



Executive Summary
Board Date: September 25, 2001

SUBJECT: Certification of Environmental Impact Report and Selection of Site for the Acquisition and Construction of the Proposed Brooklyn-Kimbrough Area Elementary School.	X	OPEN/ACTION
		INFORMATION
		CONSENT

Recommendation(s):

The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education:

Reference pages 17 and 18 of the subject board report.

Summary of Previous Board of Education Discussion and Action:

None

Summary of Key Issue(s):

Prior to acquiring property for construction and operation of the proposed new Brooklyn-Kimbrough Area Elementary School, the district must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other requirements imposed by California Education Codes, Code of Regulations, Government Codes and Public Resources Codes. The results of the investigations and subsequent findings are presented in this report for Board of Education consideration.

The new school is scheduled to be available for the 2005-2006 school year.

Fiscal Analysis:

Site acquisition and construction of the proposed Brooklyn-Kimbrough Area Elementary School will be funded from Proposition MM general obligation bond sale proceeds at an estimated cost of \$24.8 million for the recommended site.

Chief Operating Officer

Chief of Staff

**SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
Office of the Superintendent**

**CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
AND SELECTION OF SITE
FOR THE ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE
PROPOSED BROOKLYN/KIMBROUGH AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
September 25, 2001**

Introductory Statement

Prior to acquiring property for construction and operation of the proposed new Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School, there are numerous conditions that the San Diego Unified School District (District) must satisfy. The District must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), conduct various investigations, evaluate the property at a public hearing, and make certain findings pursuant to applicable California Education Codes, Government Codes, Public Resource Codes, and California Code of Regulations. The results of the investigations and subsequent findings are presented in this report for Board of Education consideration.

Background

On November 3, 1998, San Diego voters approved Proposition MM, which authorized the sale of up to \$1.51 billion in general obligation bonds to repair, renovate, upgrade and expand existing schools; and to acquire property and construct 13 new elementary schools including the proposed new Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School.

The proposed new Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School will provide enrollment relief to the existing Brooklyn and Kimbrough elementary schools. The proposed school will be designed to serve 700 students but would be master planned to accommodate up to 900 students, and would facilitate District achievement of the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP). The proposed project is located in the Greater Golden Hill Community Plan Area (see Attachments A and B).

Community Outreach/Involvement:

A community meeting was held at Kimbrough Elementary School on Saturday, April 13, 1999, which initiated the process for the three new schools targeted for the Downtown/Golden Hill/South San Diego area, including the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School. Notification of this meeting was mailed to all recognized area community planning groups, public agencies, and other interested parties that had participated in District planning and site selection activities in the past. Flyers noticing the meeting were also sent home with students attending area schools.

The April 13, 1999 meeting included a general informational session regarding the site selection process, and the criteria for evaluating and choosing elementary school sites. Meeting participants provided potential general location alternatives for each of the three new schools, based on their knowledge of the area and reference data which included locations of existing schools and maps depicting land use and student population density/distribution.

Following the April 13 meeting, a Site Selection Task Force was convened, consisting of individuals representing Brooklyn and Kimbrough Elementary Schools, the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee, the city's Planning and Park and Recreation departments and the District's Facilities Development Department and Institute for Learning, and other interested parties. Based on the information collected from the April 13 meeting and site areas identified by District staff, the task force identified a Preferred Site and two alternative sites for the new school. These sites were taken forward into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process.

The EIR process for the initial Preferred and Alternate Sites was placed on hiatus in fall 1999 based on input from the community. Two additional community meetings were held on March 27, 2000 and April 26, 2000 at Brooklyn Elementary School to solicit additional community input relative to a Preferred Site and Alternate Sites to be studied through the EIR process. These meetings were noticed via mailings to residents and property owners in a large portion of the Golden Hill community (approximately 6,000 mailings for each meeting), in addition to the individuals and organizations that participated in the initial site selection task force process. Through dialogue and analysis at these community meetings, the Preferred Site and two Alternate Sites (see Attachments C, D, and E) identified in this report were selected for study in the EIR process.

As part of the EIR process, comments were received on the Draft EIR. As a Response to City of San Diego comment 13 (CSD 13), the District considered a smaller project site (Alternative Site 1-A, see Attachment F) at the Alternative Site 1 location. The District considered this smaller site in an effort to reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing associated with development of the 13 proposed new elementary schools.

