

2006 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN (FMP)

The Hayward Unified School District (HUSD) Administration determined that a comprehensive master plan is essential in addressing the physical condition of aging facilities and providing an improved organizational structure of the Facilities Department.

On December 10, 2004, the District issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the development and implementation of a District-Wide Facilities Master Plan (2006 FMP).

In 2005, HUSD contracted with Vanir Construction Management, Inc. (Vanir CM) for the comprehensive evaluation of existing facilities and operations in order to provide recommendations for the long-term facilities needs of the District. The 2006 FMP incorporates information collected from a community stakeholder group, newly adopted facility standards, demographic analysis, Departmental input, community input, facility assessments and funding studies. A copy of the full 2006 FMP is available in the Appendix.

SUMMARY OF FMP PROCESS

The 2006 FMP attempts to (1) define and outline the current situation; (2) provide comprehensive solutions to immediate and short-term challenges; and (3) provide guiding principles for anticipating long term needs.

In April 2005, the community stakeholder group, known as the Hayward Unified Schools Design Team (HUSDT), was formed in order to evaluate ways to provide fiscal solvency, endorse District facility standards (Education Specifications) and generate revenue from assets (property). The HUSDT recommended a standardized enrollment range, also known as Optimal Size, to the Superintendent. On November 9, 2005, the Board of Education adopted the Optimal Size enrollment range, resulting in Vanir CM's recommendation to close six elementary schools, with four ultimately closing.

FMP MISSION STATEMENT & GOALS

The intent of the 2006 FMP is to propose a building program at the forefront of educational design and provide a plan that ensures the quality and equity of facilities District-wide.

Essential elements and guiding principles of the 2006 FMP are designed to:

- Support curriculum initiatives that enhance the student environment.
- Balance enrollment levels.
- Create a single platform of Information Technology infrastructure for a wholly converged communication environment.
- Maximize the economic benefit from school construction and reconstruction.
- Develop standard operating procedures to maximize the useful life of the underlying assets.
- Develop a sustainable energy plan.
- Assist and sustain business development of under-represented populations.
- Identify and utilize innovative financing techniques.
- Develop asset management strategies.

The approved Optimal Size is as follows:

Board of Education approved	Optimal Size, enrollment range
Elementary Schools	650 - 750 students
Middle Schools	750 - 900 students
High Schools	2,000 - 2,200 students

Vanir CM and Betty Hansen of California Financial Services worked to create facility standards, called Education Specifications, in order to institute a standard measurement by which to evaluate existing facilities and to design future facilities. Education Specifications were presented to the HUSDT for review and endorsement. On December 15, 2005, the HUSDT endorsed the Education Specifications.

Demographic and enrollment analysis was provided by Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc. in order to properly assess State, Bay Area and local migration trends. Declining enrollment patterns were identified at all levels. As a result, HUSDT enrollment was forecasted to continue declining slowly and possibly stabilizing over time if residential development in Hayward can offset the loss of students.

Vanir CM interviewed HUSD Department heads in order to better understand operational issues and challenges. In addition to Departmental input, Vanir CM coordinated 14 community meetings to share information and gather community input related to Optimal Size, funding challenges, demographic findings and the 2006 FMP.

Vanir CM, along with VBN Architects, conducted a detailed assessment of all 41 District-owned sites and facilities, with the assessment findings detailed in the Condition Assessment Report. Designed to organize building system information relative to cost, the report provides cost figures representing what it would cost to repair or replace existing facilities, not provide new facilities or programmatic changes.

Vanir CM, Government Financial Strategies, California Financial Services and VBN Architects looked at alternative sources of funding. Detailed funding options were defined by State Modernization eligibility, local tax base bonding capacity and the Hayward Property Best Use Analysis data. It was determined that HUSD was (1) eligible to apply for over \$30 million in State Modernization funds; and (2) Hayward’s tax base could produce a maximum of \$327 million in bond money, if approved by voters. The District also pursued opportunities to use underutilized property to generate revenue without selling property.

On May 24, 2006, the Board of Education made the difficult decision to close four of the six recommended elementary schools.

On September 26, 2006, HUSD began formally realigning boundaries in order to implement the consolidation and closure of four elementary sites.

SCHOOL CLOSURES 2006 TO 2009

Subsequent to the 2006 FMP, the following schools were closed:

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| • Highland Elementary | Closed 2006 |
| • Shepherd Elementary | Closed 2007 |
| • John Muir Elementary | Closed 2008 |
| • Markham Elementary | Closed 2009 |

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Shifting demographics and enrollment patterns suggest that boundaries should be evaluated on a scheduled, consistent basis. Vanir CM recommended the evaluation of boundaries every five years.
- Departmental needs intersect at transportation, bell schedules, Board policies and in some cases, program offerings. Vanir CM recommended the evaluation of year-around schedules relative to transportation, bell schedules and strategic centralization of Special Education and ELL programs so as to maximize program offerings and minimize expenditures.
- Community input, the Condition Assessment Report findings and the logistics of transitional housing (project phasing) contribute to the recommendation to prioritize projects on a site-by-site basis. Vanir CM recommended prioritizing and phasing projects on a site-by-site basis in order to maximize productivity and minimize disruption to school operations.
- State funding, pegged to enrollment, creates a volatile financial situation for the District. Vanir CM recommended the development of an advisory group to seek and implement alternative funding sources, including asset management opportunities.
- In order to minimize construction escalation impacts and maximize purchasing power of potential bond funds, Vanir CM recommended placing a General Obligation Bond on the ballot as soon as possible.
- Planning and implementation logistics related to the aforementioned recommendations suggest a concerted effort by internal and external community. Vanir CM recommended the development of seven future planning teams to be implemented per District direction, starting with top priorities.
- Vanir CM recommended strategic updates to the Master Plan as these recommendations bring clarity to specific challenges such as asset management, recommendations from future planning teams, and boundary shifts.

