



**Pacifica School District**  
**Facilities Plan/Needs Analysis**  
**2017-2018**

# Table of Contents

	Page
I. Executive Summary	3
II. Statement of Purpose	4
III. Current and Future Needs	5
A. Needs Identification	5
B. Conclusion	6
IV. Educational Program	8
A. History and Education Transition	8
B. Community of the School District	8
C. Educational Goals and Practices	8
D. Educational System	9
V. Facilities	11
A. Educational Facilities	11
1. Evaluation Procedure	11
2. Space Inventory Summary	12
B. Workforce Housing	14
VI. Demographic Study	15
VII. Implementation Plan	16
A. Projects Summary	17
B. Other Projects by School Site	24
C. Facilities Master Plan	25
D. Financing Plan	26
E. Schedule	27
F. Review	27
VIII. Appendix	28
A. Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) sample form	28
B. School Safety Checklist sample form	31
C. Workforce Housing Project Timeline	32

## **I. Executive Summary**

Pacifica School District has developed this Facilities Plan (Plan) as a fundamental element in our commitment to meeting our goal of providing safe facilities conducive to learning. This goal is not only a significant part of our 2017-20 Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) but also critical to our goal of “preparing students for an evolving world.”

The Plan identifies our current and future facilities needs based on several factors. It also presents an implementation plan based on anticipated funding that includes the development of a Facilities Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan will take the information developed through this plan and perform a more thorough and robust evaluation and assessment of our needs and proposed projects to ensure we identify and define the needs with proper clarity and have the best solutions in place to meet them.

With support from our PSD community and our neighbors throughout Pacifica we are confident that this plan will ensure we have the best resources in place to deliver the quality education that we are committed to providing the students we serve.

## **II. Statement of Purpose**

### **Why do we need a Facilities Plan/Needs Analysis?**

- Our educational program needs are defined in the district's 2017-20 LCAP (Local Control & Accountability Plan) and our facilities must be able to properly support and enable us to address these needs and achieve our goals
- Our Plan identifies needs that will support our current LCAP goals and enable us to deliver a consistent and equitable level of learning to every student we serve
- Our Plan identifies needs beyond our current year and current LCAP term that will support long-term District goals
- Our Plan sets the course for considered and intentional use of financial resources that serve and are in support of our identified needs
- Our Plan creates and maintains a systematic process for the continuous planning of educational facilities that will meet the changing needs of our students and the community we serve
- Our aging facilities are in need of repair or replacement in order to provide proper learning environments for our students and to preserve asset value
- Our current funding sources support operations but there is no funding available for major facilities and technology needs such as replacements, upgrades, or modernizations dictated by programming needs. The Facilities Plan is essential in order to establish a road map for a considered and intentional program to execute the projects that address these needs and make adjustments as necessary

### III. Current and Future Needs

The focus of this Facilities Plan is to support our Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) goal of recruiting and retaining qualified staff and providing safe and attractive facilities that promote student achievement:

2017-20 LCAP Goal #1: *Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and educational support staff,* instructional materials that align to the state standards in the core content areas of ELA/ELD, mathematics, science, history-social science, physical education, and health education; as well as *safe facilities that are conducive for learning.* (Conditions for Learning)

The District has described specific needs and target actions to accomplish in order to successfully meet the goal:

- Identified Need: A well maintained, safe, and clean learning environment that supports 21<sup>st</sup> century learning
  - Target action: Address deferred maintenance needs
  - Target action: Address issues of safety and security
  - Target action: Apply environmental impact focus
  - Target action: Enhance our learning environment
  - Target action: Support 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environment by purchasing technology and improve infrastructure
- Identified Need: Attractive incentives for qualified teachers and staff to join and remain with Pacifica School District in a highly competitive hiring climate
  - Target action: Provide below-market rate housing for teachers and staff as a benefit available to District employees

The District's intent is for the Facilities Plan to address meeting the goal not only for the current school year but for the remainder of the LCAP term (through 2020) and beyond. The District takes this long-term perspective when evaluating its facilities and in its needs identification and evaluation process.

#### A. Needs Identification

The District considers its facilities utilization and planning over the long term when identifying its facilities needs. These needs are also based on the District's strategic goals as identified in the LCAP, enrollment projections based on population trends, and current space inventory.

