

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
Office of the Superintendent

CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
AND SELECTION OF A SITE FOR THE
CONSTRUCTION AND EXPANSION OF THE
PROPOSED MEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

February 4, 2003

Introductory Statement

Prior to acquiring property for construction and expansion of the proposed Mead Elementary School, there are numerous conditions that the 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. Included in Prop MM is the proposed construction and expansion of Mead Elementary School.

The proposed project is located in the Chollas View Community of the Southeastern San Diego Community Planning Area (Attachments A and B). Currently Mead Elementary School and nearby Chollas Elementary School operate as joint elementary schools to service the Chollas View neighborhood. Mead Elementary School currently provides facilities for grades kindergarten and first (K-1), while Chollas Elementary School provides facilities for grades second through sixth (2-6). The proposed reconstruction and expansion of Mead Elementary School is needed to replace the site's aged buildings and portable structures, provide sufficient space for a K-5 curriculum and provide sufficient hardcourts and playfields. Chollas Elementary School will also be converted to a K-5 curriculum. Once the Lincoln High School (9-12) reconstruction and the conversion of Gompers Secondary School to a middle school (6-8) are complete, the total number of students to be accommodated by the Mead and Chollas elementary schools will be approximately 1,200 students.

The existing Mead Elementary School site serves approximately 300 kindergarten and first grade students and 60 Child Development Center (CDC) students. Under Alternative A (Attachment C), the existing school site will be expanded to include adjacent single- and multi-family residential property. The reconstructed and expanded elementary school will serve approximately 350 students (grades K-5) with a master plan capacity of 450 students. The

expanded campus will also include a 60-student CDC. Under Alternative B (Attachment D), a new Mead Elementary School will be constructed on District-owned property just west and south of the existing Chollas Elementary School. The new elementary school will serve approximately 450 students (grades K-5) with a master plan capacity of 550 students. The expanded campus will also include a 60-student CDC. Either of these two Alternatives will provide an elementary school within the Chollas View Community with sufficient capacity, facilities, and resources to adequately serve the educational and recreational needs of the Southeastern San Diego elementary school population. The new elementary school will facilitate District achievement of the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP).

Community Outreach/Involvement

A community meeting was held at Chollas Elementary School on November 15, 2001 to discuss the proposed demolition, reconstruction and expansion of Mead Elementary School. Notification of this meeting was mailed to all recognized area community planning groups, public agencies, homeowners and tenants on and within 300 feet of the sites, and other interested parties that had participated in District planning and site selection activities in the past. The meeting included a presentation of the Alternative A site that identified descriptively and statistically the elements involved in the proposed project. The elements described included the following: Proposition MM, typical project schedules, the EIR process, and the site design task force process. Following the District's presentation, a session was held in which questions and concerns of the citizens were addressed. The questions and concerns were recorded and are analyzed in this EIR along with other aspects of the project. Questions and concerns raised during this meeting focused on the need for the project, the impact to neighborhood housing, and the desire to examine additional project options including expanding the existing Chollas Elementary School.

A second community meeting was held at Chollas Elementary School on April 2, 2002. Notification of this meeting was mailed to all recognized area community planning groups, public agencies, homeowners and tenants on and within 300 feet of the sites, and other interested parties that had participated in District planning and site selection activities in the past. This meeting included a general informational session regarding the site selection process, the criteria for evaluating and choosing elementary school sites, and a discussion of alternative site layouts developed for expansion of the school at the existing Mead Elementary School (Alternative A) site. Based on their knowledge of the area and community, meeting participants recommended the District-owned property south of Chollas Elementary School as a potential alternative location for the new elementary school.

In light of the community input received at the April 2, 2002 meeting and district staff internal review, the proposed project was changed to include Alternative B, the site location south of Chollas Elementary School. Both Alternatives A and B were presented to the public at a community meeting held at Chollas Elementary School on September 4, 2002. Notification of this meeting was mailed to all recognized area community planning groups, public agencies, homeowners and tenants on and within 300 feet of the sites, and