PLANNING & DESIGN PRINCIPALS

New school designs include (1) self-contained buildings with open areas that can be easily supervised during or after school hours; (2) drive-by visibility for police supervision; (3) designated observation points for buildings and play areas during non-school hours; minimized pockets of hidden space; (5) well-defined entry/exit points; and (6) building materials that limit and discourage graffiti, vandalism and skateboarding. Considerations Include:

- Increase student safety during peak traffic hours by designating pick-up/drop-off zones and providing ample parking. During the design process, special attention should be given to traffic patterns and their effect on site layout.
- Locate kindergarten classrooms and play yards near the front of schools in order to provide better visibility and easy access during drop-off/pick-up times.
- Eliminate portable classrooms and replace with permanent classrooms.
- Position multi-purpose room near the front of the school to provide direct adjacency to parking lots for community events; (2) unobstructed visibility of drop-off/pick-up zones; and (3) an architecturally-expressive, community gathering place. Ensure that multi-purpose rooms are adequately sized to accommodate half of a school's enrollment at lunch.
- Provide flex rooms to be used at the discretion of site administration. More specifically, the recommendation is to provide two classroom size rooms (960 square feet) at the elementary school level, one large (2,000 square foot) room at the middle school level and eight 1,000 square foot rooms at the high school level.
- Provide small theaters at the high school level to better support the performing arts.
- Provide dedicated, small gyms in order to accommodate more athletic programs at the secondary level.

PRIORITIZATION, PHASING & TRANSITIONAL HOUSING

District needs cannot be addressed in one bond, therefore the prioritization of projects and phasing must be part of the strategic plan. Considerations include (1) distributing the work equitably throughout the District; (2) accommodate larger enrollments at schools with limited capacity; (3) define boundary shifts and then address resulting transportation changes; (4) minimize student displacement; (5) minimize school disruption during moving and construction; and (6) minimize the relocation of portables.

From the start of the planning process, it has been the intent of District Administration to (1) realign facilities and resources in a way that more equitably delivers education to students and (2) divide work within the four geographical district regions. This would address the short-term capacity requirements and is aligned with the long-term vision of the Master Plan.

Several project priorities were evaluated by Vanir CM and District Administration. While maximizing work at the middle school level was preferred by some, the need for increased site capacities at the elementary level was imperative to fiscal solvency. In all scenarios, projects at the high school level were too costly, and therefore not considered.

Renovation projects in any school bond/building program are complex and require the use of transitional housing. As the goal is to minimize student displacement, transitional housing strategies would include (1) utilizing closed school sites and (2) renovate and construct schools in their entirety, on unoccupied sites. The latter strategy would minimize disruption to school operations and maximize construction progress.

RECOMMENDED BOND PROJECTS

For planning purposes it was assumed that HUSD would pass a 55% voter approved bond measure of \$172 million. After a bond passing, the District would need to augment staff and develop policies and procedures so as to effectively manage a major capital expenditure program.

The table below depicts the recommended sequencing of projects next to projected costs, using figures from December 2005. Adjacent columns reflect estimated costs with inflation and escalation increases to the midpoint of construction, for the proposed phasing of four bonds. The figures depict an industry standard estimate of cost increases relayed over four year increments of time.

	Sum of Estimates: December 2005	1st Bond +15% Inflation 2008	2nd Bond +35% Inflation 2012	3rd Bond +55% Inflation 2016	4th Bond +75% Inflation 2020
East Avenue	24.7	28.4	33.4	38.3	43.3
Harder	23.6	27.2	31.9	36.6	41.4
Schafer Park	29.2	33.6	39.4	45.3	51.1
Tyrrell	23.4	26.9	31.5	36.2	40.9
MLK, Jr.	33.8	38.8	45.6	52.3	59.1
		154.9			
Bickwell	29.0	33.3	39.1	44.9	50.7
Bowman	34.1	38.1		52.9	59.7
Eldridge	24.0	27.6	32.4	37.2	42.0
Fairview	26.1	30.0	35.2	40.5	45.7
Ruus	23.7	27.3	32.0	36.8	41.5
Bret Harte	24.7	28.4	33.3	38.2	43.2
		172.1			
Cherryland	22.9	26.3	30.9	35.4	40.0
Cesar Chavez	27.1	31.2	36.6	42.0	47.4
Ochoa	33.6	38.6	45.3	52.0	58.8
Winton	31.3	36.0	42.3	48.6	54.9
Hayward	81.5	93.7	110.0	126.3	142.6
Mt. Eden	80.0	92.0	108.0	124.0	140.0
				428.4	
Eden Gardens	20.4	23.5	25.1	31.6	35.7
Longwood	21.2	24.4	28.6	32.9	37.1
Larin Eden	27.7	31.9	37.4	42.9	48.5
Palma Cela	20.7	23.8	28.0	32.1	36.2
Park	23.4	26.9	31.5	35.0	40.9
Southgate	24.0	27.6	32.4	37.2	42.0
Strobridge	21.7	25.0	29.3	33.6	38.0
Tennyson	69.0	79.4	93.2	107.0	120.8
					399.1