Additionally there are four areas of focus that influenced and will continue to impact the development and refinement of this plan:

- Partnership and Collaboration: We will develop and strengthen partnerships within and outside of the Pacifica School District community that will support the District programs and leverage opportunities to enhance 21<sup>st</sup> century learning

## **Needs Identification (continued)**

- Community Outreach: We will communicate and promote the qualities of Pacifica School District to attract and retain families, staff, and partnerships and to expand positive connections with the greater community
- Facilities and Maintenance: We will provide well-maintained, attractive facilities that are *flexible and adaptable* to meet both the present and future needs of the students, staff, and community
- Funding Strategy: We will develop and maintain an adequate and stable funding strategy that will enable the District to implement the plan while not adversely impacting our instructional mission

## **B. Conclusion**

The District's assessment of current and future facilities needs spans the next ten years and is based on the following factors:

- 2017-20 LCAP goal identified needs and target actions that are aligned to the District Strategic Plan
- Capacity and condition of existing facilities as shown in the Educational Facilities section V, A
- Forecasted population growth in the age groups we serve as shown by data in the Demographic Study section VI

These factors establish the following conditions and will drive the implementation of the Plan:

- The District presently has and will continue a commitment to providing well-maintained and attractive facilities that are flexible and adaptable to meet future needs
- Existing facilities were originally constructed as long ago as the late-1950s and are all at least 50 years old
- Existing facilities underwent modernization of varying extent during the period 2000-2005. Most sites underwent extensive modernization, but no major construction has occurred since these modernization projects
- Population growth for San Mateo County in ages 14 and under are forecasted to be generally negative
- Enrollment District-wide is expected to be generally flat or negative based on population growth forecasts

## **Conclusion (continued)**

Based on these conditions the District has structured the Plan to address facilities needs by:

- Maintaining existing square footage of instructional areas district-wide
  - A. Continue to refurbish and modernize these spaces including periodic and regular replacement and/or upgrades in:
    - Infrastructure/building systems (lighting, power, climate control, room finishes, building envelope)
    - Technology
    - Furniture
  - B. Renovate these spaces to accommodate new instructional and/or programming uses as needs change. Renovation shall be based on maintaining flexibility and adaptability of the space to accommodate future needs
- Selectively developing and building new facilities to serve underrepresented needs identified as essential to the mission of the district
- Implementing the plan in conjunction with addressing means to recruit and retain qualified teachers and staff

## **IV. Educational Program**

### **A. History and Education Transition**

Located along the coast of California, just south of San Francisco and within the County of San Mateo, Pacifica School District (PSD) is a TK-8 district with a special education preschool program that has made great progress by leveraging its resources to provide quality education to the families served.

Undergoing a reduction in student enrollment from approximately 10,000 students in 1969 with 15 schools to a current student population of approximately 3,200 students with 6 schools, in a time of unprecedented rise of property values as well as economic downturn, not to mention being one of the lowest funded revenue limit districts within San Mateo County (SMC), PSD has managed to maintain a district that has: 1) between 2000 and 2005, modernized all functioning schools (2-TK-5; 3-K-8; 1-6-8 Middle School) and partially modernized an education center that houses the Special Education Preschool and other various special education programs and the Home School Program; 2) passed a parcel tax in 2008 and passed two renewals in 2011 and 2016; 3) supported the revitalization of Pacifica School Volunteers (PSV) that provide student and adult volunteers for each of schools; and 4) supported the development of a foundation, Pacifica Education Foundation to compliment from a district-wide perspective, the great school-focused work of our schools' Parent Teacher Organizations that protect and advance high quality programs.

### **B. Community of the School District (2016)**

- Ethnic Subgroups – Black or African American (1%), Asian (7%), Filipino (9%), Hispanic or Latino (25%), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (1%), White (42%), Two or more races (17%),
- Low Income Pupils (20%),
- English Learners (ELs) (9%),
- Pupils with Disabilities (8%),
- Other Subgroups – Foster Youth (5, <1%) and Re-designated ELs (2%)

### **C. Educational Goals and Practices**

To capitalize on the work of the District and to provide an articulated direction, PSD developed in the 2010-11 academic year the PSD Strategic Plan: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning. The strategic plan has been a beacon that keeps us focused on preparing students for an evolving world by supporting *learning that is*:

- *Rigorous* – implementation of the State Standards and curricular integration;
- *Differentiated* – implementation of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI<sup>2</sup>) from both an academic and social-emotional perspective;
- *Holistic* – application of the Coordinated School Health Model (CSHM) that guides the integration of content from a health and wellness lens. We also found this model to be of particular strength due to the inclusion of the adults that touch the lives of our students: parents, staff, and community



## **Educational Goals and Practices (continued)**

With this blueprint, PSD continues to focus their efforts to consistently reduce the achievement and opportunity gap of the significant subgroups.

Beginning in the 2013-14 academic year, the state made two major shifts in accountability and funding. All districts throughout California developed a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) and a new funding formula, Local Control Funding Formula. Goal I of the LCAP focuses on Conditions for Learning and includes a metric and actions focused on facilities needs. The LCAP and LCFF are updated annually with the most updated information found on the PSD Website.