other interested parties that had participated in District planning and site selection activities in the past. The addition of Alternative B was viewed very favorably by those attending the meeting. Concerns and questions discussed during the meeting included timing for a final decision, traffic and parking impacts, and site layout.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for construction and expansion of Mead Elementary School at the existing school site was circulated for a 30-day public review period on November 2, 2001. Five public comment letters were received in response to the NOP. A subsequent NOP, which included Alternative B, was circulated for a 30-day public review period on August 16, 2002. Three public comment letters were received in response to the subsequent NOP. Letters announcing the availability of both NOPs were mailed to all recognized community planning groups, public agencies, and all residents and property owners within the study sites and a 300-foot buffer around each site. All public comments received during the NOP process were addressed in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR for the proposed Mead Elementary School was distributed for public review on October 18, 2002. The Draft EIR included an analysis of both Alternative A and Alternative B. Letters announcing the availability of the document were mailed to all recognized community planning groups, public agencies, and all residents and property owners within the study sites and a 300-foot buffer around each site (approximately 400 letters total). The 45-day public review period ended on December 6, 2002. Four public comment letters were received. One of the comment letters was from Deputy Mayor George Stevens and newly elected District 4 Councilmember Charles Lewis. The letter was written in support of development on the Alternative B site.

The Encanto Community Planning Group endorsed the location of the school at Alternative Site B in a letter to the District dated May 1, 2002.

On January 7, 2003, the District held a community meeting at Chollas Elementary School to present the recommended site to the neighborhood and discuss the next steps in the process. The meeting was noticed through a letter mailed to all residents and tenants within the current enrollment boundaries for the Chollas and Mead elementary schools, plus all recognized community planning groups and public agencies. Concerns raised at the meeting focused on the date for a final decision and the loss of homes, if Alternative B is not selected by the Board.

As discussed above under Community Outreach/Involvement, two sites were evaluated at a project level in the Draft EIR for the Mead Elementary School project. These sites were identified as Alternative A and Alternative B. A comparison of major site characteristics applicable to each of the sites is presented in the comparative Site Characteristics Table (Attachment E).

Alternative A – Alternative A includes the existing 2.93-acre Mead Elementary School campus and the acquisition of 18 residential lots on which 14 single-family and 8 multi-family dwelling units are located. Development on Alternative Site A will involve displacement of approximately 93 residents. The expanded area will create a new 5.53-

acre campus bound by F Street on the north, G Street on the south, 44th Street on the northwest and west, and 45th Street on the east (Attachment C). The reconstructed and expanded elementary school will have classrooms for grades K-5 rather than the existing K-1, and will include a reconstructed 60-student CDC. The proposed elementary school will be master planned to accommodate 450 students. The new facilities will include additional playground and playfield areas.

Alternative B – Alternative B involves the construction of a new Mead Elementary School on approximately 7.2 acres just west and south of the existing Chollas Elementary School. The District owns approximately 6.33 acres of the property, while the remaining portion of the property (0.87 acre) will be added from the vacation of a portion of the cul-de-sac at the end of 45th Street. Alternative B does not require the acquisition or demolition of any dwelling units or the displacement of any residents. The new school site is bound by Chollas Elementary School on the north, the San Diego Trolley right-of way on the south, I-805 on the west, and 46th Street and residential development on the east (Attachment D). The new elementary school will have classrooms for grades K-5 rather than the existing K-1, and will include a reconstructed 60-student CDC. The proposed elementary school will be master planned to accommodate 550 students. The new facilities will include additional playground and playfield areas.

Analysis

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 (CDE) 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 July 19, 2001 and June 7, 2002 to visit Alternative A and Alternative B, respectively. Subsequently, CDE provided the District with site reviews for each of the proposed sites. Based on initial site visits, CDE provided favorable reviews for both sites. In the event that CDE does not approve the site chosen by the Board, state-matching funds would not be available for the 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, will be prepared for the selected site, as required by the state. This form provides 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.

The District's Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP) includes District standards used to plan and design new facilities and the modernization of existing facilities. These standards are used as a baseline for evaluating the adequacy of each school sites' existing facilities and for the planning of new facilities. The LRFMP has established a guideline of 107 students per acre for an elementary school. A school with 450 or 650 students requires a site of approximately 4.2 or 6.1 acres, respectively.

The Alternative A site consists of approximately 5.53 gross-acres with a master plan capacity of 450 elementary students and 60 CDC students. The Alternative B site consists of approximately 7.2 gross acres with a master plan capacity of 650 elementary students and 60 CDC students. These sites are adequately sized to meet facilities standards (building area, parking area, and hardcourt) for their master plan enrollment.

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. A map that shows the boundaries for the two sites is included as Attachment B to this report. There are no hazardous industries in the vicinity of the two sites that will adversely affect the environmental integrity of either site.

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 of San Diego Park and Recreation Department has been involved with the site selection process throughout its duration. City staff supports the potential to enter into a joint-use agreement for design, implementation, and maintenance of a turf playfield on the field area of the proposed school sites, based on budget priorities and funding availability.