After District staff identified the Recommended Site (Alternative Site 1-A), this recommendation was taken to regular meetings of the Golden Hill Community Development Corporation (July 19, 2001) and the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee (August 8, 2001) for their review and comment. A final community meeting was held on September 10, 2001 at Brooklyn Elementary School to announce this recommendation to the general community. This meeting was noticed by a mailing to residents and property owners in the Golden Hill area east of 27th Street and south of Elm Street (approximately 4,000 total mailings).

Site Discussion

The Draft EIR for the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School was distributed for public review on October 6, 2000. Letters announcing the availability of the document were mailed to all residents and property owners within the study sites and a 300-foot buffer around each site. The 45-day public review period ended on November 20, 2000. Five (5) letters, containing approximately 65 comments, were received within the public review period from both public entities and area residents. The City of San Diego was one of the public entities that commented on the Draft EIR. As a Response to City of San Diego comment 13 (CSD 13), the District considered a smaller project site (Alternative Site 1-A) at the Alternative Site 1 location. The District considered this smaller site in an effort to reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing associated with development of the 13 proposed new elementary schools. Alternative Site 1-A consists of a smaller portion of Alternative Site 1.

Although the EIR evaluated three project sites in an equal level of detail, the analysis and comparisons presented in this report are limited to Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A. The Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 were removed from further consideration by District staff for various reasons. The primary reason is that the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 are associated with potentially significant and unavoidable geotechnical (Texas Street Fault) and hazardous conditions (petroleum pipeline and natural gas pipeline in 28th Street). The Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 would also displace more residents and dwelling units as compared to Alternative Site 1 and 1-A. Furthermore, the net developable area of the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 would be below the minimum net size of 6.5 acres, which is required to provide for all educational requirements. In addition, the field area would be undersized and developing a joint-use grass-field area with the City of San Diego may not be possible.

Alternative Site 1 is located within the Golden Hill Community Plan Area. Regional access to Alternative Site 1 is provided by SR-94, with primary access provided by 28th Street. The site is bound by A Street to the North, to the south by C Street, to the east by 33rd Street, and to the west by 32nd Street. Alternative Site 1 consists of 9.4 gross acres (2-city blocks).

Alternative Site 1-A has essentially the same configuration as Alternative Site 1; however, Alternative Site 1-A does not include the land occupied by residential dwelling units located in the southwestern portion of Alternative Site 1 and the northeastern portion of Alternative Site 1 (bordered to the north by A Street, to the east by 33rd Street, to the west by the existing on-site drainage that traverses the central portion of the site in a north-south direction, and the alleyway south of A Street). Alternative Site 1-A consists of 7.4 gross acres (approximately 2-city blocks).

Existing land uses within Alternative Site 1 and 1-A consist solely of residential uses. Specifically, Alternative Site 1 consists of 21 single-family and 14 multi-family dwelling units for a total of 35 dwelling units. Alternative Site 1-A consists of 10 single-family and 9 multi-family dwelling units for a total of 19 dwelling units. A comparison of major site characteristics applicable to Alternative Site 1 and 1-A is provided as Attachment G.

The following sections of this report summarize the various research and analyses conducted by District staff.

A. State Requirements

A state-funded school District, before acquiring title to real property for school use, must obtain written approval from the California Department of Education using the following procedures pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 14011.

1. Consultation with School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD):

Title 5, 14011 (a) and (b) requires the District to consult with a field representative from the School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD) to review and evaluate sites under final consideration and obtain a "School Facilities Planning Division Field Site Review," form SFPD 4.0. District Staff met with the CDE field representative on May 31, 2000 to visit the Preferred Site, Alternative Site 1, and Alternative Site 2; and on July 9, 2001 to visit Alternative Site 1-A. Subsequently, the CDE provided the District with written field site reviews. As previously indicated in the *Site Discussion* section of this report, the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 were subsequently eliminated from further consideration due to the presence of potentially significant and

unavoidable geotechnical conditions (Texas Street Fault) and the proximity of hazardous substances (petroleum and natural gas pipelines located adjacent to the sites). Consequently, the District requested contingent site approval from CDE for Alternative Site 1-A. In the event that CDE does not approve Alternative Site 1-A, state-matching funds would not be available for this project.

