STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
1130 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 7, 2005

Legislative Office Building
1020 N Street, Room 100
Sacramento, CA

Members Present

Mavonne Garrity, SAB
Dave Zian, OPSC
David Hawke, CDE (Alternate for Fred Yeager)
Walt Schaff, DOF (Alternate for Blake Johnson)
John Palmer, CASBO
William Cornelison, CCSESA
Beth Hamby, LAUSD
Eric Hall, CASH
Brian Wiese, AIA
Gary Gibbs, CBIA
Debra Pearson, SSDA
Dennis Dunston, CEPPI

Members Absent

Constantine Baranoff, SSD
Jay Hansen, SBCTC
Dennis Bellet, DSA

SENATE BILL 550 GOOD REPAIR STANDARDS REPORT

Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) Staff presented a draft of the "Good Repair Report: Options for a Permanent State Standard" which must be submitted to the Governor and Legislature no later than December 31, 2005, in accordance with Education Code Section 17002. The report discusses options for state standards as an alternative to the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI), as required by the statute.

The staff introduced the report by discussing the development of the IEI, the collection of feedback from the users of the IEI, the examination of facility evaluation methods used by other states and entities, and the discussions that took place during workgroup meetings.

The draft report includes an analysis of six aspects to be considered when developing the permanent state standard of good repair. Discussion at the Implementation Committee centered around three major aspects of the future standard: the facility components to be evaluated, the level of detail to be included in future statute and the need for a statewide tool with a ranking and/or scoring mechanism.

In regard to the facility components to be evaluated, the report suggests that the list of items contained in the IEI should be used in addition to parking lot surfaces, walkways, site drainage, and exterior lighting. Audience members suggested clarifying the term "exterior lighting" to include on-site lighting exclusive of the lighting of the adjacent public streets. The audience members also pointed out that a daytime evaluation of the school site cannot include an assessment of the exterior lighting which may be set to function only during the night hours. Others in the audience emphasized the importance of lighting on a school site, especially in urban communities, and indicated that it is important to require that an effort be made to visit the school during the evening hours to evaluate the exterior lighting on school sites.

The presence of graffiti was also discussed as another potential element to be added to the list of components. In addition to contributing to the uncleanliness of a facility, graffiti may be of concern from a safety standpoint as it promotes gang behavior, as noted by audience members.

Discussion of the need to evaluate the overall cleanliness of the school site revealed differences in opinion in the audience and the Committee. Some believe that the current definition of good repair, the IEI, under-emphasizes the cleanliness aspect in facility evaluations. Others think that there is no need for an overall site cleanliness evaluation; rather, each item evaluated (i.e. interior & exterior surfaces, school grounds) can include a cleanliness element. Representative of the plaintiffs in the case of *Williams, et al vs. State of California* (*Williams*) opined that cleanliness should be spelled out in statute and emphasized in the evaluation of a facility.

The OPSC responded by agreeing to consider the above discussions when compiling the final list of components to be included in the report and presented to the Governor and Legislature.

To aid in the discussion regarding the level of detail to be included in the permanent state standard, the OPSC presented an example of statutory language, which was also discussed. The OPSC suggested a narrative description of good repair components in statute. Audience members noted that an explicitly detailed statutory description may not be useful in the long run as it may be difficult to modify.

The wording of the standards will also determine the level of expertise of the evaluator. Participants noted that, while some school districts may lack the resources to contract for expert services to perform the evaluations, a completely observational evaluation by an untrained individual may not provide an adequate and meaningful evaluation of a facility. This discussion also involved the question of whether to include roofing as a component of a facility to be evaluated. The OPSC staff emphasized that roofing was purposefully excluded from the IEI. Many roofing defects, such as leakages, may be observed from within the building (on the walls, ceilings, etc.) and the IEI was intended to be for observational evaluation and does not require an inspector to be looking at a roof up close.

The final point of discussion was the need for a statewide evaluation tool, whether mandatory or voluntary, containing a ranking and/or scoring mechanism. The representative of the plaintiffs in the *Williams* case favored a development of a uniform tool that would allow for comparison of school facilities and statewide data collection on the condition of California schools. School district's representatives expressed an interest in a tool such as the IEI to be provided for districts that do not have the resources to develop local assessment instruments. Many have found the IEI to be helpful not only in evaluating facilities but also as a vehicle for improvement of school conditions.

There appeared to be a consensus regarding the need for minimum standards contained in statute and in an evaluation tool, with a scoring and ranking system, developed by the OPSC. However, school district's representatives would like to maintain flexibility by being able to incorporate the minimum standards into customized evaluation tools. Those concerned with having to assign scores to facilities or rank individual categories suggested that this may require evaluators to make judgment calls that could be open to interpretation. Initial discussion centered on removing any specific recommendation from the report regarding an evaluation tool with a ranking and/or scoring mechanism, however, the OPSC later announced that it will discuss this topic further amongst staff.

This concluded the discussion of the "Good Repair Report" and it was decided that further discussions at the Implementation Committee are not needed.

The final report on options for state standards will be presented to the State Allocation Board on December 15, 2005 with subsequent submission to the Governor and Legislature by December 31, 2005, as prescribed by Statute.

ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next Implementation Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 2, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. and will be held at the East End Complex, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Rooms 72.149B and 72.148C, in Sacramento.