

**TWIN RIVERS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**Meeting:** Facilities Advisory 7-11 Committee

**Date:** October 28, 2020

**Time:** 6:00 p.m.–8:00 p.m.

**Meeting Location:**  
Virtual Online Meeting Via Zoom

ITEM	AGENDA/ACTION
A.	The 7-11 Committee meeting was convened and called to order by Chair Michelle Rivas at 6:00 p.m.
B.	<p>ROLL CALL</p> <p>Chair Rivas called roll.</p> <p>Committee Members Present: Michael Baker, Stacey Bastian, Valerie Chavez (joined a few minutes late), Jackie DeWitt, Joseph Geer, Kenneth Kinsey (joined at 6:20 p.m.), Michael Lowman, Michelle Rivas (Chair), Jason Sample (Vice Chair) (joined at 6:08 p.m.), and Susan Uhl</p> <p>Committee Members Absent: Mervin Brookins</p> <p>Staff Present: Connor Allison, Dr. Kristen Coates, Yasmina Flores, Perry Herrera, and Kate Ingersoll</p> <p>Consultants/Others Present: Joanna Dziuk (staff, School Services of California Inc. [SSC]), Brianna García (facilitator, SSC), Paul Barajas (Spanish Interpreter), and Oliver Thor (Hmong Interpreter)</p> <p>I. Establishment of a Quorum</p> <p>Chair Rivas noted that a quorum had been met.</p>
C.	<p>PUBLIC COMMENTS</p> <p>Due to the virtual environment, the committee accepted public comments via email until 5:30 p.m. to be read aloud. Yasmina Flores noted that there were no public comments.</p> <p>The interpreters were introduced.</p>
D.	<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES—OCTOBER 14, 2020</p> <p>Motion to approve October 14, 2020, meeting minutes</p> <p>Motion: Mr. Baker</p> <p>Second: Ms. Bastian</p> <p>Yes: Baker, Bastian, DeWitt, Geer, Lowman, Rivas, and Uhl</p> <p>No: 0</p> <p>Abstain: 0</p> <p>Absent: Brookins, Chavez, Kinsey, and Sample</p> <p>Motion passed</p>
E.	<p>SUBMITTAL OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS</p> <p>Chair Rivas asked Dr. Coates if all the conflict of interest forms were received. Dr. Coates replied that all but two have been received and staff will follow up with those individuals.</p>
F.	<p>DISCUSSION OF ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS</p> <p>Dr. Coates introduced Executive Director, Fiscal Services Kate Ingersoll to speak to current and historical</p>

