

**Riverside Unified School District  
Operations Division**

Board Operations Subcommittee Meeting  
3380 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Riverside, Conference Room 1 A/B  
February 28, 2012 – 3:30 p.m.

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 3:31 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Mr. Tom Hunt, Dr. Charles L. Beaty, and Dr. Kirk Lewis

Also present were Mr. Mike Fine, Mrs. Janet Dixon, Mr. Kevin Hauser, Ken Mueller, Ms. Barbara Heyman, The Planning Center, and Ms. Lizette Delgado (Recorder)

**Discussion Items**

**1. Re-Purposing of Hyatt Elementary School**

Dr. Lewis stated that staff presented a proposal concerning the potential re-purposing of Hyatt Elementary School to the Board of Education at the Study Session on Tuesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, and that the Board of Education supported further study of the concept. Dr. Lewis said that the basic proposal is to close Hyatt Elementary School and reuse the school for the STEM academy to allow for expansion of the program and it is expected that 240 – 280 students will attend the academy in 2012-13.

Dr. Lewis presented an update on the tentative timeline and stated that information on potential school attendance area adjustment scenarios would be presented for review and comment by the Subcommittee. He made comments on the Hyatt staff meeting held on Wednesday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, and said that staff recognized the instructional challenges at the school and expressed that the STEM Academy is a good option for students. Dr. Lewis said that the item will be presented at the March 5<sup>th</sup> Board meeting for approval and that if approved, staff will initiate the process to adjust attendance areas to various elementary schools to accommodate students in the Hyatt attendance area. He informed the subcommittee that he and Mrs. Dixon will be meeting with the principals at Emerson, Longfellow, Highland, Pachappa, and Taft Elementary Schools to present the options for the proposed attendance area adjustments.

Ms. Dixon presented three different scenarios for the proposed attendance area adjustments: Option A, Option B, and Option C, and stated that Option C appears to be the most feasible option because the schools are within walking distance for students.

Dr. Lewis added that a Hyatt Parent Meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow, Wednesday, February 29<sup>th</sup>, to inform parents on the Board of Education's decision to explore the re-purpose of Hyatt Elementary School.

Subcommittee members requested an update on the RCTC construction of the block wall close to the railroad tracks in the Hyatt vicinity. Mr. Hunt made comments regarding the naming of the STEM Academy and the wearing of uniforms by students attending the academy.

**2. Potential Re-allocation of Designated but Unused Measure B Funds for Energy Conservation Projects**

Dr. Lewis stated that given the structural deficit in the District budget, it is prudent to investigate and consider the implementation of projects that will generate savings to the district's utility budget. For that reason, this item was presented for discussion by the Subcommittee.

Mr. Mueller provided information for upgrading current energy management systems at about a dozen sites, which will yield an estimated annual savings to the general fund of \$159,150. The net cost to install the new controls would be just over \$1.2 million with a payback of approximately 8 years. After a brief discussion, the subcommittee asked staff to bring back a proposal to re-prioritize the list of projects to be financed by remaining Measure funds.

**Action Items**

**3. Parking Lot Lighting at Schools**

A list of schools without parking lot lights was presented at the Operations/Board Subcommittee meeting on 2/2/2012. A prioritized version of the list was also provided, but the sorting of the schools by priority was later found to be erroneous. A correctly sorted prioritized list of schools without parking lot lights was presented for the subcommittee's approval. Staff also recommended that the Subcommittee determine an initial group of schools that could be recommended to the Board of Education for installation of parking lot lights.

Mr. Hunt moved and Dr. Beaty seconded that the list of schools with parking lot lighting needs be approved as presented and to move forward for the Board of Education's approval of the funding for the initial installation of parking lot lights for schools in Group A (Adams, Emerson, Fremont, Liberty, Longfellow and Madison Elementary Schools, and Central Middle School), in the amount of \$256,000, using Measure B funds. The item will be presented for Board of Education approval at a future meeting.

