boiler Replacement ▪ Fire Alarm, Intercom and Clock Replacement ▪ Security Upgrades ▪ Telecommunications Upgrades ▪ Wireless Data Upgrades ▪ Access Compliance Projects ▪ DSA Certification and Closeout ▪ Deportabilization <p>* Note: All projects in this category are currently under discussion for reprioritization</p> <p>For a list of all projects See Appendix D and E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None

Appendix

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A - Facilities Data by Planning Area
- Appendix B - Facilities Data by District
- Appendix C - List of Administrative Facilities
- Appendix D - Major Project Priority List
- Appendix E - District-Wide Project Priority List

Appendix A

Facilities Data by Planning Area



FACILITIES CAPACITATOR 2013

Planning Area A: Jordan

Elementary

SITE	Master Plan Group	Master Plan Scope**	Acreage	Students Per Acre	TEMPORARY TYPES							Total Classrooms
					Permanent Classrooms	Temporary Classrooms	Portable	Bungalow	Russell			
ADDAMS ES	1	MJR/A	4.75	192	28	19	10	4	5	47		
BARTON ES	2	MJR/A	6.91	113	32	23	13	4	6	55		
DOOLEY ES	4	GH	5.39	202	56	0	0	0	0	56		
GRANT ES	2	MOD/A	9.1	118	33	24	22	2	0	57		
HARTE ES	1	MOD/A	7.16	132	16	26	14	0	12	42		
KING ES	2	MOD/A	5.03	163	17	23	23	0	0	40		
MCKINLEY ES	2	MJR/A	7.78	96.4	25	17	17	0	0	42		

K-8

POWELL K-8	3	GMA	17.3	73.9	55	1	1	0	0	56
------------	---	-----	------	------	----	---	---	---	---	----

Middle

HAMILTON MS	1	MJR	15.3	67.1	39	8	8	0	0	47
LINDBERGH MS	3	MIN	13.06	54	44	9	9	0	0	53
LINDSEY MS	1	MJR/A	11.34	77.1	32	20	18	2	0	52

High

JORDAN HS	1	MJR	26.9	103	104	32	32	0	0	136
JORDAN PLUS	1	CNVRT	9.7	82.9	37	0	0	0	0	37

Planning Area Totals

AVG										
140	113	518	202	167	12	23	720			

USE																	
ACADEMIC																	
Used as K-5, K-8, 6-8, or 9-12	Used as SDC	Used as TK	Used for RSP/SPEECH	Used for Specialist	Used as Computer Lab	Used as Science Lab	K-8 Elective (Music, Chorus, PE)	Total Academic Classrooms	Used as Pre-K	Used as CDC	Used as Head Start	Used for Kids Club/Avid	Used as PTA/Parent Center	Used as WRAP	Used as Other	Vacant	Academic Use %
NON-ACADEMIC																	
31	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	77%
22	3	0	2	1	1	1	1	31	0	5	0	0	0	6	8	5	56%
36	1	0	1	3	1	0	2	44	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	79%
36	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	40	0	4	0	0	1	7	2	3	70%
31	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	36	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	86%
27	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	31	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	2	75%
24	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	28	1	0	3	0	0	0	7	4	67%
42	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	84%
28	3	0	2	0	3	0	6	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	89%
29	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	9	64%
26	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	34	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	65%	
127	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
16	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	54%	
475	20	4	17	8	16	1	15	519	1	12	10	0	1	27	46	65	74%

ENROLLMENT									
CBEDS					PROJECTION				
2012 Regular	2012 SDC	2012 Total	2013 Regular	2013 SDC	2013 Total	2013-2017 Trend#	Total Students in Boundary	Total Living In/Attending In	
913	0	913	963	0	963	↑22%	4,75	192	
744	37	781	655	47	702	↓-15%	6,91	113	
1070	21	1091	1085	13	1098	↓-21%	5,39	202	
1071	0	1071	1052	0	1052	↓-9%	9,1	118	
918	25	943	934	31	965	↑8%	7,16	132	
822	0	822	795	1	796	↑7%	5,03	163	
749	1	750	712	2	714	↑4%	7,78	96	
1277	1	1278	1313	0	1313	↑15%	17,3	74	
980	47	1027	919	42	961	↓-16%	15,3	67	
688	17	705	649	20	669	↓-10%	13,06	54	
820	54	874	805	37	842	↓-27%	11,34	77	
2614	161	2775	2955	167	3122	→-1%	26,9	103	
803	1	804	0	0	0	↓-27%	9,7	83	
13,469	365	13,834	12,837	360	13,197	↓-5%	140	1,475	