5. Planning Commission Report - Title 5, Section 14011(f) requires the District to send a written notice to the City Planning Commission before acquiring title to property for a new school site and request a written report of the investigations and recommendations for the 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. In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21151.2, if a report is received from the City 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. In accordance with Government Code Section 65402, if a report is not received from the planning agency within 40 days after the matter has been submitted to it, then it shall be conclusively deemed a finding that the proposed acquisition is in conformity with said adopted general plan or part thereof. If the City Planning Commission disapproves the location, purpose or extent of the acquisition, the disapproval may be overruled by the District. The District will comply with the requirements for acquisition of property according to Public Resources Code Section 21151.2 and Government Code Section 65402.

The City was informed of the proposed project through the environmental review process. Mr. Lawrence Monserrate, City Environmental Review Manager, provided a comment letter in response to the August 16, 2002 Notice of Preparation. The letter stated that Alternative B is a welcome addition to the environmental assessment, as it would not result in the loss of housing units or displacement of residents. Other comments generally addressed potential traffic-related issues. In addition, Mr. Monserrate commented on the Draft EIR in a letter dated December 6, 2002. Comments concerning the Draft EIR were generally associated with support for Alternative B, transportation/circulation, biological resources, and historical resources.

6. Geological Hazards - Title 5, Section 14011(g) requires the District to comply with Education Code Sections 17212 and 17212.5 with particular emphasis on 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 URS Corporation for Alternative A and Kleinfelder, Inc. for Alternative B, neither of the proposed sites is located within an earthquake fault zone. Furthermore, the sites are not located within Geologic Hazard Category 31, which is an area considered to have a high potential for liquefaction.

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

The EIR for the Proposed Construction and Expansion of Mead Elementary School evaluated the following environmental issues: air quality; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; noise; population and housing; recreation; transportation and traffic; cultural resources; and biological resources. The EIR also addressed cumulative impacts; other required considerations, including growth inducing impacts and effects found not to be significant during the initial study process; and alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project.

The Draft EIR for the proposed Mead Elementary School was distributed for public review on October 18, 2002. The 45-day public review period ended on December 6, 2002. Four comment letters were received during the public review period. Responses for all comment letters were prepared and are included in the Final EIR.

The EIR found Alternative B to be the “Environmentally Superior Alternative.” Development on the Alternative B site will not result in the loss of housing units or the displacement of individuals. All environmental impacts can be reduced to below a level of significance. Alternative B will not result in significant, unmitigated impacts and will not require a Statement of Overriding Consideration. Alternative B will provide a neighborhood elementary school within walking distance for students who live in the existing Mead Elementary School attendance area. All other environmental impacts for Alternative A and Alternative B would be similar.

The Findings (Attachment F), Statement of Overriding Considerations (only required for Alternative A) (Attachment G), and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment H) for the Mead Elementary School have been prepared in support of each of the sites. This allows the Board of Education to select either of the two sites.

The Final EIR for the proposed Mead 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# 2001111046) for the proposed Mead Elementary School, as defined by Section 15051 of the State CEQA guidelines.

Copies of the Final EIR and Technical Appendices for the Mead Elementary School project 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

available for review in the District's Facilities Management office, Maintenance and Operations Center, Valencia Park-Malcolm X Library, and the San Diego Central Library. The Final EIR, without appendices, is also available on the District's website at: www.sandi.net/repairs/ceqa/ceqa.html.

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 or solid waste disposal site, and, if so, whether the wastes have been removed; (2) a hazardous substance release site identified by the State Department of Health Services for removal or remedial actions; or (3) a site that 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 (ESAs) conducted for the Alternative A and Alternative B sites, neither of the sites: (1) is a current or former hazardous waste or solid waste disposal site; (2) a hazardous substance release site; or (3) contains pipelines that 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 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 approximately 16 federal, state, and local regulatory databases, and consulted with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, as required. Consultation with these agencies identified two companies within one-quarter mile of the Alternative A site that could reasonably emit hazardous air emissions or handle hazardous solutions: Holy Cross Cemetery and Sundance Market. However, based on the type of business conducted at these companies, it was determined that there is a low likelihood that these businesses present an environmental concern. No facilities were identified within a quarter mile of the Alternative B site.

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, Phase I ESAs were prepared for the Alternative A and Alternative B sites by URS Corporation and Kleinfelder, Inc., respectively.

