

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
July 14, 2016

Criteria for Definition of a Historical Building under the Facility Hardship Program

PURPOSE

To discuss potential criteria for a definition of a historical building for inclusion in future amendments to the School Facility Program (SFP) Regulations for the Facility Hardship and Seismic Mitigation Programs.

DESCRIPTION

At the January 2016 State Allocation Board (Board) meeting, the Board directed Staff to explore regulatory amendments for replacement funding requests for rehabilitation of historical buildings when the cost to rehabilitate the facility exceeds 50 percent of the replacement costs as calculated in SFP Regulations that would allow the processing of these request administratively.

BACKGROUND

The Facility Hardship Program regulations provide funding for districts to replace or rehabilitate existing school facilities as a result of health and safety threats. Replacement funding is provided under SFP Regulation Section 1859.82. Rehabilitation funding is provided as an Excessive Cost Hardship Grant under SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e), with the exception of SMP rehabilitation projects which is provided for under section 1859.82. The type of funding provided is partially determined by the cost benefit analysis that is established in SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(A).

At its January 27, 2016 meeting, the Board approved replacement funding for a SMP project for a building that was being rehabilitated. The project funding was considered through the appeal process because it qualified for replacement funding based on Education Code Section (EC) 17075.10. SFP Regulations do not provide a mechanism to administratively allow funding for a project that qualifies for replacement funding when rehabilitation work is being performed.

The district's reason for electing to rehabilitate the building instead of replacing it was due to its historical significance. As it was the third appeal of a similar nature, the Board directed Staff to investigate options for how to facilitate administrative approval of applications for rehabilitation of historical buildings when the project qualifies for replacement funding under existing SFP Regulations.

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

As shown in the table below, in the appeal requests regarding historically significant buildings, the Board has approved funding for school districts whose facilities had varying definitions of "historical", including buildings that were on a historical registry and buildings that were deemed historically significant, but were not on a local, state or federal registry. Some school districts have chosen not to pursue historical designation for various reasons, including but not limited to potential limitations to alter or use the designated facility.

Past Applications for Historically Significant Facilities			
	SIMI VALLEY USD	COALINGA-HURON JUSD	PALM SPRINGS USD
Reason for Rehabilitation	Registered Local Historical Designation	Community Value and Excessive Cost to Replace in Kind	Eligibility for Historical Designation
% off Rehab vs. Replacement	99.7%	57.9%	71.8%
District Request	Replacement Funding for Rehabilitation	Replacement Funding for Rehabilitation	Replacement Funding for Rehabilitation

OPSC is requesting stakeholders input on the development of criteria for a definition of a historic building. The criteria will be presented to the Board as future amendments to SFP Regulations for Facility Hardship and SMP applications.

EC Section 17075.10 and SFP Regulations encompass both the Facility Hardship and SMP, for this reason the amendments will be proposed for both programs. For reference, the relevant statute and regulations are included as an Attachment.

DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis provided above, Staff is requesting stakeholder feedback on the following proposed criteria for a historical building and methods for verification/demonstration under SFP Regulations. Suggestions for additional criteria are requested as well.

1. Designated Historical on a Local, State or Federal Registry
 - i. Letter from local jurisdiction
 - ii. Registry number
 - iii. Registry website listing

2. Eligibility for historical designation
 - i. Letter of support from a historical architect
 - ii. Other suggestions

3. Suggestions for other options and methods of verification/demonstration.

ATTACHMENT – AUTHORITY REFERENCE

Education Code Section 17075.10.

(a) A school district may apply for hardship assistance in cases of extraordinary circumstances. Extraordinary circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the need to repair, reconstruct, or replace the most vulnerable school facilities that are identified as a Category 2 building, as defined in the report submitted pursuant to Section 17317, determined by the department to pose an unacceptable risk of injury to its occupants in the event of a seismic event.

(b) A school district applying for hardship state funding under this article shall comply with either paragraph (1) or (2).

(1) Demonstrate both of the following:

(A) That due to extreme financial, disaster-related, or other hardship the school district has unmet need for pupil housing.

(B) That the school district is not financially capable of providing the matching funds otherwise required for state participation, that the district has made all reasonable efforts to impose all levels of local debt capacity and development fees, and that the school district is, therefore, unable to participate in the program pursuant to this chapter except as set forth in this article.

(2) Demonstrate that due to unusual circumstances that are beyond the control of the district, excessive costs need to be incurred in the construction of school facilities. Funds for the purpose of seismic mitigation work or facility replacement pursuant to this section shall be allocated by the board on a 50-percent state share basis from funds reserved for that purpose in any bond approved by the voters after January 1, 2006. If the board determines that the seismic mitigation work of a school building would require funding that is greater than 50 percent of the funds required to construct a new facility, the school district shall be eligible for funding to construct a new facility under this chapter.

(c) The board shall review the increased costs that may be uniquely associated with urban construction and shall adjust the per-pupil grant for new construction or modernization hardship applications as necessary to accommodate those costs. The board shall adopt regulations setting forth the standards, methodology, and a schedule of allowable adjustments, for the urban adjustment factor established pursuant to this subdivision.

(Amended by Stats. 2008, Ch. 179, Sec. 41. Effective January 1, 2009.)

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82. Facility Hardship.