2. Pupil Information and Site Size:

Title 5, Section 14011(c) requires the District to prepare a statement reporting the grades to be served, pupil transportation, ultimate enrollment at the site and size of the site as justified by the District's Facilities Master Plan.

A "School Facilities Planning Division School Site Report," form SFPD 4.02, was prepared for Alternative Site 1-A, as required by the state (see Attachment H). This form provided miscellaneous information relative to the site, concerning the range and organization of grades to be served, the transportation of pupils, and the ultimate maximum pupil enrollment to be housed on the site. If the Board selects another site, staff will prepare a form consistent with the site selected.

The District's Educational Specifications for Elementary Schools states that "The District has determined that the new sites will likely be seven to nine acres each, which is a minimal size for the planned enrollment." They also state that "deviations from this guide are anticipated due to variations in site size, shape, and topography, and the needs of each school and community it serves." Planning consequences of the various site scenarios are outlined below:

Alternative Site 1 consists of approximately 9.4 gross acres and 7.8 net acres. The site is adequately sized to meet facilities standards (hardcourt, parking area, and building area) for enrollment of 700 students. There is also adequate space to offer a field area of 2.0 acres for joint-use development with the City of San Diego. Space would be available to expand enrollment beyond 700 students. This space could originally be developed as hardcourt or field area.

Alternative Site 1-A consists of approximately 7.4 gross acres and 6.5 net acres. The site is adequately sized to meet facilities standards (hardcourt, parking area, and building area) for an enrollment of 700 students. There is also adequate space to offer a field area of 2.0 acres for joint-use development with the City of San Diego. To expand the enrollment beyond 700 students, classrooms could be placed on existing hardcourt area or joint-use area, which would reduce the hardcourt area below the District elementary school standard of 1.1 acres and/or reduce the area of the joint-use field.

3. Maps:

Title 5, Section 14011(d) requires preparation of maps showing present and proposed school sites, significant roads or highways, unsanitary or hazardous installations, such as airports and industries, and the pupil attendance area to be served.

The District has provided a copy of the District-wide map to the California Department of Education, which shows all existing school sites, as well as a map of the proposed school sites (see Attachment B), which was included in the EIR. There are no hazardous industries in the vicinity of Alternative Site 1 or 1-A. The map requirements have been satisfied.

4. School/Park Planning:

Title 5, Section 14011(e) requires the District to meet with appropriate local government, recreation and park authorities to consider possible joint use of the grounds and buildings and to coordinate the design to benefit the intended users.

Staff from the City Park and Recreation Department have been involved with the site selection process throughout its duration. City staff supported the plan to enter into a joint-use agreement for design, implementation, and maintenance of a turf playfield on the field area of the proposed school site (regardless of the site ultimately chosen).

Staff from the City Park and Recreation Department support Alternative Site 1-A in general, as stated in the City of San Diego comment letter on the Draft EIR, "The following information is provided to clarify the Park and Recreation Department's acceptance of Alternative Site 1 as acceptable. The Greater Golden Hill Community Plan has identified the vacant land at the southeast corner of this alternative site as the "C" Street Mini-Park. The acquisition of this property for school use, with required joint-use of the turfed field, will help satisfy the neighborhood park needs of the area as required in the City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan."

5. Planning Commission Report:

Title 5, Section 14011(f) requires the District to send a written notice to the City Planning Commission of the proposed acquisition and to request a written report of the investigations and recommendations for each proposed site with respect to conformity with the adopted general plan as required by Public Resources Code Section 21151.2 and Government Code Section 65402. If a report is received from the Planning Commission within 30 days that does not favor acquisition of the property, the District shall not acquire title until 30 days after receiving the Planning Commission report.

The City was informed of the proposed project through the environmental review process. Two letters were received from the City's Environmental Review Manager of the Planning and Development Review Department, dated July 19, 2000 and November 22, 2000. Comments from these letters were generally associated with recreational resources, residential relocation, transportation and circulation.

The District sent City Planning Commission Chairman, Mark Steele, a letter on July 5, 2001. This letter addressed the District's intent to acquire Alternative Site 1-A and gave the Planning Commission an opportunity to investigate the site and make recommendations concerning site acquisition. No response from the Planning Commission has been received to date. The Title 5 requirement has been satisfied.