Alternative A

The Phase I ESA for the Alternative A site was prepared in June 2001. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) reviewed the first Phase I ESA performed on the Alternative A site and provided comments on August 31, 2001. Subsequently, a Phase I addendum letter, which addressed DTSC comments, was sent on September 5, 2001, and DTSC performed a site visit on September 26, 2001. A Phase I ESA Determination letter was received from DTSC on October 10, 2001. A follow-up correction letter was received from DTSC on November 14, 2001 (Attachment I). The DTSC letter of November 14, 2001 concluded that lead-based paint and Asbestos Containing Building Materials (ACBM) are the only recognized environmental conditions that warrant investigation and appropriate mitigation. The DTSC concluded that if the District elects to pursue acquisition or construction on the site, then the District shall enter into an Environmental Oversight Agreement with DTSC to oversee the preparation of a Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) to determine whether a release or threatened release of lead and/or ACBM, which may pose a threat to public health or the environment, exists on the site. If previously unidentified contamination is discovered, additional assessment, investigation, and/or cleanup may be required. The District will comply with these requirements following acquisition of the site and demolition of the existing structures.

Alternative B

The Phase I ESA for the Alternative B site was prepared in March 2002. The DTSC reviewed the Phase I ESA performed on the Alternative B site and provided comments on July 24, 2002. Also, since the majority of the site has been covered with varying amounts of fill soil over the last 15 to 20 years, DTSC requested that a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) Equivalent Report be prepared to review site-specific background and site investigation data associated with undocumented fill material that exists at the proposed site. A PEA Equivalent Report was prepared by Kleinfelder, Inc. and submitted to DTSC on October 29, 2002. Based on the information presented in the PEA, DTSC concluded in their letter of November 12, 2002 (Attachment I) that neither an actual or potential release of hazardous materials nor the presence of a naturally occurring material, which would pose a threat to human health or the environment under unrestricted land use, was identified at the site. The PEA concluded that no further investigation of the proposed site is required.

10. Airports - Pursuant to Title 5, Section 14011(k), the District is required to evaluate proposed new school sites relative to airport runways, existing and planned, within two miles of the proposed site as required by Education Code 17215. No airport runways are located within two miles of either of the proposed sites.

11. Site Standards - Pursuant to Title 5, Section 14011(l) the District is required to follow the standards for school site selection in Title 5, Section 14010. Pursuant to Title 5, Section 14011(m), the District must conduct a public hearing by the governing board of the school district as required in Education Code Section 17211 to evaluate the property using the standards described in Title 5, Section 14010. An evaluation of the proposed sites 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 10 to 11.6 net usable acres as noted on the School Facilities Planning Division Field Site Review. The actual net acreages for each of the sites are: Alternative A – 5.5 acres; and Alternative B – 6.2 acres.

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 based on this assumption. Due to the high cost and rarity of available land in urban areas, smaller sites are necessary. 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 550 students would net a site size of approximately 5.1 acres. The net acreage for each of the proposed sites will allow the District to provide for all of the educational requirements for the master planned enrollments.

14010 (c) – Both proposed sites are at least the following distances from the edge of respective power line easements: 100 feet for 50 –133 kV line; 150 feet for 220-230 kV line; and 350 feet for 500-550 kV line.

14010 (d) – The Alternative A site is at least 1,500 feet from a railroad track easement. The Alternative B site is within 1,500 feet of the San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway line, which is located immediately south of the proposed site. The railway is used primarily by the San Diego Trolley. Because freight service is only allowed to operate on the rail line for a limited time between 2:00 a.m. and 4:00 a.m., the potential impact on the proposed school facilities and children due to a freight train accident was determined through the EIR analysis to be less than significant.

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 will not cause safety problems or sound levels that will adversely affect the educational program at the proposed sites.

14010 (f) - As documented in the Geological Hazard Reports, neither of the proposed sites contains an active earthquake fault or fault trace.

14010 (g) - As documented in the Geological Hazard Reports, neither of the proposed sites is located within a dam flood inundation area or within a 500-year flood area.

14010 (h) – Except as noted, neither of the proposed sites is located within 1,500 feet of an aboveground or underground pipeline or located near an aboveground water or fuel storage tank that can pose a safety hazard.

Both of the proposed sites are located within 1,500 feet of a 20-inch-diameter, 400-psi, natural gas pipeline. A Qualitative Pipeline Risk Analysis (PRA) was prepared by URS Corporation for each site for the pipeline. The PRAs concluded that the probability of pipeline failure is an unlikely event with a low risk designation, and the risk of fatalities is “negligible.” On this basis, the pipeline risks would not preclude the proposed sites as suitable for a school.