### **D. Educational System**

Our current design consists of two paths: Single School (K-8) and Dual (K-5 + Middle School). The main difference between the paths is the school environment in grades 6-8. All education is based on the California curriculum standards and is taught by credentialed, professional teachers who are supported by continuing education. Both paths offer enrichment that includes music, visual arts, performing arts, and physical education. The single school path provides class continuity from kindergarten through grade 8. The dual school path provides a comprehensive middle grade experience. The path that works for the individual child is a personal decision.

The two paths provide students an excellent 21<sup>st</sup> century education with a slightly different focus. One may go to the Pacifica School District website ([www.pacificasd.org](http://www.pacificasd.org)) and click on the Schools tab to develop an understanding of the District and the unique characteristics of each school.

	<b>Single Path School</b> <i><u>Cabrillo School; K-8 - Creative Arts Emphasis</u></i> <i><u>Ocean Shore; K-8 - Parent Participation</u></i> <i><u>Emphasis</u></i> <i><u>Vallemar; K-8 - Balanced Program Emphasis</u></i>	<b>Dual Path School</b> <i><u>Ortega Elementary School; K-5</u></i> <i><u>Sunset Ridge Elementary; K-5</u></i> <i><u>Ingrid B. Lacy Middle School; 6-8</u></i>
K - 5	The educational experience of each path is very similar through 5 <sup>th</sup> grade. The students are grouped into classes, and each class is taught, most of the time by the primary teacher. As in all Pacifica School District classrooms, the curriculum is rigorous, taught by exceptional teachers who are provided support.	
6-8	<b>In the single school path</b> students remain together through 8th grade. Students are blocked into core subject areas. All students experience elective classes. Older and younger students interact for mentoring.	<b>In the dual school path</b> students move to Ingrid B. Lacy Middle School at 6 <sup>th</sup> grade. 6 <sup>th</sup> grade students are blocked into core subject areas and move to single subject classes in 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grades. All students experience elective classes.

## **Educational System (continued)**

### **Other Programs**

In addition to the current structure, PSD also offers the following programs:

- Long Term Homeschool Program

The District's Homeschool Program, based at Linda Mar Educational Center, is an alternative instructional strategy. Homeschool students follow the district-adopted curriculum and meet the graduation requirements. The program offers flexibility to meet individual student needs, interests, and learning styles. Students work independently, according to a written agreement and under the general supervision of a credentialed teacher or teachers. The program involves an hour conference every two weeks, four hours of class time are offered on site every two weeks, individual tutoring is offered weekly as well as field trips each month.

- Preschool Special Day Class Program

The District offers a preschool program for children with special needs that consists of:

- Three classes with approximately 10 students in each class. One class is located at Sunset Ridge and two classes are located at Linda Mar Education Center
- Two paraprofessionals per class
- Multi-categorical programs
- North County Consortium (Jefferson Elementary School District, Bayshore, Brisbane, Millbrae, and San Bruno Park) students: Pacifica School District partners with neighboring school districts to provide program options closest to one's home
- Schedule includes a specialized autism instructional program TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and Related Communication of Handicapped Children), group work, 30 minute circle time, free play, sensory play, art, facilitated snack and inclusive educational opportunities

## **V. Facilities**

### **A. Educational Facilities**

#### **1. Evaluation Procedure**

The District utilizes the following processes for evaluating the condition of its facilities:

- Facility Inspection Tool

The Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) is an annual assessment of existing facilities conducted by the Director of FMO in conjunction with a site administrator at each of the sites within the district. The assessment consists of a walkthrough of the site by the Director and administrator that visually inspects various components of the buildings, building systems, and grounds to determine their current condition. Each component inspected is graded numerically against a standard scale and the individual component scores are compiled to compute an overall score for the site. See Appendix item A for sample FIT form.

Deficiencies that are noted during the inspection are addressed through the Work Order system or may be addressed as a future capital project, depending on the scope of the remedy and estimated cost to implement.

FIT was developed by the Office of Public School Construction to assist districts in fulfilling the requirement of Education Code Section 17002(d)(1) requiring school facilities to be evaluated and to be in good repair. PSD utilizes FIT because it provides our District a standardized process and measurable criteria to evaluate our facilities.

As mentioned the PSD Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) Goal I includes the desire to maintain “safe facilities that are conducive for learning.” The metric used to measure accomplishment of this section of the goal is the FIT score (see section above). Each school must achieve a minimum score of “good” to consider the metric met. Measureable outcomes in our LCAP analysis are a factor in evaluating facilities needs.

- Work order system

The District utilizes a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) as its work order system to manage and document service, repair, and minor modifications to existing facilities. The system provides data as to scope and frequency of work required to maintain the facilities and serves as a source of information on facilities condition when evaluating repair and replacement needs for structures and their components.

