



Changing Lives by Design™

60 South Market, Suite 150, San Jose, California 95113



FACILITIES MASTER PLAN
CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
LPA PROJECT NO. 19141.10

DATE: March 17, 2020
TIME: 6:00-8:00PM
PLACE: GoToMeeting Conference Call

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE #04
Meeting Minutes

This report of the meeting's events, if not corrected within seven days of transmittal, shall be acknowledged as accurate and deemed as if accepted in writing by the addressee(s).

PRESENT

Jeff Bowman, COO
Britt Brittain, HVAC Technician
David Fung, Community Member
Piu Ghosh
Daric Jackson, Principal on Special Assignment
Kerstin Johnson, Principal, Collins ES
Leslie Mains, Information and Community Engagement
Audrey Prouse, Principal, Blue Hills ES
Mark Loundy, School Site Instructional Tech Specialist
Mike Veloria, Property Analyst
Brook Wallace, Parent
Jim Kisel, LPA
Walter Estay, LPA
Andrea Pippin, LPA

DISTRIBUTION

FMPC Members
FMP Website
Miu Cheung, Parent
Malini Gadepally
Monali Gadepally, Teacher
Rena Takahashi, Parent, McAuliffe School
Annie Yang, Parent
Jingna Zhang, Parent

Attachment: 20 0317 FMPC Mtg 04 Presentation.pdf

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

ITEM NO.

4.01 Introductions & Welcome:

- LPA facilitates this conference call with Andrea Pippin as the lead and Jim Kisel adding support throughout.

4.02 FMP Process To-Date:

- Andrea briefly reviews the project timeline, which remains on track to wrap in June.
- Andrea runs through the various modes of stakeholder engagements, resulting in 8,580 participants in 87 contact points.

4.03 FMP Diagram Review:

- Reiterating information provided at the Town Hall, the group reviews the legend of the master plan diagrams and identify the levels of work: modernization/repair,



ITEM NO.

reconfiguration, and new construction. Then, they walk through Garden Gate Elementary as an example of the levels of work and how the Educational Vision (Ed Specs) overlay onto the campus.

4.04 FMP Scopes of Work:

- As LPA develops the cost estimate, they use 17 different categories (scopes) of work, listed on slide 13. Andrea then goes through each category in more detail:
 1. **Repair and Refresh:** This reflects the costs developed by EMG (the firm partnering with LPA on the site assessments) and what they have identified as needing to be repaired or replaced within the next 10 years.
 2. **Reconfigure Classrooms:** General education, kindergarten, and special education classrooms as well as student collaboration spaces that show as a hatched space on the diagrams. These spaces use existing building areas to create classroom spaces.
 3. **New Classrooms to Eliminate Portables:** New construction for general education, kindergarten, and special education classrooms as well as student collaboration spaces. These new spaces are priced as stick-built construction, not as new portables.
 4. **Science, Arts, and Electives Spaces:** New or reconfigured spaces dedicated to all electives including Science, Art, Music, Wood Shop, Culinary Arts, and the Design and Innovation Labs.
 5. **Student Union and Food Service:** New or reconfigured spaces at the Middle Schools for a Student Union. New or reconfigured spaces at all grade levels for kitchens and serving areas. This scope also includes lunch shelters.
 6. **Library and Elementary Assembly Spaces:** New or reconfigured spaces at all grade levels for Libraries. New or reconfigured spaces at elementary schools for assembly spaces (typically the GLC assembly area).
 7. **Student Support and Counseling Services:** New or reconfigured spaces for the Learning Center and Wellness Center at all sites.
 8. **Administration and Staff Support:** New or reconfigured spaces at all sites for administration, main entry, faculty lounge, professional development, and workspaces, School Site IT Specialist spaces, and spaces for PTA or other parent volunteers. This scope includes work to the Admin/front office that may be needed to create a secured, single point of entry but does not include fencing.
 9. **Event Center:** New or reconfigured Event Center space(s) at the Middle Schools.
 10. **Existing Building Systems, Toilets, and Improved Energy Efficiency:** New restroom buildings, reconfigured restrooms to repair sewer lines underneath the building and relieve plumbing issues, other improvements to HVAC units, lighting fixtures, and electrical fixtures not identified in the EMG assessment scope.
 11. **Site Utilities:** Mainly captures electrical capacity upgrades at all sites.
 12. **Safety and Security:** Includes but is not limited to fencing and gates to support a secured campus, safety locks for all existing and reconfigured spaces, fire alarms, public address systems and other communication systems, signage, exterior lighting.
 13. **Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off, and Entry Plaza:** Creation of a clearly identifiable front door to campus. Entry plaza could include student/parent waiting area with seating. The scope also includes improvements to parking and drop off areas, reconfiguring and/or expanding these areas.
 14. **Outdoor Learning Environments and Quads:** Exterior spaces that serve as an extension of the classroom, typically in between classroom wings. These areas promote the use of outdoor environments as classroom spaces.



ITEM NO.

15. **Exterior Play Spaces, Playfields, and Hardcourts:** Play apparatuses with rubber surfacing, fields (improved grass field with a perimeter track at elementary schools and synthetic turf field with rubber running track at middle schools), improved/expanded hardcourts. This scope includes all components in a Kindergarten play yard, including shade.
16. **Flexible Furniture:** an allowance for new furniture in all learning and professional development spaces.
17. **Technology Infrastructure and Equipment:** Classroom presentation technologies, school site server rooms, and increased wireless internet capacity.