Both of the proposed sites are located within 1,500 feet of a 28- to 30-inch-diameter, 97-psi, water pipeline, which runs along 45th Street. The EIR concluded there is a low likelihood that the water pipeline will represent a potential safety concern to occupants of the proposed sites should a rupture occur. In accordance with the California Department of Education’s “School Site Selection and Approval Guide” regarding proximity to high-pressure water pipelines, the District will: (1) avoid or minimize student use of ground surfaces above or in close proximity to the buried pipeline; (2) locate facilities safely or provide safeguards to preclude flooding in the event of a pipeline failure; and (3) update the school’s emergency response plan to include appropriate actions to be taken in the event of pipeline failure or flooding. No further action is required or warranted at this time.

14010 (i) - As documented in the Geological Hazard Assessment, neither of the proposed sites is expected to be subject to liquefaction or landslides.

14010 (j) - Once a final site is selected and approved by the Board, the actual design of the new school and grounds will be completed. Both of the proposed sites 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 of the proposed sites have proper access from arterial roads. 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) – Both of the proposed sites under consideration are located on or near 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 the City of San Diego 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 ESAs, except as noted, neither of the proposed sites is: (1) the site of a current or former hazardous waste disposal site or solid waste disposal site; (2) a hazardous substance release site; or (3) a site that contains one or more pipelines, situated aboveground or underground, which carries hazardous substances, acutely hazardous materials, or hazardous wastes. Neither of the proposed sites is located within one-quarter mile of facilities that 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 Section 21151.2 and Government Code Section 65402, once a site has been selected by the District's Board of Education, the City of San Diego Planning Commission will be notified by letter of the District's intent to acquire property and construct the new elementary school. 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) – Both of the proposed sites are located in or near the neighborhood from which students would be drawn which will encourage student walking and avoid the need for extensive vehicular transportation of students.

14010 (o) – Both of the proposed sites would have the opportunity for development of a joint-use play area.

14010 (p) - As documented in the EIR, both of the proposed sites 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. This has been done for each of the proposed sites.

14010 (r) – Existing easements will not restrict access or building placement on either of the proposed sites.

14010 (s) - The cost and complications of utility supply, site preparation, acquisition of property, and long-term landscaping and maintenance costs have been considered in the site selection process. Neither of the proposed sites is expected to result in undue delays or unreasonable costs.

14010 (t) - As documented in the Phase I ESAs, neither of the proposed sites is located within 2,000 feet of a significant disposal of hazardous waste.

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 J) which finds that the proposed Mead Elementary School sites meet 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.

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.

Both of the sites considered for the Mead Elementary School meet the California Department of Education's standards for safety and educational adequacy and, therefore, neither of the proposed sites requires any exemptions.

13. Certification of School Site Availability - Title 5, Section 14011(o), requires the District to certify that there are no available alternative school district-owned sites for the project deemed usable for school purposes by the California Department of Education or certify that the school district intends to sell an available alternative school district-owned site and use the proceeds from the sale for the purchase of the new school site.

The District owns the existing Mead Elementary School, which would make up the majority of the property needed for construction of the new Mead Elementary School on the Alternative A site, and the District owns all of the Alternative B site

with the exception of the City-owned cul-de-sac at the end of 45th Street. District staff will study the non-selected site for future uses and potential referral to the District’s Advisory Committee for the Utilization of Excess School Property (ESP).

B. Architectural Evaluation

District architects have evaluated both of the proposed sites. Based on their location and configuration, both sites meet the minimum site requirements for a 450- to 550-student elementary school. Evaluation consequences of the various site scenarios are outlined below:

Alternative A consists of approximately 5.53 gross acres. The site is adequately sized to meet facilities standards (building area, parking area, and hardcourt) for an enrollment of 350 to 450 students.

Alternative B consists of approximately 7.2 gross acres. The site is adequately sized to meet facilities standards (building area, parking area, and hardcourt) for an enrollment of 450 to 550 students.

C. Cost Comparison

A comparison of the estimated costs associated with acquisition of land and construction of the Mead Elementary School on either of the proposed sites is summarized below. The costs are indicated in “millions.”

The acquisition cost estimates are based on recent sales of comparable properties in the area with adjustments made for escalation and uncertainties.