## **Evaluation Procedure (continued)**

- School Safety Checklist

The School Safety Checklist is a means for site staff to document and report facilities-related issues in the course of evaluating their sites for safety. Safety concerns may generate facilities needs so the Checklist is another tool the District utilizes to identify such needs. The Checklist sample form is in the Appendix.

## **2. Space Inventory Summary**

Below is an inventory of classroom, library, and multi-purpose room (MPR) counts as well as portable buildings at each school site. Building square footage (SF) for each school is approximate and exclusive of portables. With only a few exceptions almost all portables throughout the district are utilized exclusively by partner organizations such as Preschool, childcare operations and Boys & Girls Club.

<b>School</b>	<b>Room type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Building SF</b>
<b>Cabrillo</b>	Classrooms	25	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Portables	3	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>42,923</b>
<b>Ingrid B Lacy</b>	Classrooms	27	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Gymnasium	1	
	Portables	1	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>68,851</b>
<b>LMEC</b>	Classrooms	10	
	Leased spaces	13	
	Portables	1	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>41,896</b>
<b>Ocean Shore</b>	Classrooms	24	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Portables	7	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>43,723</b>

### **Space Inventory Summary (continued)**

<b>School</b>	<b>Room type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Building SF</b>
<b>Ortega</b>	Classrooms	28	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Portables	6	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>43,072</b>
<b>Sunset Ridge</b>	Classrooms	27	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Portables	5	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>82,729</b>
<b>Valleamar</b>	Classrooms	24	
	Library	1	
	MPR	1	
	Portables	4	
	<b>School total</b>		<b>43,000</b>
<b>District office complex</b>			<b>8,250</b>

## **B. Workforce Housing**

The District is developing workforce housing for District staff on the site of the former Oddstad School. The project is anticipated to include approximately 45 residential units to be rented specifically to District employees, off-street parking, and athletic fields for community use. The project is currently in the pre-development phase, having already been through preliminary phases of feasibility, community input, and Board review and approval.

The pre-development and development phases occur prior to construction and will incur legal and other project-related advisory services as well as design services. The District will finance the cost of these services through short-term interim financing. Once the construction phase of the project commences the work will be financed through Certificates of Participation (COPs) that will repay the current short-term financing as well as pay for the actual cost of constructing the project. The COPs will be repaid over an extended period with the rental revenue from the housing units. A proposed timeline has been included in the Appendix.

The District expects the rental revenue to cover the cost of the COPs financing plus provide for a reserve but may consider utilizing bond proceeds if necessary for some project construction costs.

Further information on the workforce housing project is available in the Appendix and at:

<http://www.pacificasd.org/District/2042-Oddstad-Property.html>

## VI. Demographic Study

County population projections over the next 25 years in the student age groups we serve show a generally declining trend through 2030 then a sharp increase in years 2031-2040. We can reasonably assume that the age-group population trends in our community will be consistent with these county projections.

### **San Mateo County Population Projections 2016-2040 (number of persons)**

	2016	2020	% change	2030	% change	2040	% change
AGE GROUP							
0-4	43,861	42,242	-4%	44,765	6%	49,264	10%
5-9	45,880	44,321	-3%	42,257	-5%	46,476	10%
10-14	46,009	46,714	2%	42,673	-9%	45,521	7%

Source: State of California Department of Finance, December 2014

## **VII. Implementation Plan**

The implementation process is comprised of several steps, some of which are already completed:

- Needs identification (completed)
- Preliminary project identification (completed)
- Facilities Master Plan development
- Financing plan development and implementation (in progress)
- Project execution/scheduling
- Review and assessment (ongoing)



## **A. Projects Summary**

The Projects listed in the following six pages have been identified through the needs identification process described in section III above and comprise the preliminary project identification list.

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
GENERAL REFURBISHMENT		
All schools except LMEC	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000/school (interior finishes-flooring, walls, ceilings + signage- for classrooms, MPRs, libraries, labs, offices, restrooms, common areas)
LMEC	\$500,000	interior finishes-flooring, walls, ceilings + signage- for classrooms, offices, restrooms, common areas
FURNITURE REPLACEMENT		
LMEC	\$30,000	non-traditional classrooms; \$15K/5 yrs
Cabrillo	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
Ortega	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
Valleamar	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
IBL	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
Ocean Shore	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
Sunset Ridge	\$300,000	\$30K/yr ongoing
ROOF REPLACEMENT (including covered walkways)		
District Office complex	\$500,000	
LMEC	\$500,000	
Portable	\$40,000	
Cabrillo	\$1,000,000	
Portables	\$240,000	\$40K each
Ortega	\$1,000,000	
Portables	\$240,000	\$40K each
Valleamar	\$1,000,000	
Portables	\$160,000	\$40K each
IBL	\$1,000,000	
Portable	\$40,000	
Ocean Shore	\$750,000	for remaining roofs after A, B, C wings completed summer 2016 for \$400,000
Portables	\$280,000	\$40K each
Sunset Ridge	\$1,000,000	
Portables	\$200,000	\$40K each