	<p>enrollment trends, including the district’s projections and actual enrollment for the current year. The information provided also included class sizes and the potential reduction of staff due to the 2020–21 and 2021–22 declines in enrollment. Ms. García read a question from the chat box: Would the loss be approximately 20 teachers? Ms. Ingersoll said that she didn’t see it being any more than 20, and she thought it would be less; it depends on the projection of students and classroom allocations but shouldn’t be more than 20. Chair Rivas asked if there were any other questions. No further questions.</p> <p>Dr. Coates shared the DecisionInsite projection report, which provides enrollment projections that aid the district in making staffing and facilities decisions. She summarized the data contained within the report including not only the enrollment projections but also proposed housing developments that impact enrollment, percent changes in enrollment from year to year, and cohort transition trends.</p> <p>Dr. Coates asked if there were any questions. Ms. García read a question from the chat box: The declining enrollment is in the aggregate. Is there a break down by geographic location? Dr. Coates said that staff did not have that information at the meeting but could bring it to another meeting. Chair Rivas asked if there were any other questions. Ms. García added that the enrollment data that was just presented should aid the committee in determining if the properties are surplus, so they should keep those numbers in mind in regard to the facilities and the district’s ability to house the students now and into the future. No further questions.</p>
G.	<p><b>FACILITY CAPACITY STUDY</b></p> <p>Dr. Coates displayed the School Capacity Study which is usually updated annually, but not this year due to remote learning. The study helps district staff better understand the use of the existing facilities. She summarized the district standards with regards to classroom capacity, utilization rates, the number of permanent versus portable classrooms, the total capacity—district-wide and by school site, etc. Dr. Coates utilized Smythe 7–8 as an example as this is one of the sites the committee is considering for surplus. Dr. Coates asked if there were any questions. Ms. García added that Dr. Coates focused on Smythe 7–8 because it’s actually being used as a school site, while some of the other sites would not fit into the capacity study as they are not being used. She asked the committee to keep this information in mind when considering the properties as surplus to the district’s needs as there is a lot more available capacity than projected students.</p> <p>Mr. Baker asked if Smythe 7–8 was at capacity. Ms. García said that the unitization rate was at about 60%, which is pretty low—it should be at about 80% to 90% to be efficient. Mr. Baker then asked why Smythe 7–8 was selected for potential surplus. Dr. Coates noted that Smythe 7–8 is right on the border and does not generate any students from the area. The students are being bused in from Martin Luther King (MLK) and Rio Tierra boundaries. She noted that staff would go into more detail at the next meeting. Chair Rivas mentioned that Smythe 7–8 is not a neighborhood school; it is in the middle of an industrial area and there is no housing near the site since the housing projects were demolished. Mr. Baker asked if the school’s population from when the neighborhood was there, before it was torn down, is available. Dr. Coates said staff did not have that information at the meeting but could provide that data. Mr. Baker said that within the past year, the Board of Trustees (Board) voted 6-1 to not close the school, so maybe the committee is wasting its time with this site. Ms. García asked if the Board voted to keep the site or just the program, as the program could be relocated. Ms. García said that should be kept in mind—that the students could be moved closer to their homes and the program wouldn’t go away just because the facilities might go away. Mr. Baker said that was the answer he was looking for and it was a good point. He asked if the Board would first need to approve moving the program or would the committee bundle moving the program and surplus of the property in its recommendation? Ms. García said that would be her recommendation—that the committee recommend the surplus of the property and that the program be kept intact but moved to another location. Ms. García read a question from the chat box: Does Smythe 7–8 have any students that live in Dos Rios? Committee member DeWitt elaborated on her question—she knew that students from the housing projects went to Woodlake but didn’t know they went to Smythe. Dr. Coates said that information could be provided during the deep dive on the sites. Chair Rivas asked if there were any other questions. There were no further questions.</p>
H.	<p><b>FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS</b></p>

Dr. Coates shared a presentation with details about each site (address, year built, etc.). Mr. Baker asked if the committee could get data on the students attending Smythe 7-8 and from where they are being bused. Are more being bused from MLK or Rio Tierra neighborhoods? Dr. Coates said that information can be presented at the next meeting. Dr. Coates shared the operational (mostly utility) costs for the sites and noted that they are higher for operating sites. Dr. Coates asked if there were any questions. Ms. Chavez said that on Google, Futures High School comes up on Grace Ave, which is correct? Dr. Coates said staff got the address from the assessor's information but would confirm the correct address. No further questions.

**COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Chair Rivas asked if there were any comments. Ms. Chavez said she noticed that there wasn't capacity or enrollment information noted for the Plover school, is that site being used? Dr. Coates replied that it was not being used. Mr. Baker said that Plover was used by a charter school and asked when it vacated? Mr. Sample said that the property was vacated three years ago when both Futures and Higher Learning Academy occupied a new build facility on Grace Avenue. Mr. Baker said that the district never really occupied that building after North Sacramento merged and Mr. Sample and Chair Rivas agreed. Mr. Baker noted it was just a temporary school while North Sacramento completed its renovations. Mr. Baker noted, and Mr. Sample concurred, that the facility is predominantly portable buildings. Ms. Chavez said that since Futures moved, is there a middle school there as well? Mr. Sample said there is a 6-8 on the new site, which is the Community Outreach Academy that has always been collocated with Futures. Ms. Chavez said that we should consider those students also. Ms. García clarified: Students have been moved from Plover, which means Plover is empty, correct? Dr. Coates confirmed Plover is empty. Chair Rivas asked Dr. Coates to confirm that Smythe 7-8 is the only property that is being considered that has students? Dr. Coates replied that Smythe 7-8, Vineland, and maybe Bolivar—an independent charter located on 3800 Bolivar that would need to be moved if the committee recommends surplus of the property (The only two district sites that are being considered for surplus are Smythe 7-8 and Vineland). Ms. García noted that the students at Vineland are not on the portion of the property that is proposed for surplus and Dr. Coates confirmed. Ms. García further noted that Smythe 7-8 is the only property with students in which a program would need to be relocated. Dr. Baker asked if the committee could get data on the costs for vandalism and how many police service calls occur for Smythe 7-8 since it is not in a populated neighborhood.