Construction and non-construction costs were based on standard unit costs for a 450- to 550-student elementary school.

<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE SITE A (5.53 acres – 22 Dwelling Units)</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE SITE B (7.2 acres – 0 Dwelling Units)</i>
Site Acquisition/ Environmental Review	\$7.96	\$0.32
Construction	\$12.84	\$11.44
Non-Construction	\$3.30	\$2.36
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	\$24.10	\$14.12

D. Conclusion

District staff recommends the approval of Alternative B for the following reasons:

1. Development of the proposed elementary school on the Alternative B site will meet the project objective of providing a 450- to 550-student public elementary school that will serve students in the existing Mead Elementary School attendance boundaries.
2. The community identified the Alternative B site as being a viable elementary school location during the community planning and site selection process.
3. The Proposition MM Independent Citizens Oversight Committee (ICOC) recommended the reconstruction of Mead Elementary School on the Alternative B site as part of the required actions to manage cost growth on the new school program.
4. Development of the proposed elementary school on the Alternative B site, 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.
5. The Encanto Community Planning Group strongly recommended that the new Mead Elementary School be built on the Alternative B site, since it would be constructed on District-owned land, would not take homes, and would save the District money.
6. Deputy Mayor George Stevens, newly elected District 4 Councilmember Charles Lewis, and the City of San Diego Development Services Department support the Alternative B site for development of the new Mead Elementary School, as it would not require the removal of existing dwelling units and the relocation of residents.
7. Development of the Alternative B site would provide all of the required school facilities and would not displace residential units.

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 Mead Elementary School.

Facilities Implications

The Mead Elementary School project is part of the Proposition MM program and will serve up to 550 students. The project will serve to provide proper enrollment capacity and assist the District in achieving the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP). The non-selected site will be studied by District staff for future uses and potential referral to the District's Advisory Committee for the Utilization of Excess School Property (ESP).

Budget Implications

Site acquisition and construction of the proposed Mead Elementary School will be funded from Proposition MM general obligation bond sale proceeds. The cost for acquisition and development of the Alternative A and Alternative B sites is estimated to be \$24.10 and \$14.12 million, respectively. The estimated cost for site acquisition and construction on the Alternative A site would greatly exceed the amount originally forecast for the Mead Elementary School project in the Proposition MM program. The relatively high cost for Alternative A is driven by the increased cost of the land and site preparation.

Public Support and Engagement Implications

Community Outreach/Involvement was discussed above under the Background section. In addition, 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 11 designated elementary schools and two new schools to be identified later. The new Mead Elementary School will serve to provide proper enrollment capacity and assist the District in achieving the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP). The community expects the District to complete Proposition MM projects in a timely manner. Construction of new Mead Elementary School will support the District's commitment to meet community expectations. In addition, the Independent Citizens Oversight Committee was engaged to participate in the development of recommended actions for managing cost growth on the new schools program. The ICOC recommendations include the reconstruction of Mead Elementary School on the Alternative B site.

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 property for the proposed Mead Elementary School sites using standards described in Section 14010 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. Adopt a Resolution of Findings Regarding Site Selection Standards for the proposed Mead Elementary School sites, which finds that the properties meet the standards for school site selection pursuant to Section 14010 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (Attachment J).
3. Certify that there are no available alternative school district-owned sites for the project deemed usable for school purposes by the California Department of Education.
4. Certify that: (1) the Final EIR (SCH# 2001111046) 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.
5. Adopt the Findings set forth in Attachment F for each significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR for the Mead Elementary School sites.
6. Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Attachment G for the cumulatively significant population and housing impact found to be unavoidable in the Final EIR for the Mead Elementary School. (only required for Alternative A)
7. Adopt the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program set forth in Attachment H for the Mead Elementary School in order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the Final EIR are implemented.
8. Authorize staff to file the Notice of Determination for the Mead Elementary School Final EIR (SCH# 2001111046) with the Recorder/County Clerk of San Diego County, California (Attachment K).
9. Authorize that the project be carried out as defined in the Final EIR for the proposed Mead Elementary School – Alternative B.
10. Authorize staff to commence with the appraisal process, relocation plan, and/or other related procedures required to acquire the necessary property for proposed Mead Elementary School.
11. Direct staff to study the non-selected site for future uses and potential referral to the District's Advisory Committee for the Utilization of Excess School Property (ESP).

Report prepared by Louis M. Smith, Chief Operating Officer, Facilities Management; Jim Bray, Civil/Environmental Engineering Coordinator, Facilities Management.