6. Geological Hazards:

Title 5, Section 14011(g) requires the District to comply with Education Code Sections 17212 and 17212.5 with particular emphasis upon an engineering investigation made of the site to preclude locating the school on terrain that may be potentially hazardous. A geological study and a soils analysis must be conducted to provide an assessment of the nature of the site and the possibility for earthquake or other geological damage if

the prospective school site is located within (1) the boundaries of any Earthquake Fault Zones, referred to as Special Studies Zone prior to January 1, 1994; or (2) an area designated as geologically hazardous in the safety element of the local general plan.

Based on geotechnical reports prepared by Ninyo & Moore Inc., Alternative Site 1 (Alternative Site 1-A is entirely encompassed by Alternative Site 1) is not located within an earthquake fault zone. Furthermore, the site is located within Geologic Hazard Category 52, which includes “level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk,” and is not considered geologically hazardous by the City’s General Plan.

6.7. Environmental Impact Report

Title 5, Section 14011(h) requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

The EIR for the Proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School evaluated the following environmental issues: land use; traffic/circulation; air quality; noise; visual aesthetics; geology/soils; human health; hydrology/water quality; population/housing; cultural resources; public services and utilities; paleontological resources; and biological resources. The EIR also addressed cumulative impacts; other required considerations which include growth inducing impacts and effects found not to be significant; and alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project.

The Draft EIR for the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School was distributed for public review on October 6, 2000. The 45-day public review period ended on November 20, 2000. Approximately 5 letters, consisting of 65 comments, were received within the public review period from both public entities and area residents. Responses to the comments received during the public review period were incorporated into the Final EIR.

Although the environmental impacts associated with the Preferred Site, Alternative Site 2, and Alternative Site 1 were found to be similar, the Final EIR found Alternative Site 1 to be the “environmentally superior” site because: 1) it would avoid the potential significant and unmitigated impact associated with the inferred Texas Street fault which has been mapped as crossing the Preferred and Alternative Site; 2) it would avoid the potentially significant and unmitigated impact associated with the 10-inch petroleum pipeline that runs adjacent to the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2; 3) it only has 35 dwelling units which would be removed compared to the Preferred Site which has 74 and Alternative Site 2 which has 59; and 4) it would reduce the number of potentially historic structures affected. Alternative Site 1 will result in a significant impact to biological resources while the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 do not contain sensitive biological resources. Based on comments received in the Draft EIR comment period the District reviewed Alternative Site 1 to determine if the impacts could be reduced. Based on this analysis Alternative Site 1-A is proposed. The impacts would be similar to Site 1 but would reduce the number of dwelling units affected to 19.

The Candidate Findings (Attachment I); Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment J); and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment K) for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School have been prepared in

support of Alternative Site 1-A. If acquisition of any other alternative site analyzed in the EIR is selected by the Board of Education, the preparation of new Candidate Findings; Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program would be necessary.

The Final EIR for the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School has been prepared in compliance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq) and the procedures for implementation of CEQA set forth in the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq). The District is the lead agency for the purpose of preparing the Final EIR (SCH # 1999101113) for the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School, as defined by Section 15051 of the State CEQA guidelines.

Copies of the Final EIR and Technical Appendices for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School (SCH # 1999101113) have been provided to the board office for review by the Board of Education prior to the public meeting. Additional copies of the Final EIR are also available in the District's Facilities Management and Board Recording offices, and the San Diego Public Library (Central Library) and the Logan Heights Branch Library for public review.

8. Hazardous Waste/Air Emissions:

Title 5, Section 14011(i), requires the District to comply with Education Code Section 17213 which prohibits the District from purchasing a school site unless it finds that the site is not (1) a current or former hazardous waste disposal site, unless the hazardous waste has been removed; (2) a hazardous substance release site identified by the State's Department of Health Services; or (3) a site which contains pipelines which carry hazardous substances, acutely hazardous materials, or hazardous waste unless the pipeline is a natural gas pipeline supplying gas to the school or neighborhood.