CAPACITY						
Current Loading Factor	Total Capacity	85% Capacity	Permanent Capacity	Temporary Capacity	Open Seats (Academic Only)	Open Seats (w/ Non-Academic)
30	1410	1199	840	570	407	257
30	1650	1403	960	690	779	539
30	1680	1428	1680	0	499	289
30	1710	1454	990	720	549	279
30	1260	1071	480	780	227	47
30	1200	1020	510	690	288	138
30	1260	1071	750	510	420	270
30	1680	1428	1650	30	252	162
35	1645	1398	1365	280	618	548
35	1855	1577	1540	315	1150	905
35	1820	1547	1120	700	946	946
35	4760	4046	3640	1120	1985	1985
35	1295	1101	1295	0	491	421
-	23,225	19,741	16,820	6,405	8,611	6,786

K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT												
K	K/1	1	1/2	2	2/3	3	3/4	4	4/5	5	6-8	9-12
6	0	6	0	5	1	5	0	4	0	4	0	0
4	0	4	0	4	1	3	0	3	0	3	0	0
6	0	6	0	6	1	6	0	5	1	5	0	0
7	0	5	1	6	0	6	2	4	0	5	0	0
6	0	5	0	5	1	5	0	4	1	4	0	0
4	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	4	0	4	0	0
4	0	4	0	4	1	3	0	4	0	3	0	0
5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	4	14	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
42	0	40	1	39	5	38	2	32	2	32	97	143

Sources: Current Enrollment from CBEDS 2012. Projections from "LgBch131Mod" Study. Site Data based 2012 Facilities Annual Request. #Master Plan Scope (MJR=Major, MIN=Minor, MOD=Moderate, A=Addition, GH=General Maintenance, CNVRT=Conversion) #Enrollment Trend Legend: ↑ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); → denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes decreasing trend (<-2%).



FACILITIES CAPACITATOR 2013

Planning Area B: Lakewood

SCHOOL	SITE										USE										ENROLLMENT						CAPACITY						K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT																									
	Master Plan Group	Master Plan Scope	Acreage	Students Per Acre	Permanent Classrooms	Temporary Classrooms	Portable	Bungalow	Russell	Total Classrooms	Used as K-5, K-8, 6-8, or 9-12	Used as SDC	Used as TK	Used for RSP/SPEECH	Used for Specialist	Used as Computer Lab	Used as Science Lab	K-8 Elective (Music, Chorus, PE)	Total Academic Classrooms	Used as Pre-K	Used as CDC	Used as Head Start	Used for Kids Club/Avid	Used as PTA/Parent Center	Used as WRAP	Used as Other	Vacant	Academic Use %	2012 Regular	2012 SDC	2012 Total	2013 Regular	2013 SDC	2013 Total	2013-2017 Trend**	Total Students in Boundary	Total Living In/Attending In	Current Loading Factor	Total Capacity	85% Capacity	Permanent Capacity	Temporary Capacity	Open Seats (Academic Only)	Open Seats (w/ Non-Academic)	K	K/1	1	1/2	2	2/3	3	3/4	4	4/5	5	6-8	9-12	
Elementary																																																										
CLEVELAND ES	3	MOD	10.7	44	24	8	7	1	0	32	15	1	1	2	0	1	1	3	24	0	0	0	3	1	0	5	0	72%	402	11	413	398	11	409	↓-18%	310	237	30	960	816	720	240	457	247	2	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
HOLMES ES	1	MJRA	10.4	49	24	13	11	2	0	37	15	5	1	2	1	1	0	1	26	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	68%	415	38	453	426	39	465	↓-2%	456	241	30	1110	944	720	390	567	447	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
MADISON ES	3	MOD/A	10.1	58	24	10	10	0	0	34	16	8	0	3	0	1	1	0	29	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	85%	488	56	544	451	52	503	↓-26%	273	226	30	1020	867	720	300	386	176	2	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	0
MACARTHUR ES	2	MJR	9.82	57	27	12	12	0	0	39	17	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	25	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	7	64%	476	27	503	441	25	466	↓-34%	405	230	30	1170	995	810	360	577	337	2	0	3	0	3	0	4	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
RILEY ES	1	MJRA	11.1	46	23	16	12	0	4	39	15	2	0	2	0	1	0	3	23	0	3	0	0	0	5	2	6	59%	447	27	474	425	26	451	↓-20%	344	172	30	1170	995	690	480	606	396	2	0	3	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
TWAIN ES	1	MJRA	7.71	81	27	12	10	2	0	39	22	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	27	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	5	69%	595	37	632	578	36	614	↓-4%	523	442	30	1170	995	810	360	448	328	3	1	3	0	3	2	3	0	3	1	3	0	0	0
K-8																																																										
GOMPERS K-8	2	MJRA	10.2	82	29	11	11	0	0	40	25	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	75%	738	35	773	674	32	706	↓-24%	776	520	30	1200	1020	870	330	277	277	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	3	0	3	10	0	0
HENRY K-8	3	MOD	10	77	23	14	10	4	0	37	29	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	32	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	86%	758	14	772	797	15	812	↑19%	447	189	30	1110	944	690	420	188	68	4	0	4	0	4	0	3	0	3	0	3	8	0	0
MONROE K-8	2	MJRA	10.1	82	24	19	19	0	0	43	23	5	0	2	0	2	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	74%	608	73	681	527	63	590	↓-68%	285	158	30	1290	1097	720	570	459	399	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	1	12	0	0
Middle																																																										
BANCROFT MS	1	MJR	19.3	52	43	7	7	0	0	50	24	4	0	3	0	3	0	4	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	3	76%	931	44	975	926	44	970	↓-5%	880	555	35	1750	1488	1505	245	775	600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0
HOOVER MS	3	MOD/A	16	62	36	2	2	0	0	38	22	3	0	3	0	1	0	3	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	84%	888	38	926	839	36	875	↓-15%	658	485	35	1330	1131	1260	70	404	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0
High																																																										
LAKEWOOD HS	3	MOD	32.3	125	126	30	22	0	8	156	134	16	0	6	0	0	0	134	290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	3696	137	3833	3536	137	3673	↓-14%	2786	2021	35	5460	4641	4410	1050	1627	1417	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	0
Planning Area Totals																																																										
AVG										AVG										AVG																																						
158										357										10,442						18,740						20																										
68										51										537						15,929						1																										
430										2										10,979						15,929						23																										
154										29										10,018						13,925						0																										
133										14										516						4,815						24																										
9										3										10,534						6,771						5																										
12										150										8,143						4,956						24																										
584										608										5,476												76																										
										76%																						134																										

