



SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item# 9.3

Meeting Date: March 1, 2012

Subject: Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School

- Information Item Only
- Approval on Consent Agenda
- Conference (for discussion only)
- Conference/First Reading
- Conference/Action
- Action
- Public Hearing

Division: Superintendent's Office

Recommendation: Do Not Approve Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School and Approve Creation of Design Team for A.M. Winn Elementary School.

Background/Rationale:

On November 4, 2010, The Board adopted criteria for school consolidation and closure. Subsequently, the Board appointed a Facility Consolidation and Closure/7-11 Committee to review data and recommend sites for consolidation and closure. The Committee met during the spring and summer of 2011 and had their final meeting on August 29, 2011. Their recommendations were brought to the Board on October 6, 2011. The Board directed the Superintendent to bring a staff analysis of the 7-11 Committee recommendations and his own recommendations with analysis to the Board for consideration.

Superintendent's recommendations were presented to the Board on November 3, 2011. On December 8, 2011, the Board tabled the closures of A.M. Winn, C.P. Huntington and Freepoint Elementary Schools.

Faced with the severe budget constraints for the 2012-13 school year and beyond, the Board reconsidered the closures of the three schools. On February 16, 2012, the Board voted to close Freepoint Elementary. Primarily due to safety concerns, the Board voted (5-2) to keep C. P. Huntington Elementary open for 2012-13. The Board asked for more information regarding A. M. Winn and for the resolution to be brought back to the March 1 meeting for further consideration.

Financial Considerations:

Financial Analysis:

Potential savings from consolidation of 2012-13 school year: \$181,060. Estimated cost of closure: \$259,000. Net savings: \$77,938. (n) J/T/TT451 T/7.98 0 0 7.98

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office

Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School

March 1, 2012



I. Overview/History of Department or Program

On November 4, 2010, The Board adopted criteria for school consolidation and closure. Subsequently, the Board appointed a Facility Consolidation and Closure/7 11 Committee to review data and

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office

Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School

March 1, 2012



III. Budget:

Potential cost varies from \$181,063 savings to \$259,777 cost (See Attached).

IV. Goals, Objectives and Measures:

The School The Potential The School The

to 7,000

\$

Q

V

L

W

The

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office

Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School

March 1, 2012



The Superintendent's additional recommendations were created using these criteria as well as academic performance, program alignment, proximity of sites, potential budget savings and enrollment trends.

The Board requested additional information concerning A. M. Winn Elementary regarding:

Transportation and safety, proposed attendance boundaries and facility costs at the following schools. A.

cost415ty
atsferTD0Tc00033c2000

Board of Education Executive Summary

Superintendent's Office

Resolution No. 2690: Closure of A.M. Winn Elementary School

March 1, 2012




VI. Results:

Superintendent recommendation: No Closure/Design Team.
Create a Design Team of stakeholders to explore desirable programs for students and families.

VII. Next Steps:

Dependent upon Board action.



Cost Benefit Analysis

Option 1 - School closure, boundary change with students attending A. Lincoln and J. Marshall without crossing guards

Option 2 - School closure, most students attend A. Lincoln to avoid crossing Bradshaw

Option 3 - School closure, boundary change with students attending A. Lincoln and J. Marshall with crossing guards

A.M. Winn

Costs Associated with Moving the

A.M. Winn / Abraham Lincoln Youth & Family Resource Center

From Winn to Lincoln in the Event of Closure

The modular building housing the Youth and Family Resource Center (YFRC) team serving A. M. Winn and Abraham Lincoln is located on the A. M. Winn campus. Purchased with a combination of funds supplied by the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency and the Department of Human Assistance, the center provides office space not only for school district staff (Specialist II, Social Worker, Family Advocate), but outside agency staff as well. In addition to the CSUS social work interns, mentors, and nursing students that call the YFRC home, four therapists from Catholic Healthcare West, the



Abraham Lincoln Elementary School - Portable Move Cost Estimate
Planning and Construction Department - 22 Feb 2012

ESTIMATED COST

SOFT COSTS

Site Costs

Acquisition Cost

Escrow/Title/Legal Fees

Bond/Financing Costs

Real Estate Consultant

Property Appraisal Costs

Special Studies

Toxic Study

CEQA

Geotechnical

Civil Survey

Electro Magnetic Field

\$ 6,200.00

Green Consulting
Commissioning
Data/LAN
Health Dept.
Kitchen
Door and Hardware
Community Outreach
HazMat Consultant
Miscellaneous

Bidding and Printing

4,000.00

Distribution Expense

Advertising Expense
Miscellaneous

Misc Construction Expense

Specialty Contractor

Relocatable Building Move Contractor (total of 6 - 32x30)

\$ 54,000.00

Owner Furnished Equipment

Misc. Contractors

Miscellaneous

Construction Testing and Controls

Project Inspector

\$ 12,000.00

Testing Laboratory

\$ 5,000.00

Surveying Controls

Security

Miscellaneous

Furniture Fixtures and Equipment Expenses

Furniture

Equipment

Moving Expense

Computer/Network Equipment

\$ 11,500.00

Telecommunications Equipment

\$ 3,000.00

Library Materials

Specialties

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous Project Expenses

Miscellaneous
Design Contingency 10%

SOFT COST SUBTOTAL \$ **143,440.00**

HARD COSTS

Construction Costs

ADA Site Prep Utilities Misc

\$ 100,000.00

General Contractor

General Requirements Conditions Insurance 15%

\$ 28,350.00

Construction Contingency 5%

\$ 9,450.00

HARD COST SUBTOTAL \$ **226,800.00**

\$ 270,240.00

5. The Superintendent or his designee is authorized and directed to take such further action as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this Resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Sacramento City Unified School District Board of Education on this 16th day of February, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES: _____
NOES: _____
ABSTAIN: _____
ABSENT: _____

Diana Rodriguez
President of the Board of Education

ATTESTED TO:

Jonathan P. Raymond
Secretary of the Board of Education

ADDENDUM TO CEQA INITIAL STUDY FOR A.M. WINN SCHOOL CLOSURE

INTRODUCTION

On February 16, 2012, the Board of

James Marshall Elementary School is located in the unincorporated portion of the County of Sacramento. James Marshall School is located in the “urban policy boundary” not the urban services boundary of the County. Therefore, LOS D is applicable.

The common standard of significance for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan EIR states that “the project is considered to have a significant effect on bike and pedestrian facilities if it would result in adverse effects to existing bikeways or pedestrian facilities that would

Public Transit, Bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities

The common standard of significance for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan EIR states that “the project is considered to have a significant effect on bike and pedestrian facilities if it would result in adverse effects to existing bikeways or pedestrian facilities that would discourage their use and result in safety issues” or if a project “would conflict with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation or increase demands for transit facilities greater than planned capacity (e.g., transit service, carpooling, bicycling, walking).” From a CEQA perspective, the proposed project does not adversely physically affect the bikeway or pedestrian facilities in the area, but the project does