

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 19, 2004

Call to Order:	The meeting of the AMPAC was called to order by Chairperson Vernon Medeiros at 4:05 p.m.
Roll Call:	Sign in sheet provided for members to sign in.
Members Present:	James Colclaser, Ray Hudash, Tim McSunas, Vernon Medeiros, Douglas Rapp, Frank Rugani, Teri Sorey, Ken Stone, Terry Walker
Members Absent:	Dick Fenner, Janet C. Wang
IUSD Staff:	Vern Medeiros, Deputy Supt./CFO Judy Mueller, Confidential Secretary
Others:	Guests: Guest Speaker, Corinne Loskot – Loskot Consulting Services; Sandy Litzie, City of Irvine; Frank McGill, VPCA; Jeff Parker, Standard Pacific; Cynthia Ricks-Maccotan, City of Irvine; and Ione Stein, Ione Real Estate.
Next Meeting Date:	Thursday, March 18, 2004, Superintendent’s Conference Room: 4:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. The proposed meeting schedule has been approved and is now posted on the IUSD Internet under the Fiscal Information>AMPAC link.

Oral Communications

There were no oral communications.

AMPAC Committee Business

1. Call to Order

- Vernon Medeiros called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

- Roll Call completed through Sign In sheet

3. Adoption of the Agenda

- Agenda adopted for the February 19, 2004 meeting.

4. Adoption of Meeting Minutes from January 29, 2004

- Meeting minutes were adopted for the January 29, 2004 meeting.
- Meeting minutes will be posted on the internet for public information.

5. Yale Surplus Property Sales – Guest Speaker: Corinne Loskot, Loskot Consulting Services

- Ms. Loskot will also review Agenda Item #7 – The Naylor Act
- Hand out: “Yale Surplus Property Sale”
 - CAC – Citizens Advisory Committee was convened for Yale property
 - Concluded it should be residential
 - Discuss public bid process (RFP vs. RFQ)
 - Applicability of Naylor Act: Factors rendered Naylor Act inapplicable. In discussion with the City.
 - Sale Process:
 - Public agencies were notified; there were no responses to this.
 - Had there been a response, then there would have been a negotiated sale.
 - Routine matter – school planning facilities division to approve
 - Cycle of entitlement approvals with the city (concluded 22 single family units)

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 19, 2004

-
- Primary objective is top dollar for the parcel – so why was the CAC involved with what the purchaser involved with what the developer would do with this project? Why not the cities entitlement? The city was involved to maintain a comfort level with them for compatibility and the thresholds of tolerance.
 - CAC ranked the firms that presented proposals and provided input back to the Board (related to more of the layout of the community)
 - At what place did they hear the price? January 1997 – when the developers went before the Board. Requirement of the CAC was originally NOT to consider the price – the Board made that decision.
 - Several Bids proposed; Review the Top 3 bids; CAC ranks; then developers come back with highest and best offer.
 - Discussion on Disposition Process:
 - Lien easy to get removed from the Title Report.
 - Encumbrances – typically not an issue.
 - Legal Review & Advisory Committee are a part of every process.
 - Do not anticipate any issues with State Dept. of Ed.
 - No opposition – therefore, no community relations issues with the Yale property.
 - Naylor Act – was determined not applicable very early on.
 - City Review – always a lot of meetings and communication with the city. No surprises with entitlement or notification process.
 - IUSD would not have to get a public waiver if processed entitlement without a buyer. Sale totally contingent on purchase of entitlements.
 - Additional handouts on the Yale Property from Sandy Litzie, City of Irvine.
 - Pre-submittal / Pre-application meetings with the city are a great plan of action. It needs to meet their tolerance threshold.
 - Just because we do not foresee any issues with the master plan of parks with the city; that does not mean there is no need for parks in the city. If there is no need, then why the heavy usage at these sites? We just need to go to the city or the planning commission. Sometimes there is a need for another amenity.
 - Surplus Property Objective and Threshold Tolerance – discuss these issues up front so that there are no surprises.
 - We get HOA support by “pre-brokering” a deal so that we understand that there is compatibility with the home owners association and their sphere of influence.
 - Does adjacency of other parks have anything to do with this? “Pocket Parks” (i.e. .8 acre park is too costly in comparison). City does not like to develop their parks so they give land back to develop a park. HOAs are entirely different than the City as they assess the acreage of parks. These are normal things a developer will face.
 - Have we identified at least 3 HOAs in the parameters of Alderwood? Check with WVA to get the sub-associations (Action Item for Vern to identify if we are missing any of the HOAs and the sub associations).
 - Corinne Loskot will be invited back in a future meeting to discuss: Sale/Lease impact us on the State School Building Fund

6. Estimated Property Values

- Alderwood - Doug & Tim provided feedback to the committee. E-mail from Tim - \$2M / per acre and would want to close at the appropriate tenant map – including entitlement. This price is going up and the ease to entitlement will impact the price. Cannot put an average price on entitlement because of the nature of the beast. Likely to be less expensive rather than more

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 19, 2004

expensive because traffic studies have already been done on these properties (i.e. parking standards are actually over for this property). Cost of \$50K +/- 25%; Alderwood – hard to see it as anything other than residential.