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
ELECTRICAL INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT		
Lighting controls replacement	\$175,000	Replace aging equipment-\$25K per school
HEATER UNIT REPLACEMENT		
District Office	\$50,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
LMEC	\$250,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
Cabrillo	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
Ortega	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
Valleamar	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
IBL	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
Ocean Shore	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
Sunset Ridge	\$750,000	Replace aging units with more energy-efficient units
OCEAN SHORE D WING SOUTH CLASSROOMS CLIMATE CONTROL	\$100,000	temperature regulating measures for classrooms
RESTROOM UPGRADES/ADDITIONS	\$1,550,000	\$25K/student restroom, \$10K/staff restroom, \$5K/kinder restroom
KITCHEN EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT		
Valleamar	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
Sunset Ridge	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
Cabrillo	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
Ortega	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
IBL	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
Ocean Shore	\$250,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
LMEC	\$50,000	Replace aging equipment with more energy-efficient units
TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT UPGRADE/REPLACEMENT	\$6,000,000	\$600K/yr ongoing every year for 10 yrs

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
CLIMATE CONTROL FOR DATA/TELECOMMUNICATIONS HUB EQUIPMENT DISTRICT-WIDE	\$200,000	\$20K/location
OCEAN SHORE BAND ROOM	\$1,000,000	modular building + furniture
GENERAL REFURBISHMENT OF PORTABLES		
District-wide	\$810,000	\$30K/portable (interior/exterior finishes, heater replacement, weather- and pest-sealing)
EXTERIOR REPAINTING		
District Office	\$100,000	including signage
LMEC	\$100,000	including signage
Cabrillo	\$200,000	including signage
Ortega	\$200,000	including signage
Valleamar	\$200,000	including signage
IBL	\$200,000	Last done summer 2016
Ocean Shore	\$200,000	including signage
Sunset Ridge	\$200,000	Last done summer 2015
CAMPUS RELANDSCAPING		
Cabrillo	\$100,000	
Ortega	\$100,000	
Valleamar	\$100,000	
IBL	\$100,000	
Ocean Shore	\$100,000	
Sunset Ridge	\$100,000	
LMEC	\$100,000	
DISTRICT OFFICE FAÇADE AND ENTRY MODERNIZATION AND CAMPUS RELANDSCAPING	\$100,000	

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
SECURITY UPGRADES (district-wide)		
Window/door glass coverings	\$50,000	Remaining locations not addressed in initial project
Door lock retrofit	\$50,000	Remaining doors not retrofitted in initial project
Perimeter and access	\$2,000,000	Various perimeter security improvements, access controls at entrances, or other enhancements
Security/fire alarm systems	\$700,000	\$100K/school
IBL emergency exit ramp behind MPR	\$200,000	
CANOPY REPLACEMENT		
Sunset Ridge	\$100,000	Replace rusting canopy and supporting members at main entry and at MPR with non-corrosive material
Valleamar covered walkway extension	\$50,000	around computer lab bldg
Ocean Shore entry	\$25,000	modernize for appearance and reduced maintenance
PORTABLE-TO-MODULAR REPLACEMENT		
Cabrillo	\$1,500,000	\$500K each
Ortega	\$3,000,000	\$500K each
Valleamar	\$2,500,000	\$500K each; plus new shared space
LMEC	\$500,000	\$500K each
IBL	\$500,000	\$500K each
Ocean Shore	\$3,500,000	\$500K each
Sunset Ridge	\$2,500,000	\$500K each
PLAY STRUCTURE REPLACEMENT		
Valleamar	\$150,000	\$75K each
Cabrillo	\$150,000	\$75K each
Ortega	\$150,000	\$75K each
LMEC	\$150,000	\$75K each
Ocean Shore	\$150,000	\$75K each-Upper grade structure may be replaced summer 2018
Sunset Ridge	\$150,000	\$75K each