I. Mr. Sample noted that he was on the previous 7-11 Committee and noticed that two sites (Greg Thatch and Aero Haven) were considered at that time and are now being considered again. What has changed from then to now? The last committee voted to keep the sites. Dr. Coates took note of this.

Mr. Baker asked if the committee could look at the preschool on Vineland and whether there is another location to which it can be moved. Ms. García reminded the committee that when the district looks to sell or lease a property, they have various options. The Board has the option to put parameters in place under a Request for Proposal to determine the types of uses that could purchase or lease the property if the preschool were to remain on site, and that a recommendation in that vein could be made by the committee. Mr. Baker suggested that moving the preschool would allow the district to command a higher price for the site. Ms. García sought clarification as to whether Mr. Baker was suggesting the entire site be considered surplus or simply alternatives for moving the preschool. Mr. Baker suggested surplus of the entire site. Chair Rivas said that the district would have to move the preschool somewhere still in the community so that it could continue to serve the existing Rio Linda families. Dr. Coates said that the preschool is a special education preschool, so it has a special population, and that information regarding potential relocation of the preschool can be incorporated into the information for upcoming meetings. Mr. Baker noted he is only one committee member and researching this option is not necessary if others do not agree. Ms. Chavez noted that Joyce is a school that is nearby and could accommodate the preschool. Chair Rivas said that it serves a different community from Rio Linda, but it's a good question and parameters can be added as to who acquires the property. However, if it is recommended that the preschool be moved, it should be a location within Rio Linda. Mr. Baker explained that the Board recently voted to move the 7-8 out of Orchard, so that is a possibility. He does not want to dismiss moving the preschool and surplus of the entire property. Mr. Geer asked if Orchard was a special needs school and could the preschool be transferred there easily? Dr. Coates said that Orchard already

	<p>has a preschool, but staff can explore the options for surplus of the entire property. She noted that the Vineland appraisal that will be presented will provide an estimate of the value. She also understands that any options to relocate the preschool need to be mindful of the community. Ms. García added that the committee can recommend surplus of the entire property, and that the Board direct staff to find alternative facilities for the preschool, which will allow staff to conduct the additional investigations that would be necessary at the Board’s direction. This would allow for the recommendation to surplus that property as part of this committee and not require the site be brought to another 7–11 committee in the future after the investigations are completed. Chair Rivas asked if there were any other comments from committee members. There were no other comments.</p>
<p>J.</p>	<p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>I. Schedule and Topics of Next Meeting—November 18, 2020</p> <p>Chair Rivas stated the date of the next meeting. Dr. Coates noted that the staff will provide a deep dive regarding all the sites. Ms. García explained that staff will also share and review the data that has been requested.</p> <p>Requested data:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Declining enrollment by geographic location</li> <li>2. Population of Smythe 7–8 prior to demolition of surrounding residential neighborhood</li> <li>3. Whether students from Dos Rios attended Smythe 7–8</li> <li>4. Neighborhoods from which Smythe 7–8 students are being bused, including percentage/number of students by neighborhood</li> <li>5. Vandalism costs and calls for service for Smythe 7–8</li> <li>6. The reason Aero Haven and Greg Thatch are being considered again for surplus</li> <li>7. Options for relocation of the Vineland preschool, so that the entire property can be deemed surplus</li> </ol>
<p>K.</p>	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Rivas at 6:56 p.m.</p> <p>Future meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 18, 2020, 6:00-8:00 p.m.—Third Meeting (Presentation of Sites)</li> <li>• December 16, 2020, 6:00-8:00 p.m.—Fourth Meeting (Site Analysis)</li> <li>• January 20, 2020, 6:00-8:00 p.m.—Fifth Meeting (Draft Report Review)</li> </ul>