Sources: Current Enrollment from CBEDS 2012. Projections from "LgSch13Mod" Study. Site Data based on 2012 Facilities Annual Request. *Master Plan Scope (MJR= Major, MIN=Minor, MOD=Moderate, A=Addition, GM=General Maintenance, CNVRT=Conversion) Enrollment Trend Legend: ↑ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); ↔ denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes decreasing trend (<-2%).



FACILITIES CAPACITATOR 2013

Planning Area C: Millikan

Elementary

SITE	Master Plan Group	Master Plan Scope	Acreage	Students Per Acre	Permanent Classrooms	Temporary Classrooms	Portable	Bungalow	Russell	Total Classrooms
CARVER ES	1	MOD	10.21	41	24	10	8	2	0	34
EMERSON ES	3	C/PA	10.28	62	26	14	14	0	0	40
PRISK ES	2	MINA	10.3	59	25	11	11	0	0	36

K-8

BURCHAM K-8	2	MOD	10.77	55	22	15	13	2	0	37
CUBBERLEY K-8	3	MOD/A	9.39	101	24	29	21	8	0	53
NEWCOMB K-8 (Interim)	2	MJR/A	13.5	69	25	19	19	0	0	44

Middle

MARSHALL MS	1	MJR	15.37	53	38	17	9	8	0	55
STANFORD MS	3	MOD	15.16	86	37	14	4	10	0	51

High

MILLIKAN HS	1	MJR	34.4	118	124	31	27	0	4	155
-------------	---	-----	------	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	-----

Planning Area Totals

AVG										
129	72	345	160	126	30	4	505			

USE																	
NON-ACADEMIC																	
Used as K-5, K-8, 6-8, or 9-12	Used as SDC	Used as TK	Used for RSP/SPEECH	Used for Specialist	Used as Computer Lab	Used as Science Lab	K-8 Elective (Music, Chorus, PE)	Total Academic Classrooms	Used as Pre-K	Used as CDC	Used as Head Start	Used for Kids Club/Avid	Used as PTA/Parent Center	Used as WRAP	Used as Other	Vacant	Academic Use %
14	4	1	2	0	1	1	1	24	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	3	68%
24	3	0	1	1	1	1	1	32	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	80%
18	6	0	2	3	1	1	0	31	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	86%
30	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95%
30	4	1	2	0	2	0	4	43	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4	81%
32	3	0	2	0	2	1	1	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	93%
25	3	0	2	0	3	0	6	39	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	71%
30	12	0	0	2	1	0	4	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	96%
145	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
348	48	3	11	6	12	4	17	449	0	2	0	4	6	5	13	20	86%