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
MPR MODERNIZATION/REDESIGN		
Cabrillo	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
Ortega	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
Valleamar	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
IBL	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
Ocean Shore	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
Sunset Ridge	\$150,000	envelope + furniture
PARKING LOT AND HARDSCAPE PLAY AREA RESURFACING		
District Office	\$50,000	including restriping & markings
LMEC	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
Cabrillo	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
Ortega	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
Valleamar	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
IBL	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
Ocean Shore	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
Sunset Ridge	\$100,000	including restriping & markings
SUNSET RIDGE PARKING LOT CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS	\$250,000	DSA approval required
FIELD IRRIGATION REFURBISHMENT		
Valleamar	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
Cabrillo	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
Ortega	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
Oddstad	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
LMEC	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
Ocean Shore	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
IBL	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components
Sunset Ridge	\$25,000	Repair and replace aging system infrastructure components

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	NOTES
FIELD/TRACK RESTORATION		
Valleamar	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
Cabrillo	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
Ortega	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
Oddstad	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
LMEC	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
Ocean Shore	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
IBL	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
Sunset Ridge	\$100,000	Level/regrade field/track to improve drainage and resod grass
OFFICE/ADMIN MODERNIZATION		
Cabrillo	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
Ortega	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
Valleamar	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
IBL	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
Ocean Shore	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
Sunset Ridge	\$150,000	including staff, break, workrooms (finishes + furniture)
DISTRICT OFFICE INTERIOR MODERNIZATION	\$150,000	offices, board/conference rooms, ESS areas (including furniture + equipment)
FMO SHOP MODERNIZATION	\$100,000	bldg + base yard
HYDRATION STATIONS		
Cabrillo	\$10,000	\$5K each
Ortega	\$10,000	\$5K each
Valleamar	\$10,000	\$5K each
LMEC	\$10,000	\$5K each
IBL	\$10,000	\$5K each
Ocean Shore	\$10,000	\$5K each
Sunset Ridge	\$10,000	\$5K each
SUNSET RIDGE MPR FLOOR REPLACEMENT	\$25,000	Refloat uneven subfloor and replace delaminating floor tile in MPR
PERFORMING ARTS CENTER	\$30,000,000	500-seat capacity; site TBD
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>\$86,885,000</b>	
<b>PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS</b>	<b>\$8,688,500</b>	10% of project costs
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</b>	<b>\$95,573,500</b>	

## **B. Other Potential Projects by School Site**

Additionally some schools have identified other possible projects that should be considered for incorporation into related projects shown above or as independent projects:

### **LMEC**

- Restroom in classroom A-2

### **Ocean Shore**

- Synthetic turf and track for upper field
- Improved air circulation in MPR

### **Sunset Ridge**

- Kinder yard- dirt/ mud area covered over with foam padding similar to what is under the playgrounds, benches added to the play area
- Large cement planters added around the school with trees added
- Benches added around school
- More bathrooms- children and adult
- New larger kitchen/ cafeteria/gym where portables with new delivery location so drivers don't drive through children at recess
- Old kitchen turned into pod area for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade classes
- Play equipment for 4/5<sup>th</sup> grade yard
- Add new drop off using utility road on Hickey Blvd
- Update office so it can handle the volume of people that come in
- Music room with amphitheater
- Solar panels
- Privacy post added to existing fencing
- Dishwasher in staff room
- Washer and dryer so we can clean kids clothes
- New staff room so we can all fit around one table
- Canopy on some parts of the play ground for shelter during inclement weather

### **Valleamar**

- Closet or whiteboard storage for classroom A-1. More built in storage space would be good in making the rooms more similar.
- More built in storage across all classrooms since our school was built for smaller class sizes
- Cabinet doors for under sinks in classrooms that don't have them.
- Create a better system for air flow in all restrooms (especially D-wing restrooms)
- Air conditioning or shading for band room and D-wing classrooms
- Band room carpeting to help with sound
- Ball wall for primary yard



## **Other Projects by School Site (continued)**

### **Vallemar (continued)**

- New green box car/storage container
- Drainage system in the floor of restrooms to ease floor cleaning and maintenance
- Add student restrooms next to computer lab
- Picnic tables on kinder yard (2 of them)
- Replace worn or broken white benches on upper yard
- Multi-media lab/Flexible Learning Space (convert computer lab)
- Larger middle school classrooms
- Sound baffling between play yards and classrooms (especially D-wing)
- New chairs for MPR

## **C. Facilities Master Plan**

Fundamental to proper execution of facilities projects that fulfill the needs identified by district goals is a robust Facilities Master Plan (FMP). The FMP incorporates the needs as identified in this analysis in conjunction with information obtained through community (both within PSD and Pacifica in general) outreach, data research, and professional advice to a greater depth than what was undertaken to develop this initial analysis. This analysis is the starting point for developing the FMP but further work needs to occur to produce the comprehensive plan that will guide the project prioritization, development, and timing that will enable the District to attain our goals.