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments conducted on Alternative Site 1 (Alternative Site 1-A is entirely encompassed by Alternative Site 1), the site (1) is not a current or former hazardous waste disposal site; (2) is not a hazardous release site; and (3) does not contain pipelines which carry hazardous materials unless the pipeline is a natural gas line which is used only to supply natural gas to that school or neighborhood.

Section 17213 also requires the District to consult with the Air Pollution Control District to identify any facilities within one-quarter mile of the site, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or handle hazardous substances, materials or waste.

During the preparation of the EIR, the District reviewed federal, state and local regulatory databases, and consulted with the Air Pollution Control District, requesting the identification of facilities within one-quarter mile of the sites, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Database review and consultation with these agencies identified that such facilities existed in the past and also currently exist in the vicinity of Alternative Site 1 (Alternative Site 1-A is entirely encompassed by Alternative Site 1). However, the EIR concluded that these sites would have a low

likelihood to pose a threat to human health or the environment, and therefore, impacts would not be significant because of the distance of these properties from the site, the direction of groundwater flow, reported chemical use, and the reported nature and severity of the releases.

9. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA):

Title 5, Section 14011(j) requires the District to comply with Education Code Sections 17210.1, 17213.1, and 17213.2. The Education Codes cover the requirements and processing of a Phase I ESA and any additional investigations.

In accordance with these requirements, a Phase I ESA was prepared for Alternative Site 1 (Alternative Site 1-A is entirely encompassed by Alternative Site 1) by Ninyo & Moore, Inc. The Phase I ESA was completed on August 4, 2000. Ninyo & Moore concluded that with the exception of asbestos containing building materials (ACBM), lead-based paint, and the trash observed on-site, no recognized environmental conditions were identified at the site. The ACBM, lead-based paint, and trash will be mitigated during demolition following site acquisition.

The Phase I ESA was submitted to CDE for transmittal to DTSC for review and approval. On October 26, 2000, DTSC completed their review of the Phase I ESA for Alternative Site 1 and concurred with the Phase I ESA conclusions (see Attachment L) DTSC recommended that the District evaluate all potentially impacted structures and appropriately mitigate the lead-based paint and ACBM. They will require post demolition soil samples to be analyzed for lead to confirm that historical and/or demolition activities have not impacted the site. The soil sample results and proper ACBM abatement certification will be submitted to DTSC in a focused Preliminary Environmental Assessment report. Upon the successful completion and mitigation of the asbestos and lead issues DTSC expects to be able to issue a “no further action letter” for all environmental issues associated with this site. The District will need to enter into a voluntary oversight agreement to enable DTSC to oversee this process.

Following DTSC’s review, the San Diego Unified School District requested contingent site approval from the California Department of Education. The California Department of Education is currently reviewing the application. -California Department of Education approval is not required prior to approving or purchasing the site, however, it is required prior to application for State funding.

10. Airports:

Pursuant to Title 5, Section 14011(k), the District is required to evaluate proposed new school sites relative to airports, existing and planned, within two miles of the proposed site as required by Education Code 17215. District staff has provided the State Department of Education written notice that there are no existing or planned airports within two miles of Alternative Site 1 or 1-A.

11. Site Standards:

Education Code Section 17211 requires the Board of Education to evaluate the State Department of Education Site Selection Standards at a public hearing using the site selection standards described in Title 5, Section 14010. The evaluation of Alternative

Site 1 and 1-A is provided below. The public will have an opportunity at the public hearing to comment on the following standards.

14010 (a):

The 2000 Edition of the “School Site Analysis and Development” published by the California Department of Education recommends 11 – 12 net usable acres as noted on the School Facilities Planning Division Field Site Review for Alternative Site 1-A. The actual net acreages for Alternative Site 1 and 1-A are 7.9 and 6.5, respectively.

14010 (b):

The 2000 Edition of the “School Site Analysis and Development” Manual published by the California Department of Education provides site size recommendations based on the assumption that “single-story buildings and campus style layouts likely will continue to be the predominant design style for California schools in most communities.” The site size requirements provided are therefore based on this assumption. The San Diego Unified School District Educational Specifications – Elementary Schools states in part that “Due to the high cost and rarity of available land in urban areas, smaller sites are necessary.” It further states that “Strategies for efficient site utilization should be considered, such as two-story structures where possible, and staggered lunches and recesses to maximize use and reduce congestion on the playground areas. The optimal enrollment of 700 students would net a site size of approximately 6.5 acres without accommodating increased enrollment.”

Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A contain sufficient acreage to provide for all of the educational requirements. For Alternative Site 1-A to expand the enrollment beyond 700 students, classrooms would need to be placed on existing hardcourt area or joint-use area, which would reduce the hardcourt area below the District elementary school standard of 1.1 acres and/or reduce the area of the joint-use field.

14010 (c):

As documented in the Phase 1 ESA, Alternative Site 1 and 1-A must be at least the following distances from the edge of respective power line easements:

- 100 feet for 50-133 KV lines
- 150 feet for 220-230 KV lines
- 350 feet for 500-550 KV lines

Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are approximately 60 feet from two separate 69 KV lines. However, the remaining distance to make up the 100-foot setback will fall in unusable slope area. In addition, an EMF study was performed on the site. The study concluded that EMF readings at the site are within acceptable limits.

14010 (d):

Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A is at least 1,500 feet from a railroad track easement.

14010 (e):

As documented in the EIR, the results of a traffic study and noise study concluded that with appropriate mitigation measures, the adjacent roads and/or freeways will not cause safety problems or sound levels which will adversely affect the educational

program at either Alternative Site 1 or 1-A. Development of the proposed elementary school on Alternative Site 1 or 1-A will slightly exceed the City of San Diego exterior noise standard (by 1 decibel) due to aircraft overflights (primarily landings). However, the noise level will be within the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Noise Element Guidelines and is not expected to adversely affect the educational program.

14010 (f):

As documented in the Geological Hazard Assessment, Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A do not contain an active earthquake fault or fault trace.

14010 (g):

As documented in the Geological Hazard Assessment, Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are not within the 100-year flood area nor are they within a dam flood inundation area.

14010 (h):

As documented in the Phase I ESA, Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are not within 1,500 feet of an aboveground or underground pipeline nor are they located near an above-ground water or fuel storage tank.

14010 (i):

As documented in the Geological Hazard Assessment, Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are not expected to be subject to high liquefaction or landslides.

14010 (j):

Once a site is selected and approved by the Board, the actual design of the new school and grounds will be completed. Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are roughly rectangular which will allow for proper building layout, parking, and playfields that can be safely supervised and will not exceed the allowed passing time to classes for the District.

14010 (k):

Both Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A would have proper access from arterial roads such as C Street and 33rd Street. As documented in the EIR, the actual design for the school and grounds is not yet completed and therefore the location and layout of the driveways has not been determined. Design of the driveway sight distances will be performed in accordance with the Sight Distance Standards established in the Highway Design Manual, Table 201.1, published by the Department of Transportation, July 1, 1990 edition and other appropriate guidance.

14010 (l):

Neither Alternative Site 1 or 1-A is located on a major arterial street with heavy traffic patterns. As documented in the EIR, the actual design for the school and grounds is not yet completed and therefore specific traffic safety measures have not been determined. Design of the school and off-site improvements will include these considerations and specific safety measures will be developed cooperatively with City of San Diego officials in accordance with the School Area Safety Manual published by the California Department of Transportation and other appropriate guides.

14010 (m):

As required by Education Code Section 17213 and as documented in the Phase I ESA, neither Alternative Site 1 or 1-A is a current or former hazardous waste disposal site or solid waste disposal site; a hazardous substance release site; a site which contains one

or more pipelines, situated aboveground or underground, which carries hazardous substances, acutely hazardous materials, or hazardous wastes or located within ¼ mile of facilities which might reasonably be expected to emit hazardous waste emissions which would constitute an actual or potential endangerment of public health to persons who would attend or be employed at the school. In accordance with Public Resources Code 21151.2 and Government Code Section 65402, the City of San Diego Planning Commission was notified by letter of the District's intent to acquire Alternative Site 1-A and construct the new elementary school. No response has been received to date. As documented in the EIR the actual design for the school and grounds is not yet completed and therefore specific traffic safety measures have not been determined. Design of the school and off-site improvements will include these considerations and specific safety measures will be developed cooperatively with City of San Diego officials in accordance with the School Area Safety Manual published by the California Department of Transportation and other appropriate guides.

14010 (n):

Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are centrally located in and near the neighborhoods from which students would be drawn which will encourage student walking and avoid the need for extensive vehicular transportation of students.

