



City of Emeryville
1333 Park Avenue, Emeryville, CA 94608-3517
TEL: (510) 596-4300 - FAX: (510) 658-8095
www.ci.emeryville.ca.us
Emery Unified School District
4727 San Pablo Avenue, Emeryville, CA 94608
(510) 601-4000 (510) 601-4913 Fax
www.emeryusd.k12.ca.us



Education and Youth Services Advisory Committee
April 19, 2004 – Emeryville City Hall
Meeting Notes

Attending: Elizabeth Altieri, Anakarita Allen, Ruth Atkin, Carol Balfe, Angela Baranco-Mason, Barbara Blood-Walker, Kurt Brinkman, Lois Brown, Bob Canter, Marion Casey, Christina Corodimas, Jason Crouch, Renita Cummings, Michelle DeGuzman, Nora Davis, Melodi Dice, Miguel Dwin, Neil Eisenberg, Cheryl Fabio, Mitch Fine, John Flores, Joe Frantz, Laura Garnier, Forrest Gee, Karla Golden, John Gooding, Patti Jeffery, Linda Jones, Dick Kassis, Marcelline Krafchick, Eleanor Letchaw, Jim Martin, Pauline Marx, John Michels, Roy Miller, Joanna Mooney, Randy Nelson, Angel Norris, John Perry, John Quinn, Katherine Shao, Joshua Simon, Tony Smith, Mary Stump, Ken Taylor, Suzy Wallace, Cheryl Webb, Ellen Whittom, Sharon Wilchar.

1. Welcome.

EYSAC Chair John Gooding welcomed the group. EUSD School Board President Forrest Gee provided an update on activities at EUSD, including the student art exhibit at Cuppa Cabana and the Rebuilding Together community improvement project at Anna Yates School. Sharon Wilchar announced that a youth art project is being planned for May. Lois Brown described the student photographic project at the Center for Photographic Art.

2. Citizens to be Heard.

There were no Citizens to be Heard.

3. Overview.

EYSAC Chair John Gooding described the leadership that EYSAC has provided during the past two years in preparing the Education and Youth Services Master Plan and recommending the EUSD parcel tax initiative. He described the strength of the coalition that has been built at EYSAC, which pulls together all elements of the community. He challenged the members of EYSAC to continue providing that leadership by guiding the vision of the Emeryville Center of Community Life. He explained that each of the three subcommittees would meet separately to discuss the alternative site locations for the Emeryville Center of Community Life that were presented on March 15, 2004. He urged all of the members to provide input at their subcommittee meetings and to consider the

following question: “Of the three site location alternatives presented, which one best achieves the community vision for the Emeryville Center of Community Life?”

4. EYSAC Subcommittee Meetings.

The three subcommittees each met separately. Notes from the Facilities and Programs subcommittee meetings are included at the end of these meeting notes.

5. EYSAC Full Committee Meeting.

- Subcommittee reports to full EYSAC regarding discussion
- Group discussion/consensus on key question

Programs Subcommittee. Forrest Gee reported that the Programs Subcommittee unanimously supports Scenario A. He shared some of the concerns that the subcommittee discussed, including mixing older and younger students on the same campus and concerns regarding the inadequacy of the existing facilities (e.g. cafeteria at Anna Yates).

Facilities Subcommittee. Josh Simon reported that the Facilities Subcommittee had a qualified consensus favoring Scenario A. There was no support for Scenarios B or C; however, there was one suggestion that more information is needed before making any decision. Josh reported that the subcommittee discussed a number of issues, including small neighborhood schools versus a centralized campus, the need to make sure younger and older students have separate entrances and areas on the campus and the need to develop more detailed information about Scenario A. Dick Kassis introduced representatives of Armstrong, whose property is included in all three scenarios.

Finance Subcommittee. John Gooding reported that the Finance Subcommittee unanimously supports Scenario A. He reported that the subcommittee focused most of their discussion on the preliminary financial plan and pointed out the importance of effectively communicating the quality of life issues to the Emeryville community.

EYSAC Discussion. Following the subcommittee reports, John Gooding recognized that the consensus of the EYSAC was to focus on Scenario A and develop additional detail about this alternative. He clarified that this is not a final decision. We understand that there are a lot of unknowns that need to be explored in the coming months.