## **D. Financing Plan**

The current funding model for Pacifica School District is primarily state funding (Local Control Funding Formula). This model does not provide adequate and sustainable funding for facilities and technology upgrades and modernization on a regular and ongoing basis to the extent required to execute a Facilities Master Plan to meet district goals. To obtain the necessary funding to develop a Facilities Master Plan as well as execution of the plan, the District looks to funding options outside of the current funding model. A sound and viable funding option are general obligation bonds.

- **Funding sources:**

### **General Obligation Bond (GO Bond)**

- Proposed initial (phase I) \$55 million general obligation bond authorization (anticipate June 2018 voter approval)
- Proposed second (phase II) general obligation bond authorization of amount to be determined (anticipate June 2020 or 2022 voter approval)

### **Developer Fees**

- Approximately \$230,00 in developer fees is currently available

- **Funding allocation:**

- Proceeds from the phase I bond authorization will be used to fund projects undertaken over the period 2018 through 2028
- Proceeds from the phase II bond authorization will be used to fund projects undertaken over the periods 2021 through 2030 or 2023 through 2032 depending on approval date
- Workforce housing potential impact: While the workforce housing project is anticipated to be funded entirely through certificates of participation (COP) the District may need to utilize bond funding. Should this need arise, there will be a transparent process that includes community engagement.
- Developer Fees information: These fees will likely be used to fund the development of the Facilities Master Plan as soon as 2018

## **Financing Plan (continued)**

- Other funding strategies:
  - State School Facility Program: The state’s Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) administers a program of funding available to school districts for the modernization or new construction of school facilities. Funds are provided on a matching basis and districts must establish eligibility for funds, typically based on need criteria such as enrollment and existing capacity. This program may be a potential source of funding should projects be eligible during their respective development stages.
  - Asset repurposing: PSD may consider the sale of surplus property such as the former Fairmont school site and use proceeds to fund FMP projects or workforce housing.

## **E. Schedule**

Project implementation will be determined by prioritization based on the Facilities Plan as well as the timing of funding. The intent is to execute the highest priority projects in the phase I bond program, but to allocate the work over the life of the program in a fashion that will utilize efficiencies of scale and operation to ensure funds are utilized efficiently and project work has proper oversight.

## **F. Review**

Regular periodic review of the Facilities Plan is necessary to ensure it continues to serve the goals established by the LCAP. Regular periodic assessment of projects already completed and underway is also necessary to evaluate the efficacy of the project execution process and outcome. The District will put in place a process to conduct a formal review of the projects listed in the Plan on a regular and ongoing basis. Adjustments to plan objectives and project processes, and subsequently the bond programs, will be made based on these reviews.

A potential bond measure would include strict fiscal accountability provisions. All funds would go to the Pacifica School District, be controlled locally and could not be taken away by the state or federal governments. An independent citizens’ oversight committee would ensure that all funds are spent as required by law.

## VIII. Appendix

### **A. Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) sample form**

The FIT form consists of instruction on inspection standards and standard forms for reporting ([https://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/opsc/Forms/Worksheets/FIT\\_rev.pdf](https://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/opsc/Forms/Worksheets/FIT_rev.pdf)). The following is a sample of the Evaluation Form. The markings to be added to the form indicate the following:

<b>✓</b>	No Deficiency - Good Repair: Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
<b>D</b>	Deficiency: Mark "D" if one or more statement(s) in the Good Repair Standard for the specific category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
<b>X</b>	Extreme Deficiency: Indicate "X" if the area has a deficiency that is considered an "Extreme Deficiency" in the Good Repair Standard or there is a condition that qualifies as an extreme deficiency but is not noted in the Good Repair Standard.
<b>N/A</b>	Not Applicable: If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or component) does not exist in the area evaluated,

Pacifica School District Facilities Plan/Needs Analysis 2017-2018

SAMPLE FORM

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

SCHOOL FACILITY CONDITIONS EVALUATION

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL		Date of Inspection		School Name		Page 1 of 1									
CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
AREA	GAS LEAKS	MECH/VAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOMS	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/SCHOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/GATES/ FENCES
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														
	COMMENTS														

Marks: -J = Good Repair; D = Deficiency; X = Extreme Deficiency; NA = Not Applicable

Pacific School District Facilities Plan/Needs Analysis 2017-2018

SAMPLE FORM

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL (FIT)  
SCHOOL FACILITY CONDITIONS EVALUATION

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

(REV 0509)

Page 1 of 1

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION		CITY/STATE	
SCHOOL SITE		SCHOOL TYPE (SCHOOL NUMBER)	NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE LAST INSPECTION
INSPECTOR'S NAME	INSPECTOR'S TITLE	RATING FOR SCHOOL REPAIRS (A=Very Good, B=Good, C=Fair, D=Fair-Poor, E=Very Poor)	
DATE OF INSPECTION	FACILITY CONDITION RATING OF INSPECTION		