ENROLLMENT									
CBEDS					PROJECTION				
2012 Regular	2012 SDC	2012 Total	2013 Regular	2013 SDC	2013 Total	2012-2017 Trend**	Total Students in Boundary	Total Living In/Attending In	
402	28	430	399	28	427	↑8%	386	281	
662	50	712	699	53	752	↑36%	275	223	
550	69	619	571	72	643	↑6%	295	246	
770	42	812	814	45	859	↑54%	504	230	
922	46	968	896	45	941	↓-2%	887	611	
922	53	975	866	50	916	↓-14%	306	273	
734	33	767	726	33	759	↓-9%	375	138	
1233	72	1305	1174	69	1243	↓-4%	867	741	
3839	152	3991	3689	153	3842	↓-11%	1584	1104	
10,034	545	10,579	9,834	548	10,382	↑7%	5,479	3,847	

CAPACITY						
Current Loading Factor	Total Capacity	85% Capacity	Permanent Capacity	Temporary Capacity	Open Seats (Academic Only)	Open Seats (w/ Non-Academic)
30	1020	867	720	300	500	380
30	1200	1020	780	420	398	278
30	1080	918	750	330	371	221
30	1110	944	660	450	148	118
30	1590	1352	720	870	472	322
30	1320	1122	750	570	195	105
35	1925	1636	1330	595	1158	913
35	1785	1517	1295	490	480	480
35	5425	4611	4340	1085	1434	1434
-	16,455	13,987	11,345	5,110	5,156	4,251

K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT												
K	K/1	1	1/2	2	2/3	3	3/4	4	4/5	5	6-8	9-12
2	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
5	1	4	0	3	1	3	0	3	1	3	0	0
3	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	2	1	2	0	0
5	0	4	0	3	0	4	0	3	0	3	8	0
3	0	2	1	2	0	3	0	3	0	3	13	0
2	0	2	1	3	0	3	1	3	0	3	14	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
20	1	17	3	16	2	18	1	16	2	16	90	145

Sources: Current Enrollment from CBEDS 2012. Projections from "LgBch13Mod" Study. Site Data based on 2012 Facilities Annual Request.

**Master Plan Scope (MJR=Major, MIN=Minor, MOD=Moderate, A=Addition, GM=General Maintenance, CNVRT=Conversion)

**Enrollment Trend Legend: ↑ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); ↔ denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes decreasing trend (<-2%).



FACILITIES CAPACITATOR 2013

Planning Area D: Cabrillo

Elementary

SITE	Master Plan Group	Master Plan Scope	Acreage	Students Per Acre	Permanent Classrooms	Temporary Classrooms	TEMPORARY TYPES			Total Classrooms
							Portable	Bungalow	Russell	
CHAVEZ ES	4	GM	3	198	33	0	0	0	0	33
EDISON ES	3	MOD	6	117	44	2	0	2	0	46
GARFIELD ES	1	MJRA	8	104	32	28	18	10	0	60
LAFAYETTE ES	3	MOD/A	4	255	21	19	17	2	0	40
WEBSTER ES	2	MJRA	13	44.6	16	28	20	0	8	44

K-8

HUDSON K-8	1	MJRA	16	58.7	32	22	10	0	12	54
MUIR K-8	2	MJRA	7	143	25	28	12	12	4	53

Middle

STEPHENS MS	1	MJRA	15	62.2	33	20	8	0	12	53
WASHINGTON MS	3	MOD/A	5	205	54	2	2	0	0	56

High

CABRILLO HS	1	GM/POOL	56	56.2	130	20	20	0	0	150
-------------	---	---------	----	------	-----	----	----	---	---	-----

Planning Area Totals

132	124	420	169	107	26	36	589
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----	-----

USE	ACADEMIC										NON-ACADEMIC							Academic Use %
	Used as K-5, K-8, 6-8, or 9-12	Used as SDC	Used as TK	Used for RSP/SPEECH	Used for Specialist	Used as Computer Lab	Used as Science Lab	K-8 Elective (Music, Chorus, PE)	Total Academic Classrooms	Used as Pre-K	Used as CDC	Used as Head Start	Used for Kids Club/Avid	Used as PTA/Parent Center	Used as WRAP	Used as Other	Vacant	
CHAVEZ ES	15	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	58%	
EDISON ES	24	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	28	0	5	3	0	1	5	2	3	59%
GARFIELD ES	28	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	33	0	4	2	0	1	0	1	19	55%
LAFAYETTE ES	33	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	90%
WEBSTER ES	29	7	1	1	0	1	0	0	39	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	86%
HUDSON K-8	29	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	38	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4	70%
MUIR K-8	31	4	0	2	0	1	0	1	39	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	74%
STEPHENS MS	25	7	0	2	0	3	0	2	39	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	10	74%
WASHINGTON MS	27	1	0	3	1	4	0	3	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	70%
CABRILLO HS	146	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%
AVG	387	34	2	12	2	14	1	8	460	1	13	8	1	7	13	9	77	73%