14010 (o):

Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A offer the opportunity for development of joint-use facilities. As stated in the City of San Diego comment letter received on the Draft EIR, "The Greater Golden Hill Community Plan has identified the vacant land at the southeast corner of this alternative site as the "C" Street Mini-Park. The acquisition of this property for school use, with required joint-use of the turf fields, will help in satisfying the neighborhood park needs of the area as required in the City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan."

14010 (p):

As documented in the EIR, Alternative Site 1 and 1-A would have adequate public services.

14010 (q):

As documented in the District Education Specifications and the CDE Site Selection Guidelines environmental factors of light, wind, noise, and aesthetics must be considered in the site selection process and this has been done for Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A. As documented in the Phase I ESA there are no sites located within a quarter of a mile that are expected to constitute an actual or potential danger of public health of students or staff.

14010 (r):

Existing easements will not restrict access or building placement on Alternative Sites 1 or 1-A.

14010 (s):

The cost and complications of utility supply, site preparation, acquisition of property, long term landscaping and maintenance costs, and existing biological resources have been considered in the site selection process and are not expected to result in undue delays or unreasonable costs.

14010 (t):

As documented in the Phase I ESA, Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A are not within 2,000 feet of a significant disposal of hazardous waste. In addition to the state standards identified above, the California Department of Education has published a “School Site Selection and Approval Guide” to help school Districts: (1) select school sites that provide both a safe and supportive environment for the instruction program and learning process; and (2) gain state approval for the selected sites.

The guide includes a set of site selection criteria which are broken down into 12 categories: safety, location, environment, soils, topography, size and shape, accessibility, public services, utilities, cost, availability of the property, and public acceptance. The California Department of Education has indicated that these guidelines are not all inclusive and that the District can revise them or add other considerations, as appropriate, for local circumstances. District staff evaluated each factor for Alternative Site 1 and 1-A and a copy of the “Site Selection Criteria” worksheet for Alternative Sites 1 and 1-A is provided in this report as Attachment M.

Resolution:

The state standards for school site selection are set forth in Section 14010 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. District compliance with these standards has been discussed above (reference Item 11, Site Standards). Attached is a resolution (Attachment N) which finds that the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A property meets the standards for school site selection pursuant to Education Code Section 17251(b) and Section 14010 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. If the Board of Education selects another site (other than Alternative Site 1-A) for acquisition, a Resolution specific to that site will need to be prepared and approved by the Board.

12. Request for Exemption from standard in Section 14010:

Title 5, Section 14011(n) authorizes the District to submit a request to the California Department of Education for an exemption to the school site selection standards required by Title 5, 14010, including a description of the mitigation that overrides the standard.

Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A meets the California Department of Education’s standards for safety and educational adequacy and therefore does not require any exemptions.

13. Certification of School Site Availability:

Pursuant to Title 5, Section 14011(o), there are no available alternative school District-owned sites for the project deemed usable for school purposes.

B. Architectural Evaluation

District architects evaluated Alternative Site 1-A and have identified the following benefits.

1. The site is bordered on the west and east by non-continuous streets that provide greater opportunities for pedestrian access to the site.

2. The topography provides an opportunity to develop a school that will blend into the existing canyon and reduce the visual impact of the project on the surrounding neighborhood.

3. The site has the potential for expansion across 33rd Street.

C. Cost Comparison

A comparison of the estimated costs associated with acquisition of land and construction of the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School on Alternative Site 1 and 1-A have been summarized below. The costs are indicated in “millions.”

DESCRIPTION	ALTERNATIVE SITE 1 (9.4 acres – 35 dwelling units)	ALTERNATIVE SITE 1-A (7.4 acres – 19 dwelling units)
Site Acquisition	12.1	9.2
Construction	13.1	12.3
Non-Construction	3.7	3.3
TOTAL ESTIMATE COSTS	28.9	24.8

The acquisition cost estimates are based on recent sales of comparable properties in the area where possible. Subject property appraisals will begin after the board selects a site.

Construction and non-construction costs were based on standard unit costs for a 700 – 900 student elementary school.