PART III: CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING (round all calculations to two decimal places)

TOTAL NUMBER OF AREAS EVALUATED	CATEGORY TOTALS	A. PLUMBING			B. WIRING	C. CLIMATE		D. ELECTRICAL	E. INTERIORS/FURNITURE		F. SAFETY		G. STRUCTURAL		H. EXTERNAL	
		DRIVE LEAKS	MECHANICAL	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOMS	SHOW PLUMBING	PEPE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/SCHOOL GROUNDS	WILDCOVERS/SCISSOR ATTERPICES
↓	Number of "O"s															
	Number of "D"s															
	Number of "A"s															
	Number of "B"s															
	Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "O"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s)"															
	Total Percent per Category (average of above)"															
	Rank (Circle one) GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%															

\*Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a "poor" rating for that category and a zero for "Total Percent per Category".

DETERMINE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF 8 CATEGORIES ABOVE			
--	--	--	--

OVERALL RATING:

\*\*For School Rating, apply the Percentage Range below to the average percentage determined above, taking into account the rating Description below.

PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION	RATING
90%-100%	The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.	EXEMPLARY
80%-89.99%	The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and/or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.	GOOD
75 %-89.99%	The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted are critical and/or widespread. Repairs and/or additional maintenance are necessary in several areas of the school site.	FAIR
0%-74.99%	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout the campus.	POOR

COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:

## B. School Safety Checklist sample form

### School Safety Checklist

This checklist has been developed to assist Schools in addressing their hazard identification and reporting. The checklist provides guidance only, it is not intended as a definitive list for the identification of all hazards. Staff are encouraged to make modifications to suit their specific environment. **Note:** there will be hazards/deficiencies not mentioned on the checklists that will need to be identified and managed.

<b>School or Location (block/campus/room):</b>	
<b>Person/s completing Checklist:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

  

<b>Fire Safety and Emergency Response</b>	<b>Action if Required (✓ if no action)</b>
Safety rules and evacuation routes are prominently displayed in all rooms.	
Doorways, walkways and evacuation exits are always kept clear. (Check for book bags & coats as well as other "temporary" items.)	
Classroom exit doors should not have decorations.	
Fire extinguishers are mounted in plain view, with appropriate signage and are not blocked or hidden.	
EPI Pens are easily accessible during school hours. List of trained staff should be posted in front of the storage box.	
Doors, windows, locks and latches are in good condition and in working order.	
Visitor sign-in/identification procedure is adequate and enforced.	

  

<b>Rooms</b>	<b>Action if Required</b>
The room is clean and tidy.	
Maintain 36" of clearance around electrical panels. A covered panel (paper, poster, fabric) is considered a blocked panel.	
Small appliances (microwaves, toaster ovens, refrigerators, portable heaters) should not be in classrooms.	
Cleaning products should not be in classrooms. Disinfectant wipes can only be used by those who have completed a CDPR approved training program.	
Limit high storage of heavy items.	
Cabinets and furniture greater than 5 feet are secured and are not near exits.	
Floor surfaces are maintained in a safe condition. Rugs and mats do not pose a tripping hazard.	
There is sufficient space for each person to walk safely.	
Decorative items are not suspended or hanging from ceiling lights or sprinkler pipes.	
<b>Other Issues</b>	<b>Action if Required</b>

## **C. Workforce Housing Project Timeline**

Below is the preliminary project timeline for the workforce housing project:

September 15, 2017	Issuance of Request For Qualifications (RFQ)
November 15, 2017	RFQ responses due
March 1, 2018	Notification to respondents selected to participate in the Request For Proposal (RFP) process
October 1, 2018	Issuance of RFP
December 1, 2018	RFP responses due
December 1 - 31, 2018	Review of RFP Responses and recommendation to Board; Notification of selected developer and contract execution
January 1 –June 30, 2019	First Stage Award: Submittal of formal planning documents and review. Design refinement and project confirmation with selected developer to include formal project submittal for re-zoning and general plan amendment, community outreach, submittal for technical review by City staff and presentation for the Planning Commission study session
July 1, 2019 and Beyond	Second Stage Award: Work subsequent to formal review and comment by City technical staff and Planning Commission study session
July 1, 2019 -August 1, 2020	Estimated timeframe for Environmental Impact Report and entitlements (overlapping with Second Stage Award)
October 1, 2020-February 1, 2021	Construction documentation
February 1 -May 1, 2021	Building Permit process
May 1, 2021-June 30, 2022	Construction
July 1 -November 1, 2022	Move-in, project punch list and close-out
November 1, 2022-September 30, 2023	One year warranty period