ENROLLMENT	2012					2013-2017 Trend**	Total Students in Boundary	Total Living In/Attending In	
	Regular	SDC	Total	Regular	SDC				Total
CHAVEZ ES	436	48	484	409	45	454	-25%	440	355
EDISON ES	724	0	724	701	0	701	9%	737	612
GARFIELD ES	788	42	830	789	42	831	1%	864	676
LAFAYETTE ES	972	1	973	983	1	984	9%	1187	822
WEBSTER ES	541	69	610	571	73	644	29%	652	488
HUDSON K-8	829	61	890	747	55	802	-26%	384	320
MUIR K-8	1004	56	1060	992	55	1047	7%	1322	910
STEPHENS MS	782	50	832	717	46	763	-21%	1194	693
WASHINGTON MS	1099	33	1132	1112	33	1145	7%	1952	984
CABRILLO HS	2863	170	3033	2867	184	3051	-10%	3613	2162
AVG	10,038	530	10,568	9,888	534	10,422	-2%	12,345	8,022

CAPACITY	Current Loading Factor	Total Capacity	85% Capacity	Permanent Capacity	Temporary Capacity	Open Seats (Academic Only)	Open Seats (w/ Non-Academic)
EDISON ES	30	1380	1173	1320	60	566	236
GARFIELD ES	30	1800	1530	960	840	880	790
LAFAYETTE ES	30	1200	1020	630	570	137	-13
WEBSTER ES	30	1320	1122	480	840	620	440
HUDSON K-8	30	1620	1377	960	660	580	340
MUIR K-8	30	1590	1352	750	840	380	320
STEPHENS MS	35	1855	1577	1155	700	1023	848
WASHINGTON MS	35	1960	1666	1890	70	828	723
CABRILLO HS	35	5250	4463	4550	700	2217	2217
AVG	-	18,965	16,120	13,685	5,280	7,647	6,317

K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT	K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT												
	K	K/1	1	1/2	2	2/3	3	3/4	4	4/5	5	6-8	9-12
CHAVEZ ES	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
EDISON ES	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	3	1	3	0	0
GARFIELD ES	5	0	5	0	4	1	4	0	5	0	4	0	0
LAFAYETTE ES	6	0	6	0	6	0	6	0	3	3	3	0	0
WEBSTER ES	5	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	4	0	0
HUDSON K-8	2	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	3	0	3	13	0
MUIR K-8	4	0	4	0	4	1	4	0	4	0	4	6	0
STEPHENS MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
WASHINGTON MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	0
CABRILLO HS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
AVG	29	0	29	0	28	2	28	0	25	4	23	71	146

Sources: Current Enrollment from CBEDS 2012. Projections from "LgBch13Mod" Study. Site Data based on 2012 Facilities Annual Request.

**Master Plan Scope (MJR=Major, MIN=Minor, MOD=Moderate, A=Addition, GM=General Maintenance, CNVRT=Conversion)

**Enrollment Trend Legend: ↑ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); → denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes decreasing trend (<-2%).