D. Conclusion

District staff recommends the approval of Alternative Site 1-A for the following reasons:

1. The community identified Alternative Site 1-A as being a viable elementary school location during the task force site selection process.
2. Development of the proposed elementary school on Alternative Site 1-A with a joint-use facilities agreement with the City of San Diego will help to implement the City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan which planned for the southeast portion of the site to be developed as a neighborhood park.
3. Development of the proposed elementary school on Alternative Site 1-A will displace substantially fewer housing units and residents as compared to the Preferred Site or Alternative Site 1 because approximately half of the site is currently vacant.
4. Alternative Site 1-A offers better and safer design options than the Preferred Site and Alternative Site 2 as indicated in Section B, “Architectural Evaluation,” of this report.

Instructional Implications

Proposition MM was designed to improve classroom health, safety and instruction in every neighborhood school by various methods including the building of new schools. Certification of the site for acquisition will allow for timely construction of the proposed new Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School.

Facilities Implications

The Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School project is part of the Proposition MM program and will serve 700-900 students. The project would serve to provide enrollment relief to the existing Brooklyn and Kimbrough Elementary Schools and would also assist the District in achieving the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP).

Budget Implications

Site acquisition and construction of the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School will be funded from Proposition MM general obligation bond sale proceeds. The cost for acquisition and development of Alternative Site 1-A is estimated to be \$24.8 million, which is within the original Proposition MM program budget for this elementary school. Please see the "Cost Comparison" section of this report for a breakdown of estimated costs.

Public Support and Engagement Implications

Proposition MM was approved by San Diego voters in November 1998, to improve classroom health, safety, and instruction in every neighborhood school by various means, including the construction of 13 new elementary schools. The community expects the District to complete Proposition MM projects in a timely manner. Construction of the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School will support the District's commitment to meet community expectations.

Alternative Site 1-A was reviewed with the Greater Golden Hill Community Development Corporation and the Greater Golden Hill Community Planning Committee at their regular meetings on July 19, 2001 and August 8, 2001, respectively. Neither group took an official position on the recommended site. However, several individual members of each group stated that they could support the site, and would testify to that effect at the September 25, 2001 board meeting. Group members also commended the District for meeting community requests to minimize the footprint of the school site and the displacement of neighborhood residents.

Both groups stated that they would consider taking a formal position on the site at their September 2001 meetings, following the September 10, 2001 community meeting. The Greater Golden Hill Community Development Committee meets on September 20, 2001 and the Greater Golden Hill Community Planning Committee meets on September 11, 2001. The results of these meetings were not available at the time this report was prepared but will be made a part of the presentation at the board meeting.

The City's Park and Recreation Department supports acquisition of Alternative Site 1-A. The San Diego Housing Commission supports any effort by the District to reduce the loss of affordable housing.

Policy Implications

This report is consistent with board policies E-2050, E-2100, E-2250, E-2300, E-2350, E-2400, E-2500 and E-4000. No revision of administrative procedure is required.

Recommendations

The superintendent recommends that the Board of Education:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing to evaluate the proposed Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A using site selection standards established by the State Department of Education.
2. **Adopt a resolution, which finds that the property for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A meets the standards for school site selection pursuant to Education Code Section 17251(b) and Section 14010 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. (Attachment N).**
3. **Certify that: (1) the Final EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA; (2) the Final EIR was presented to the Board of Education which reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the project; and (3) the Final EIR reflects the District's independent judgment and analysis.**
4. **Adopt the Candidate Findings set forth in Attachment I for each significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A.**
5. **Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Attachment J for each significant environmental effect found to be unavoidable in the Final EIR for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A.**
6. **Adopt the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program set forth in Attachment K for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A in order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the Final EIR are implemented.**
7. **Authorize that the project be carried-out as defined in the Final EIR for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School (SCH 1999101113).**
8. **Authorize staff to file the Notice of Determination with the Recorder/County Clerk of San Diego County, California (Attachment O).**
9. Authorize staff to commence with the appraisal process, relocation plan, and other related procedures required to acquire properties for the Brooklyn/Kimbrough Area Elementary School Alternative Site 1-A.

Report prepared by Lou Smith, chief operating officer, Facilities Management; Scott Patterson, deputy chief operating officer, Facilities Management; Jim Bray, civil/environmental engineering coordinator, Facilities Management; and Sue Lawrence, administrative assistant II, Facilities Management.

LMS:SP:JB:SL

crl