

**STATE ALLOCATION BOARD**1130 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MINUTES**

August 3, 2007

Legislative Office Building  
Sacramento, CA**Members Present**Mavonne Garrity, SAB  
Kathy Hicks, OPSC  
Michael O'Neill, CDE  
Chad Rohrs, DOF  
Constantine Baranoff, SSD  
Margie Brown, CASBO (alternate for Peggy Reyes)  
Brian Wiese, AIAWilliam Savidge, CASH  
Mamie Starr, CCSESA (alternate for Kenn Young)  
Mark DeMan, LAUSD  
Cesar Diaz, SBCTC  
Mary Morris and  
Eric Shamp, CEFPI  
(alternates for Dennis Dunston)  
Gary Gibbs, CBIA  
Dennis Bellet, DSA**Members Absent**

Debra Pearson, SSDA

Prior to presentation of the topics on the agenda, a clarification from the prior minutes was made and discussion took place on how organizations and representatives came to be a part of the Implementation Committee membership. However, no consensus was reached. OPSC announced that the Implementation Committee members would be interviewed in the near future to gather more input on the topic.

The Chair requested an update on the Project Information Worksheet (PIW). An audience member representing the Coalition for Adequate School Housing provided an update on the revision to the PIW, which was followed by a discussion.

**SEISMIC MITIGATION**

The topic was presented by Katrina Valentine from the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC).

The first issue discussed was the four criteria established by the DSA to determine "The Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings." The Committee Members expressed concern regarding the cost of obtaining a structural report for those districts that eventually may not qualify. A suggestion was made to look into whether the cost for structural reports, whether the project was funded or not, could come out of the available \$199.5 million. Staff agreed to include the request in the August SAB item, but indicated that if the \$199.5 million were to be used for costs associated with obtaining structural reports, less buildings would be able to be mitigated, and the funds would not be utilized for their intended purpose, which is to repair, reconstruct or replace the most vulnerable Category 2 Buildings.

Most members of the Committee expressed concern regarding all of the seismic related costs being borne out of the available \$199.5 million. The Committee questioned if the ancillary costs could come out of the new construction and/or modernization funds. Staff informed the Committee that this had been contemplated; however, when Staff sought clarification from the parties involved during the bond development, it was determined that the intent was for all costs to be borne out of the \$199.5 million. Staff agreed to include the comments in the August SAB item for the Board to consider.

(Continued on Page Two)

### **SEISMIC MITIGATION** (cont.)

Concern was expressed for financial hardship districts that the cost for a structural engineer's report will be considered district contribution for the project. Staff agreed to look into making an exception for financial hardship districts so that the cost of a structural engineer's report would not be considered district contribution and would be reimbursable provided the project qualified for seismic funding.

### **HIGH PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE GRANTS**

The topic was presented by Steve Paul and Toni Martinez from the OPSC. Staff explained that at the September 2006 SAB meeting, the Board approved proposed regulations relating to the High Performance Incentive (HPI) grant; however, the OPSC withdrew the regulations when the Office of Administrative Law advised they were unable to approve the regulations due to undefined criteria referenced in the regulations.

Staff presented a revised draft version of the High Performance Rating Criteria (HPRC) for new construction. Although this revision was modeled after the rating criteria as identified in the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS) *2006 Best Practices Manual*, 32 credits of the CHPS rating criteria were omitted from the Proposition 1D proposed model. This was proposed to assure that the rating criteria was available to as many school districts as possible, that funds allocated from this program focused on facility components that enhance high performance and not operational components, and to ensure funding was directed toward those high performance measures that were more difficult or costly to implement.

Audience and Committee members expressed concern that neither the Implementation Committee nor the members from the previous high performance workgroup were involved in the modifications to the rating scale and regulations, and cited that up to 100 schools are currently being designed as high performance schools using the old program standards. Staff clarified the preparation work that went into developing the draft proposal that was being presented to the Committee for further input and development. Committee members suggested that the HPRC be left unchanged from the September 2006 SAB approval. At the conclusion of this discussion, Committee members expressed that because of the aforementioned concerns, they would be not inclined to support the recommended HPI grant proposals.

### **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 7, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. and will be held at the Legislative Office Building, 1020 N Street, Room 100, Sacramento, California. (Subsequently, a specially set regular Implementation Committee meeting was scheduled for Monday, August 20, 2007 in Sacramento.)