FACILITIES CAPACITATOR 2013

Planning Area F: Wilson

Elementary

SCHOOL	SITE										USE													ENROLLMENT							CAPACITY						K-12 CLASSROOM COUNT																					
	Master Plan Group	Master Plan Scope	Acres	Students Per Acre	Permanent Classrooms	Temporary Classrooms	Portable	Bungalow	Russell	Total Classrooms	Used as K-5, K-8, 6-8, or 9-12	Used as SDC	Used as TK	Used for RSP/SPEECH	Used for Specialist	Used as Computer Lab	Used as Science Lab	K-8 Elective (Music, Chorus, PE)	Total Academic Classrooms	Used as Pre-K	Used as CDC	Used as Head Start	Used for Kids Club/Avid	Used as PTA/Parent Center	Used as WRAP	Used as Other	Vacant	Academic Use %	2012 Regular	2012 SDC	2012 Total	2013 Regular	2013 SDC	2013 Total	2013-2017 Trend**	Total Students in Boundary	Total Living In/Attending In	Current Loading Factor	Total Capacity	85% Capacity	Permanent Capacity	Temporary Capacity	Open Seats (Academic Only)	Open Seats (w/ Non-Academic)	K	K/1	1	1/2	2	2/3	3	3/4	4	4/5	5	6-8	9-12	
BIXBY ES	2	MOD	10.3	56	22	9	9	0	0	31	16	6	0	1	1	1	0	0	25	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	81%	464	47	531	475	46	521	-7%	623	344	30	930	791	660	270	309	159	3	0	3	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	
BRYANT ES	2	MJR	3.72	98	10	8	6	0	2	18	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	89%	328	39	367	332	39	371	6%	417	230	30	540	459	300	240	83	83	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	
BURBANK ES	1	MJRA	5.55	140	20	14	14	0	0	34	25	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	29	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	82%	802	0	802	807	0	807	14%	985	713	30	1020	867	600	420	128	8	4	0	5	0	4	1	4	0	4	0	3	0	0		
FREMONT ES	3	MOD/A	3.73	124	15	5	5	0	0	20	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	95%	487	0	487	503	0	503	15%	509	423	30	600	510	450	150	23	-37	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0		
GANT ES	2	MJRA	11	59	21	13	13	0	0	34	20	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	27	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	2	79%	602	56	658	592	56	648	-6%	396	332	30	1020	867	630	390	272	122	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	4	0	3	0	0	
KETTERING ES	3	MOD	10.3	34	16	7	7	0	0	23	11	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	18	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	78%	326	35	361	332	36	368	11%	142	108	30	690	587	480	210	239	149	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	
LEE ES	3	MOD	3.72	263	39	5	1	4	0	44	32	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	80%	946	1	947	917	1	918	-8%	1140	881	30	1320	1122	1170	150	283	73	5	0	6	0	5	1	5	0	4	1	4	0	0		
LOWELL ES	2	MOD	9	83	26	7	5	2	0	33	22	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	30	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	91%	702	52	754	696	51	747	-10%	623	580	30	990	842	780	210	146	86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	3	0	3	0	0		
MANN ES	3	MIN/A	3.72	91	18	8	4	0	4	26	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	13	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	4	50%	335	0	335	337	0	337	7%	314	196	30	780	663	540	240	355	205	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	
NAPLES ES	3	MOD/A	4.37	77	6	8	4	4	0	14	13	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	342	1	343	351	1	352	16%	343	267	30	420	357	180	240	-13	-73	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	0		
WILLARD ES	1	MIN/A	3.57	223	17	19	15	4	0	36	25	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	29	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	81%	797	1	798	808	1	809	11%	1055	749	30	1080	918	510	570	192	102	3	1	4	0	4	1	4	0	4	0	4	0	0		
TINCHER K-8	2	MOD/A	10.6	104	31	26	26	0	0	57	32	5	1	3	0	2	1	1	45	0	3	0	2	1	0	3	1	79%	935	17	952	842	15	857	-43%	435	284	30	1710	1454	930	780	608	398	2	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	3	0	4	13	0	
HILL MS	1	MJR	16.6	60	33	11	8	3	0	44	25	4	0	3	0	2	0	5	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	89%	855	60	915	824	58	882	-13%	94	60	35	1540	1309	1155	385	625	450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	
JEFFERSON MS	2	MJR	7.38	124	39	6	6	0	0	45	34	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	89%	870	11	881	865	11	876	-7%	1644	700	35	1575	1339	1385	210	694	624	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0
ROGERS MS	3	MIN/A	6.78	133	24	6	0	0	6	30	21	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	97%	845	41	886	861	42	903	10%	600	535	35	1050	893	840	210	164	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0		
WILSON HS	3	MOD	28.1	148	117	38	38	0	0	155	139	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	3961	154	4115	3985	159	4144	-4%	4343	2677	35	5425	4611	4095	1330	1310	1135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Planning Area Totals	AVG										AVG																																															
	138	114	454	190	161	17	12	644		453	47	4	21	5	17	4	14	565	0	10	1	11	7	13	15	21	85%	13,617	515	14,132	13,527	516	14,043	-1%	13,663	9079	--	20,690	17,587	14,685	6,005	5,418	3,648	35	1	39	0	36	6	35	1	31	4	31	93	139		

Sources: Current Enrollment from CBEDS 2012. Projections from "LgSch131Mod" Study, Site Data based on 2012 Facilities Annual Request.