4.05 Total Program Cost:

- Costs were developed to reflect the finalized master plan diagrams which overlay EMG's needs assessment findings of anticipated repairs and replacements over the next ten years with the educational program vision. Certain unknowns were not included in this estimate, which includes things like escalation since it's unknown at this point as to when projects will be constructed. Also excluded from the cost estimate are costs associated with any off-site work that may become necessary or the utilization of additional temporary housing due to construction.
- Slides 25 and 26 list the costs for each school site and the totals for all Elementary/K-8 Schools, all Middle Schools, and their combined district-wide schools total:
 - Elementary Schools: \$ 700,983,000
 - Middle Schools: \$ 412,932,000
 - Schools Total (2020\$) \$ 1,088,406,000
- Elementary school sites range from \$20M to \$58.5M.
- Middle school sites range from \$35M to \$113.7M.
- Large influencers of cost are the amount of new construction at the sites.
- Middle schools have the largest cost range, at the low end are Cupertino and Lawson Middle Schools which have the most recent large improvements. The remainder of the sites carry heavier cost loads of new construction for Event Centers and 2-story classrooms.

4.06 Stakeholder Groups Priorities:

- Andrea reviews the priorities of the various stakeholder groups that have already been surveyed. Much of the base information has already been presented, however the take-away is how LPA translates the priorities into the various scope-of-work categories. Slides 28 through 32 identify the top priorities for the groups, highlighting the priorities that were district-wide, elementary-only, and middle-only.
- Slide 33 lists all identified priorities together, then highlights the priorities that were repeated in 3 or more groups.
- The goal of presenting this data, ultimately to the Board, is to help them make the ultimate decisions for future project lists.

4.07 FMPC Prioritization:

- At this point in the meeting, participants are asked to access an online survey to vote for their priorities.
- LPA acknowledges that individuals may have an affinity for a particular site but asks that they wear their 'district-wide hats' and vote, unobjectively based on the site needs. The following lists the survey questions asked:
- Do you think the district's Elementary and K-8 Schools should receive improvement/new construction first, or should the Middle Schools?
 - Elementary and K-8 Schools
 - Middle Schools



ITEM NO.

- Select six (6) schools, based on need, that you think should receive improvement/new construction first. *(Survey lists the school sites and allows participants to select up to 6 choices).*
- The Facilities Master Plan's cost estimate was divided into seventeen (17) scope of work categories. Given the choice, which four (4) scope categories do you think should be addressed first? *(Survey lists the scope categories and allows participants to select up to 4).*
 - The subsequent questions dig into the scope-of-work categories, breaking the 17 categories into 70 items to vote on. Each of these questions asked the participant to indicate, based on need, how important an item was to them. Zero being of least importance/priority and 10 being very high priority. If a participant had no opinion they were allowed to skip.
- During the survey, participants could ask clarifying questions to LPA. Participants were completed with the survey in about 30 minutes.
- Andrea shared the results with the group, which were immediately ready for the first three questions. The scope detail will take additional formatting and analysis but will be available on the FMP website.
- Results that are immediately available are (from 11 participants):
 1. Do you think the district's Elementary and K-8 Schools should receive improvement/new construction first, or should the Middle Schools?
 - a. Elementary and K-8 Schools: 5 votes
 - b. Middle Schools: 6 votes
 2. Select six (6) schools, based on need, that you think should receive improvement/new construction first. The top 6 schools are:
 - a. Hyde Middle School (8 votes)
 - b. Stocklmeir Elementary School (7 votes)
 - c. Kennedy Middle School (7 votes)
 - d. Miller Middle School (5 votes)
 - e. Blue Hills Elementary School (4 votes)
 - f. McAuliffe School (K-8) (3 votes)
 3. The Facilities Master Plan's cost estimate was divided into seventeen (17) scope of work categories. Given the choice, which four (4) scope categories do you think should be addressed first? The top 4 scope categories are:
 - a. Construct New Classrooms to Eliminate Portables (8 votes)
 - b. Event Center at Middle Schools (6 votes)
 - c. Repair and Refresh (needs assessment scope) (5 votes)
 - d. Reconfigure Classrooms (tied with 4 votes)
 - e. Student Union, Dining, and Food Service (tied with 4 votes)
- Discussion and Questions:
 - Some felt conflicted on voting for priorities at this point, without knowing the amount of funding available. At this point, all of the district's funding for facilities has been exhausted or is already allocated. This exercise, especially when it reaches the Board workshop, will be valuable in setting an amount of funding needed for a first phase of implementation.
 - The full master plan need (over \$1B) is, naturally far greater than the district's ability to fund it all at once. This prioritization exercise is one piece in a much larger puzzle that will inform future funding efforts.

4.08 Next Steps:

- April 23rd: Board Workshop
 - After reviewing the full Facilities Master Plan documents and stakeholder priorities, the Board will participate in their own prioritization activity.
- June 4th: Final FMP Presentation to the Board
- June 18th: Final FMP Approval



ITEM NO.

- FMPC members and all other stakeholders are encouraged to attend the Board meetings to express their perspectives and maintain their participation in the FMP process.
- This FMP remains to be a 'living document' that can and should be revisited every 3-5 years. Over time, demographics, funding, priorities, or other factors could change which shifts the district's needs. Periodical checks and updates are recommended in order to keep the FMP relevant and remaining as a roadmap for the district's facility improvements.

Submitted by: Andrea Pippin, LPA