- Next question would be to identify what the density is for this site? City would need a pretty good reason to decline this zoning, especially if everyone was on board. Low income housing in Irvine is different than that of other cities. All different proposals that a developer could make as we approach these different properties.
- Investigate if there is a number of units required or if the lot size may be changed to meet these requirements.
- Tag on from Sandy Litzie – you could do a fee instead of a unit. The developer paid to the city and it was applied to a non-profit housing corporation.
- Entitlement can encompass a number of things with the zoning: a) committee may want to consider getting the zoning itself, and getting the developer to do the rest; and b) ask the city to initiate the rezoning change from institutional and rezone to the way it was before as residential or c) have the developer submit an application.
- City of Irvine – Cynthia Ricks-Maccotan: There is an inclusionary ordinance if the land is rezoned to residential. Low to moderate income \$75K or less – for a family of 4 at the 80% income level. If you cannot build these types of units, you could look into mixed income residential “affordable” units (i.e. San Palo). There is funding available so that we do not have to mess with the fair market value or the city can leverage their funds to make the units affordable or put out an RFP for affordable housing. (Conventional bids vs. non-profit developers – either way we could still get an excellent bid for the properties). Could possibly go to the city and ask them to rezone the property if we agree to make some of the land on a site an affordable housing property
- District Office – Identify if this is a potential for Harvard/Barranca.
- Creekside Alternative Education Site - still needing to identify if this really is surplus or not. Options we are currently considering are as follows:
 - Creekside, and all its programs, is moving to Harvard/ Barranca (occupancy expected by January 2007).
 - Woodbridge portables would be vacated – after the move and is being master-planned for the growth of this school.
 - Comments:
 - Why would the District not consider Creekside as extra parking?
 - Woodbridge is currently being master-planned because it is 20 acres and should be 40 acres for the number of students at that site.
 - If Woodbridge needs to expand, could they use Alderwood facilities?
 - Is moving the District Office viable?

7. Naylor Act

- Corinne Loskot spoke to The Naylor Act. The hope would be that the city does not anticipate any park lands in the surplus properties.

8. Community Input Process

- Our committee needs to continue to meet and knowledge share.
- HOA input process would follow after more information and knowledge share has taken place from our committee.

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 19, 2004

-
- The School Configuration process could be included with Community Input – knowledge share is parallel with this.
 - Action Item: Deputy Superintendent, Business Services, could write a letter to the HOAs to inform them that we are currently meeting to consider the options of these surplus properties. Solicit their input on what to do and what makes sense as a community. May also want to point them to our web site for ongoing meeting information. Vern will make a personal phone call to the HOAs as a follow up after the letter.
 - Action Item: Deputy Superintendent's Office - identify if anyone from the WVA was involved with the Yale property process. Have the WVA speak to the process that worked well for them. Identify if they were included and consulted during the process? Important to include HOAs and their boards during this process.
 - Action Item: Terry Walker, IUSD - Investigate the Estimated Cost to move the D.O. (Lease Comps, Parking (Demographics when Kaiser moves out), Single User vs. Multi-Tenant & IT Expenses – for proposed agenda item #4).
 - Action Item: Sandy Litzie, City of Irvine – Contract with Contractor at City Hall – ACS.

9. Meeting Dates

- Remove March 4th from the proposed agenda. AMPAC meetings will be held at least once a month, and may be canceled by the AMPAC committee if not needed. The proposed meeting schedule will be posted out on the IUSD Internet site under “Fiscal Information>AMPAC”.
- March 18th - Proposed Agenda Items:
 - 1) State Funding – Corinne Loskot
 - 2) Creekside Status/Plans
 - 3) Update on March 2004 Letter to HOAs
 - 4) Estimated Cost to move the D.O. (Lease Comps, Parking & IT Expenses – Terry Walker Action Item).
 - 5) District Office - Single User vs. Multi-Tenant

10. Other

- Action Items: (Questions requiring research/answers) - Long range calendar
 - Woodbridge area – What investment is the DO looking at and is any reinvestment being considered?
 - Identify what happened to the \$3.3 M with the Yale site – Was it put into the General Fund?
 - Can the interest income be utilized for General Fund purposes?

11. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Meeting minutes for 2/19/2004 were approved by the committee on March 18, 2004.