*Master Plan Scope (MJR=Major, MIN=Minor, MOD=Moderate, A=Addition, GM=General Maintenance, CNVRT=Conversion)

**Enrollment Trend Legend: ↑ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); ↔ denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes decreasing trend (<-2%).

Appendix B

District Facilities Data by ~~School~~

FACILITIES



2012 - 2013 School Snapshot

DISTRICTWIDE

GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

874	ACREAGE	6,359,841	TOTAL BUILDING SQ. FT.
83	TOTAL K-12 SITES	43	ES
		11	K-8
		15	MS
		12	HS
		1	K-12
		1	Pre-K

ACADEMIC USE + CLASSROOM COUNT

78%	ACADEMIC USE	22%	NON-ACADEMIC USE
4,023	TOTAL CLASSROOMS	2,810	PERMANENT CLASSROOMS
		1,213	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS
		965	PORTABLE
		153	BUNGALOW
		101	RUSSELL

CLASSROOMS BY GRADE + TYPE

GRADE	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017					
Pre-K	2	197	3	195	6	195	23	198	4	168	22	166	536	931	242
K	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	
1-5	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	
6-8	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	
9-12	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	
SDC	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	
Other	115	18	97	23	31	86	49	36	78	36	36	18	140	284	

ENROLLMENT HISTORY + PROJECTIONS²

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Regular	80,368	79,680	78,648	78,812	77,007	77,055	76,218	76,596	76,742	77,404
SDC	2,147	2,449	2,383	2,653	2,903	2,905	2,859	2,867	2,814	2,882
Total	83,015	82,129	81,031	81,465	79,910	79,960	79,077	79,463	79,556	80,286
Trend					LAST FIVE YEARS ↓ -4%					NEXT FIVE YEARS ↗ 0%

¹ Enrollments only include K-8 Music, Art, Chorus, and Physical Education
² Enrollment Trend Legend: ↗ denotes an increasing trend (>2%); ↘ denotes no significant change (-2% to +2%); ↓ denotes a decreasing trend (<-2%).
 Sources: 2008-2012 CIBES, 2013-2017 Decision Inside Moderate Projections, 2012 Facilities Annual Request.

Appendix C
Long Beach Unified School District Facility Master Plan Update
List of Administrative Facilities

Site	Address	Acres	# Bldgs	Built	Leased	Square Footage	# Floors	Condition
Administration	1515 Hughes Way	1.1	1	1996	N	78,936	4	General Maintenance
Facilities & Maintenance	2425 Webster Avenue	5.9	10	1988	N	59,880	1	Minor Renovation
Multimedia Service	880 Locust Avenue	0.3	1	1940	N	12,406	1	Major Renovation
Personnel Commission*	999 Atlantic Avenue	0.35	1	1989	N	19,700	3	Minor Renovation
Transportation Yard	2700 Pine Avenue	0.23	1	1950	N	10,000	1	Major / Replace
Teacher Resource Center	1299 East 32nd Street	0.51	23	1994	N	22,080	1	Minor Renovation
CDC Administration - The Willows*	4310 Long Beach Boulevard	0.41	2		N	18,000	2	Moderate Renovation
Central Services	2201 East Market Street	8.09	1	1988	N	151,147	1	Minor Renovation
Nutrition Services	3333 Airport Way	3.66	1	1993	N	138,000	2	General Maintenance
Security & Emergency Prep.	5250 Los Coyotes Diagonal	0.22	3		N	2,880	1	Major Renovation

* Property is under consideration for replacement or disposition as surplus

Appendix D
Long Beach Unified School District Facility Master Plan Update
Major Project Listing Recommendations As Of January 29, 2013
Note: Priorities are Subject to Change

