

Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) Meeting notes, January 5, 2019

Meeting was convened at 7:20 p.m.

Members of the Facilities Advisory Committee and the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee were present.

A tour of the Walters Junior High campus was given by John Chwastyk, Director of Facilities from 7:20 p.m. to 7:52 p.m.

Call to Order 7:55 p.m.

Members present: Tarrah Henrie, Robert Hou, Henry Feng, Liz Fischer, Irene Shen, Bryan Gephardt, Antonio Birbeck-Herrera, Mariam Mustafa

Members absent: Sharon Coco, Rachelle Currie, Joyce Recar, Akshaya Aradhya, Andrew Law

Others present : Ken Blackstone, PIO Facilities & Construction, FUSD; John Chwastyk, Director of Facilities, FUSD: and Aaron Kael, Vanir Construction Management, Inc.

Current empty positions: CSEA, FSMA representatives

Quorum was not met.

Discussion began with a review of the attendance section of the bylaws:

Section D of Article 4 (see handout of bylaws). Antonio Birbeck- Herrera updated the committee that CSEA appointed a member recently as a result of their former appointed member having missed meetings four times. FSMA has not filled their vacancy since Steve Musto resigned. It was suggested that there be a change to the bylaws making quorum a majority of those present at the meeting.

Ken Blackstone reported there's a parent and/or community member interested in serving for Irvington.

John Chwastyk gave a presentation on the district's available funds. There are three specific funds that are used to finance facilities:

Fund 21- Measure E bond – Because all the money of the bond has been planned in advance, it can be said that the only available funds are contingency funds (\$2.5 million). However, reallocation is being considered for 171 million dollars.

Fund 25 – Developer fees – \$34 million available. Regarding this fund there stands to be potential litigation for \$11 million. Liabilities on this fund are the Horse Property COP and the Rix site COP. Some discussion ensued about the state match and Liz Fischer shared the CA Department of General Services (which includes the OPSC) Project Tracker site:

<https://www.dgsapps.dgs.ca.gov/OPSC/PT/Pt/Default.aspx>

Note: To see projects in the application stage (i.e. all Measure E projects), leave the Project Type field blank.

Fund 40 – Sale of site – There’s currently \$24 million in this fund. As the name implies, the funds from the sale of a school site go into this fund and therefore are one time monies.

While not specific to facilities, the General fund has been used on occasion (i.e. \$1 million for the Mission pool along with money from Fund 21 and Fund 40).

Discussion moved to the percentage of portables. John Chwastyk gave an update – FUSD has a new staff person who filled the position of a retired person. Considering the new hire’s unfamiliarity with the position coupled with several new programs used to crunch numbers, the current numbers are being carefully considered for accuracy. John gave an example of the breakdown for the Ardenwood Elementary site which is a primarily a modular school site. The MPR is a core, permanent building but the remaining 70% is modular. Questions arose about the differences between modular and portable/replaceable buildings. A key point regarding the latter is the vendor (lesser) is responsible for maintenance, not FUSD.

There are currently 72 temporary (portable) buildings in the district. However, temporary and modular buildings have been factored together in percentages in contrast to permanent buildings. For example, Brier Elementary has no temporary building but it has 9 modular buildings out of 22 for a total of 31%.

Note, the OPSC at one time recommended that 30% of new campuses be built using modular techniques.

Henry Fung (FUDTA rep) shared feedback on portables that he collected from 27 teachers (see attached). John Chwastyk addressed some of the negative feedback citing root causes.

It was agreed that the development trends presentation be tabled until our next meeting so that the updated enrollment analysis/demographic report that will be presented to the school board next week can be shared with this committee. As an assist, Antonio asked Ken to give members the timestamp of the demographic presentation so the FAC can view it prior to our next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned slightly after 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Liz Fischer, community member
Washington High School attendance area

Teacher Feedback Regarding the Use of Portables

Pros:

- Teachers can control their AC/heaters in portables.
- All walls can be used as bulletin boards to hang student works.
- Nothing is built-in so teachers can design their space.

Cons:

- Bathrooms are often very far away for students and teachers since plumbing is not included with the portables.
- No sinks in portables (elementary classrooms and science classes need them).
- Teachers feel segregated from the school since portables are usually on the outskirts of campus. Feel very isolated from staffroom and colleagues.
- Prone to molds and musty conditions.
- No built-in storage
- Leaky HVAC.
- Squeaky floors with weak spots.
- Not insulated and therefore the heater/AC is always on.
- When heater/AC stops working, portables become just a metal box with no insulation from the heat or cold.
- Not much sound insulation from outside PE students or nearby classes.
- Smaller than regular classrooms - tough to fit 30 6th graders in a portable.
- No alarms and therefore more subject to break-ins.
- More visits from critters like mice, roaches, and skunks.
- Not enough or no natural light.

-No phone line, fire alarm, or PA systems for announcements, especially during lockdowns.

-Portables that were leased did not get repairs fixed in timely matters because they are responsibility of the leasing companies.

-There are portables that are over 30 years old still being used at schools.

-Portables make schools look unattractive, unorganized, scattered, ugly overall.

-Only one exit. Lack of other exit options could be a safety hazard.