**4. Resolution No. 2011/12-40 – Resolution of the Board of Education of the Riverside Unified School District Making Certain Required Written Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Adopting the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the John W. North High School Athletic Facilities Master Plan Completion Project (Project); Approving the Project; and Delegating Authority to Execute a Notice of Determination**

Dr. Lewis stated that the approval of Resolution No. 2011/12-40 was presented for Board of Education approval at the February 6, 2012, meeting and that the item was pulled from the

agenda at the request of Board Member Beaty so that the CEQA document could be discussed by the Subcommittee. Ms. Barbara Heyman with The Planning Center attended the meeting and answered questions subcommittee members had concerning the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study.

Dr. Beaty moved and Mr. Hunt seconded to present the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the adoption of Resolution No. 2011/12-40, to the Board of Education for consideration of approval at the March 5, 2012.

**5. Resolution No. 2011/12-41 – Resolution of the Board of Education of the Riverside Unified School District Rendering City and County Zoning Ordinances Inapplicable to the John W. North High School Athletic Facilities Master Plan Completion Project Pursuant to Government Code Section 53094**

Dr. Lewis stated that the approval of Resolution No. 2011/12-41 was presented for Board of Education approval at the February 6, 2012, meeting and that the item was pulled from the agenda at the request of Board Member Beaty so that the item could be reviewed and discussed by the Subcommittee. Ms. Barbara Heyman with The Planning Center attended the meeting and answered questions subcommittee members had concerning the resolution, which renders city and county ordinances inapplicable to the John W. North High School Athletic Facilities Master Plan Completion project.

Dr. Beaty moved and Mr. Hunt seconded to approve that Resolution No. 2011/12-41 be presented to the Board of Education for consideration of approval at the March 5, 2012 Board of Education meeting.

**6. Resolution No. 2011/12-48 – Resolution of the Board of Education of the Riverside Unified School District Approving a School Facilities Needs Analysis, Adopting Alternative School Facility Fees in Compliance with Government Code Section 65995.5, 65995.6, and 65995.7, Adopting Responses to Public Comments Received, and Making Related Findings and Determinations**

Dr. Lewis stated that Resolution No. 2011/12-48 adopts the findings of the 2012 School Facilities Needs Analysis (SFNA), which is a routine item that it is done annually, and that if the resolution is approved by the Board of Education the new Level II fees would go into effect immediately. He added that the adoption of the 2012 SFNA remains in effect for one year, or until the adoption of a subsequent SFNA, whichever occurs first. Dr. Lewis said that the new Level II residential fee of \$3.83 per square foot replaces the Level II fee of \$3.26 per square foot which was adopted on March 21, 2011, and is set to expire on March 21, 2012. He mentioned that if the Level II fee were allowed to expire without adoption of a new Level II fee, the fee would revert to the District-adopted statutory amount, currently \$3.20 per square foot. The resolution will be presented to the Board of Education for adoption at the March 19, 2012, meeting.

Subcommittee members requested information concerning how much money was generated by collecting the developer fees last year in comparison with prior years, and the average

home size and its impact. Mr. Fine added that developer fees funds are used to pay debt service; therefore, providing relief to the general fund.

Mr. Hunt moved and Dr. Beaty seconded to present the approval of the 2012 School Facilities Needs Analysis and the adoption of Resolution No. 2011/12-48, to Board of Education at the March 19, 2012, meeting.

**7. Dugout Fencing**

Dr. Lewis stated that because of concerns that have arisen regarding the design of the fencing in front of high school dugouts in respect to the safety of the players, staff was presenting the subcommittee with fencing options to review and to determine which design should be considered as the standard for installation on District baseball and softball fields. The subcommittee was also asked to decide whether all of the dugout fencing at schools should be retrofitted with the chosen standard.

Dr. Lewis presented background information on the item and stated that during the staff investigation it was discovered that 4 ft. is the most common height used for dugout fencing. Pictures of existing dugouts with a variety of fencing designs at District schools were presented to the subcommittee.

Subcommittee members discussed the information presented and agreed that a 6 ft. padded fence is the appropriate height to provide protection to players in the dugout. They also agreed to modify all current dugout fencing to the recommended standard. Subcommittee members requested information concerning the cost of green vinyl coated fencing compared with traditional chain link galvanized fence fabric. Staff will present the requested information along with the item for consideration and approval at a future subcommittee meeting.

**Public Relations**

**8. Unscheduled Communications**

There were no requests to speak to the subcommittee.

**Members Comments:**

There were no comments from the subcommittee members.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.