Project ID No	Site Name	Planning Area	Group	2008 Scope of Work	2013 Changes/Recommendations
1	New Small High School #1 (McBride)	C	1	Convert to Small High School	
2	New Middle School #1 (Nelson)	E	1	New Middle School	
3	Roosevelt Elementary School	E	1	Major Renovation	Reconstruction
4	Cabrillo High School - Pool	D	1	New Pool	
5	Jordan High School	A	1	Major Renovation	
6	New Small High School #2 (Browning Site)	E	1	New Small High School	
7	New Small High School #3 (Jordan Plus)	A	1	Convert to Small High School	
8	New Small High School #4 (Butler Site)	F	1	New Small High School	Convert to Small High School
9	Willard Elementary School*	F	1	Minor Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Addition
10	New Small High School #5 (TBD)*	TBD	2	Assess need for additional small high school every 5 years	
11	Hill Middle School*	F	1	Major Renovation	
12	Hamilton Middle School*	A	1	Major Renovation	
13	Millikan High School*	C	1	Major Renovation	
14	Avalon K - 12*	G	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Moderate Renovation / Addition
15	Burnett Elementary School	E	1	Major Renovation / Addition	
16	Twain Elementary School	B	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
17	Garfield Elementary School	D	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
18	Burbank Elementary School	F	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
19	Stephens Middle School	D	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
20	Addams Elementary School	A	1	Major Renovation / Addition	
21	Stevenson Elementary School	E	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	
22	Hudson K - 8	D	1	Major Renovation / Addition	
23	Marte Elementary School	A	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
24	Holmes Elementary School	B	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
25	Riley Elementary School	B	1	Major Renovation / Addition	TBD - Under Review - Currently interim housing for Newcomb K-8
26	Keller Site	C	3	Major Renovation	
27	Lindsey Middle School	A	1	Major Renovation / Addition	
28	Bancroft Middle School	B	1	Major Renovation	
29	Marshall Middle School	C	1	Major Renovation	
30	Carver Elementary School	C	1	Moderate Renovation	
31	Hi Hill Outdoor Education Center	A	1	Major Renovation	TBD - Interim Closure
32	Reid HS	C	1	New Alternative School	General Maintenance
33	PAAL	E	1	Relocate to Poly Main Campus	Moderate Renovation / Site Expansion
34	New Elementary 1 - Site TBD	A	1	New Elementary School (poly PAAL)	New Elementary School

Project ID No	Site Name	Planning Area	Group	2008 Scope of Work	2013 Changes/Recommendations
35	Tucker Site	F	3	Major Renovation	Major Renovation (Administrative Use)
36	New Elementary 1 - Jordan*	A	2	New Elementary School	
37	Bixby Elementary School	F	2	Moderate Renovation	Moderate Renovation / PK -SDC use
38	Buffum School	F	3	Moderate Renovation	Major Renovation/Addition
39	Renaissance High School*	E	2	Moderate Renovation	Major Renovation
40	Lakewood High School	B	1	Moderate Renovation	Major Renovation
41	Wilson High School	F	1	Moderate Renovation	Major Renovation
42	Polytechnic High School	E	1	Minor Renovation	Major Renovation / Addition
43	Los Cerritos Elementary School	E	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
44	Lindbergh Middle School	A	1	Minor Renovation	
45	Signal Hill Elementary School	E	1	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Addition
46	Birney Elementary School	E	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Addition
47	Whittier Elementary School	E	1	Moderate Renovation / Addition	
48	Webster Elementary School	D	2	Major Renovation / Addition	
49	Muir K - 8	D	2	Major Renovation / Addition	
50	King Elementary School	A	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Minor Renovation
51	Prisk Elementary School	C	2	Minor Renovation / Addition	
52	MacArthur Elementary School	B	2	Major Renovation	
53	Newcomb K - 8	C	2	Major Renovation / Addition	Reconstructed (see District-Wide Projects)
54	McKinley Elementary School	A	2	Major Renovation / Addition	
55	Gompers Elementary School	B	2	Major Renovation / Addition	
56	Jefferson Middle School	F	2	Major Renovation / Addition	
57	Longfellow Elementary School	E	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	
58	Grant Elementary School	A	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Moderate Renovation / Converted to K-5
59	Burcham K - 8	C	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Administrative Use
60	Monroe Site	B	2	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
61	Barton Elementary School	A	2	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
62	Gant Elementary School	F	2	Major Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
63	Lowell Elementary School	F	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Moderate Renovation
64	Hughes Middle School	E	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Addition
65	Bryant Elementary School	F	2	Major Renovation	Moderate Renovation
66	Tincher K - 8	F	2	Moderate Renovation / Addition	
67	New Elementary 2 - Poly**	E	2	New Elementary School	Minor Renovation / Addition
68	Lincoln Elementary School	E	2	Minor Renovation	
69	New Middle School 2 - Poly**	E	2	New Middle School	
70	New Small High School #6 (TBD)	TBD	3	Assess need for additional small high school every 5 years	
71	Lafayette Elementary School	D	3	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation / Addition
72	Cubberly K - 8	C	3	Moderate Renovation / Addition	
73	Edison Elementary School	D	3	Moderate Renovation	Major Renovation
74	Hoover Middle School	B	3	Moderate Renovation / Addition	Major Renovation
75	Washington Middle School	D	3	Moderate Renovation	Moderate Renovation
76	Madison Elementary School	B	3	Moderate Renovation / Addition	