A district is eligible for facility hardship funding to replace or construct new classrooms and related facilities if the district demonstrates there is an unmet need for pupil housing or the condition of the facilities, or the lack of facilities, is a threat to the health and safety of the pupils. A facility hardship is available for:

(a) New classrooms and/or subsidiary facilities (corridors, toilets, kitchens and other non-classroom space) or replacement facilities if either (1) or (2) are met:

(1) The facilities are needed to ensure the health and safety of the pupils if the district can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that the health and safety of the pupils is at risk. Factors to be considered by the Board shall include the close proximity to a major freeway, airport, electrical facility, high power transmission lines, dam, pipeline, industrial facility, adverse air quality emission or other health and safety risks, including structural deficiencies required by the DSA to be repaired, seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings as verified by the DSA, traffic safety or because the pupils reside in remote areas of the district and transportation to existing facilities is not possible or poses a health and safety risk. The total available funding for seismic mitigation related and ancillary costs for the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings is \$199.5 million.

(A) If the request is for replacement facilities, a cost/benefit analysis must be prepared by the district and submitted to the OPSC that indicates the total costs to remain in the classroom or related facility and mitigate the problem is at least 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost of the classroom or related facility. The cost/benefit analysis may include applicable site development costs as outlined in Section 1859.76. The cost/benefit analysis shall not include increased costs associated with high performance related costs or components, with the exception of those high performance components that were pre-existing in the classroom or related facility. If the cost to remain in the classroom or related facility is less than 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost, the district may qualify for either grant below, as applicable:

1. Modernization Excessive Cost Hardship Grant for Rehabilitation Costs pursuant to Section 1859.83(e), or
2. A grant not to exceed 50 percent of the cost estimate that has been reviewed and approved by the OPSC and approved by the board for seismic rehabilitation.

(B) If the request is for replacement facilities that included structural and/or seismic deficiencies, the cost/benefit analysis must also include a report from a licensed design professional identifying the minimum work necessary to obtain DSA approval. The report must contain a detailed cost estimate of the repairs. The cost/benefit analysis shall not include increased costs associated with high performance related costs or components, with the exception of those high performance components that were pre-existing in the classroom or related facility. The report and cost estimate shall be subject to review by the OPSC for conformance with the Saylor Current Construction Cost Publication and, at the OPSC's discretion, the DSA. For seismic deficiencies of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings, the report and the cost estimate for the minimum work necessary must be reviewed by the DSA.

(C) The seismic mitigation projects must meet all of the following requirements:

1. The construction contract was executed on or after May 20, 2006;
2. The project funding provided shall be for the minimum work necessary to obtain DSA approval;
3. The building is designed for occupancy by students and staff; and
4. The DSA concurs with a report by a structural engineer, which identifies structural deficiencies that pose an unacceptable risk of injury to its occupants in a seismic event. If the unacceptable risk of injury is due to the presence of faulting, liquefaction or landslide, these hazards must be documented by a geologic hazards report prepared by an engineering geologist in accordance with California Building Code, Part 2, Chapter 18, section 1803A and with the concurrence of the California Geological Survey.

The structural engineer's report shall conform to the guidelines prepared by the DSA, in accordance with Education Code Section 17310.

(D) Notwithstanding Sections 1859.93 and 1859.93.1, all applications for the seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings shall be funded in the order of receipt of an Approved Application for funding.

(E) If an Application for the seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings cannot be fully apportioned or approved for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) because insufficient funding is available, the applicant may accept the remaining funding amount or refuse funding entirely. If partial funding is accepted, the applicant will remain eligible for the additional amount of seismic funds, up to the initial funding request, if funds become available within the Seismic Mitigation Program authority amount of \$199.5 million. If funding is refused, the Board shall consider funding the next project eligible for funding pursuant to this Section.

For any Application for the seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings not apportioned or approved for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) pursuant to this Section, the application shall be returned to the applicant.

(2) The classroom or related facility was lost or destroyed as a result of a disaster such as fire, flood or earthquake and the district has demonstrated satisfactorily to the Board that the classroom or related facility was uninsurable or the cost for insurance was prohibitive.

If the district qualifies for a new or replacement school pursuant to either (1) or (2) above, the district is eligible for a New Construction Grant as a new construction project for the lesser of the pupils housed in the replaced facility based on loading standards pursuant to Education Code Section 17071.25(a)(2) or the latest CBEDS enrollment at the site.

If the district qualifies for replacement facilities on the same site pursuant to either (1) or (2) above, the district is eligible for funding as a new construction project. Replacement facilities shall be allowed in accordance with the square footage amounts provided in the chart in Section (b) below. If the facility eligible for replacement is not shown in the chart in Section (b) below, the replacement facility shall be limited to the square footage replaced. The grant amount provided shall be \$173.30 per square foot for Toilet Facilities and \$96.30 per square foot for all other facilities. Additional funding may be provided for applicable site development costs pursuant to Section 1859.76, New Construction Excessive Cost Hardship Grant(s) pursuant to Section 1859.83(a), (b) or (d), therapy room pursuant to Section 1859.72, multilevel construction pursuant to Section 1859.73, project assistance pursuant to Section 1859.73.1, and high performance incentive pursuant to Section 1859.77.4 provided that the high performance points attained are related to the scope of the Facility Hardship project. The amounts shown will be adjusted in the manner prescribed in Section 1859.71. For any project funded in whole or in part from any State bond funds for which the construction contract is awarded prior to January 1, 2012, the district may be eligible for the funding provided to initiate and enforce a LCP as prescribed in Section 1859.71.4(a). For any project for which the construction contract is awarded on or after January 1, 2012, the grant may be adjusted in the manner prescribed in Section 1859.71.4(c) and subject to the limitations established in Section 1859.71.4(d).

Any grants provided pursuant to either (1) or (2) above will be reduced for any space deemed available by the Board in the district, the HSAA or Super HSAA that could be used to house some or all of the displaced pupils, fifty percent of any insurance proceeds collectable by the district for the displaced facilities and fifty percent of the net proceeds available from the disposition of any displaced facilities.