Sharon Wilchar stated that while Scenario A provides some economies through shared space, we also need to make sure that we provide sufficient space for functions that need to be separate.

Dick Kassis stated that we need to look at how you create a Center of Community Life that provides both separate and together spaces. We need to have a better understanding of this when we go to the community with more detail.

Karla Golden asked if funding for this project would take the place of other City capital priorities or if it is entirely separate. John Gooding explained that the Emeryville Center for Community Life integrates schools, community center and recreation facilities. It will have various funding sources.

Lois Brown stated that appearance is very important. The Emeryville Center of Community Life must be exciting. It must be a place that we are proud of.

Joanna Mooney asked if the EYSAC could be provided with updates regarding progress on Scenario A.

Christina Corodimas asked about timing with regard to acquisition of AC Transit and bringing more information to the public.

6. Next Steps and Adjournment

John Gooding stated that staff would be providing the EYSAC with a follow-up communication regarding upcoming meetings, as well as updates on the AC Transit site and additional information being developed on Scenario A.

Programs Subcommittee Notes

The meeting began with a reintroduction of three sites and the charge of answering the question *"Of the three site location alternatives presented, which one best achieves the community vision of the Emeryville Center of Community Life?"*

Sharon Wilchar opened discussion with strong feelings for Scenario A and, after discussion on traditional schools, community and the City of Emeryville all others agreed that it presented the best option. The Programs Subcommittee had unanimous consensus on selection of Scenario A as best option for the ECCL.

Programmatic challenges associated with Scenario A were discussed:

- High school kids with younger kids presents possible negative influence.
- High school kids with younger kids presents opportunities for mentoring and positive interactions and role models and social opportunities.
- Need for separate spaces and better understanding of what the three distinct schools or small families would look like as it relates to site design and program design.
- Adjacency issues and the need to design enough space to share - examples include cafeteria scheduling, outdoor space, and assembly space for full school meetings/presentations.
- Police Department presence and how it will interact with the schools and ECCL.
- Need for a police representative to be involved with EYSAC so there is a better understanding of needs/expectations and possible opportunities/interactions.
- Location of Police Department in conjunction with the rest of the complex.
- Better understanding of space design in what is "yours," "mine," and "ours/shared" as the process moves forward.
- Better understanding of what is in the ECCL for the community at large, not just the school community.

Other concerns/questions/points associated with Scenario A:

- When will we know if AC transit is available?
- Scenario A is the most expensive, but also best option. Other options do not reflect housing kids while a building is being upgraded or built, which may make them more expensive in the long run.
- Centralized services/schools would lead to more casual contact with the community by teachers, leading to more effective teaching due to relationships built. When have time to play together it is easier to become a learning community.
- Cost savings for operations due to centralization may make this option cost less in the long run, likely to negate the difference within 10 years.

Facilities Subcommittee Notes

The Facilities Subcommittee discussed the following issues:

- AC Transit site acquisition – clarified that Scenario A land acquisition is currently estimated to cost approximately \$35 million.
- Which of the alternatives would provide the opportunity for architecturally interesting structures? All of the scenarios assume new construction—necessary to accommodate new space and parking needs on the various sites, so this is possible in all 3.
- Review and discussion of evaluation criteria:
 - Aesthetics should be considered – look at most attractive site.
 - Need to consider impacts of each alternative on surrounding neighborhoods and minimize. Centralized site has fewer impacts.
 - Consider impact on existing businesses/tenants/property owners.
 - Consider ease of pick-up/drop-off for ECCL users.
 - Mix facilities but maintain separateness to attract broader populations.
 - Consider parent perceptions of separation of grades (one large site with K-12 campus). Need to look at design techniques to keep grade levels separate but still have joint use of facilities.
 - Consider parent desires to have children go to school in their neighborhoods.
 - Any scenario needs to fit into larger city circulation plan – pedestrian, auto, transit.
 - ECCL should be a centralized place for community to interact. Police presence creates safety.
 - Quality of education is more important than proximity of school facility.
 - ECCL facility should support educational vision.

After this discussion, the Facilities Subcommittee considered the key question: *"Of the three site location alternatives presented, which one best achieves the community vision of the Emeryville Center of Community Life?"*

Scenario A – 10

Scenario B – 0

Scenario C – 0

Need more information before choosing – 2