

**DSA/OPSC Program Review Expert Workgroup
Meeting Minutes and Updated Action Items**
June 9, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Ziggurat, Ground Floor Executive Dining Room

In attendance:

Expert Workgroup (EWG) Members

Scott Harvey, DGS (Chair)
Kathleen Moore, (Vice Chair)
Lindle Hatton, CSUS (Facilitator)
Howard “Chip” Smith, DSA
Lisa Silverman, OPSC
Scott Gaudineer, Flewelling & Moody Arct.
Gary Gibbs, CBIA
Eric Bakke, LAUSD
Tom Duffy, CASH
Carri Matsumoto, LBUSD
Laura Knauss, Lionakis
Dick Cowan, Davis Reed Construction

Additional Attendees

David Zian, OPSC
Fred Yeager, CDE
Masha Lutsuk, DSA
Delcy Thut, DSA (Note-taker)
Lisa Constancio
Brian LaPask

Expert Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Welcome

- Introductions.
- Acknowledged there was no one present on the conference call.
- Recap of meeting handouts:
 - EWG Meeting Agenda.
 - Current MOU.

Updates

Outlook is currently experiencing “Delay” and “Failure” messages when sending out emails and meeting invites. The DGS IT department is working with Microsoft to address this issue.

- **Status of MOU**
 - The original MOU was extended by one year and signed on May 2, 2011.
- **Report on MOU Tasks**
 - The chair noted that the task force was not going to get through some of the tasks on page four of the MOU given the time frames that have been set.

Single Interagency PTN

- It was discussed the Project Tracking Number (PTN) group has met twice, and is developing short term recommendations. The group will provide an update at the next EWG meeting.

Common Definition of Teaching Station

- The establishment of a common definition of a teaching station and student capacity is more complex and in some cases the group is agreeing to disagree. OPSC may call a space a classroom where CDE does not. The group is looking at the areas of disagreement to focus on defining those areas. Unusual spaces are posing a challenge to the

group. They are looking at these issues and how they are tied to existing regulations and statutes.

- It was discussed that the OPSC wants the capacity count from CDE to be consistent with OPSC's classroom count. CDE makes decisions of capacity based on their CCR Title 5 Regulations while OPSC makes decisions in relation to classroom counts pursuant to their CCR Title 2, Subgroup 5.5 SFP regulations.

One-Stop-Shop Customer Orientation

- A comment was made that a One-Stop-Shop concept should have a common intake desk. Customer Orientation was a common theme that came out of the sub-committees.

Site Acquisition

- It was discussed that the site selection approval process is a challenge as OPSC and CDE have a different orientation when looking at sites. OPSC needs to ensure that bond money is spent wisely by selecting sites that also consider site development costs. CDE is looking at the same sites with a focus on educational adequacy and safety of the school site. CDE looks at three sites weighing the cost of development, safety, and educational adequacy concerns. The districts make the decision of the final site determination that must be approved by CDE.
- It was discussed that it may be beneficial to have all agencies involved, including the design professionals to have a site acquisition discussion that helps everyone better understand and learn about the decision making process by each entity.
- It was discussed that many of the findings from the site selection process review are interweaved and relate to each other. As individual items are worked on it may help move related issues in a positive direction as well.
- It was discussed that this group look at site acquisition globally and not in a linear fashion. It was communicated that districts may not be making the appropriate site analysis and may need additional due diligence guidance in relation to the site acquisition process. It was stated there should be broader input by all stakeholders (including the design team) to help determine the best project site. This could save time and money.
- Examples of prudent site sections should be identified by the EWG and used to discuss training/understanding opportunities by all entities involved in site acquisition determination. It was suggested that CDE provide better guidelines for site selection to assist school districts in selecting the best school sites and to identify best practices.

DSA Project Closeout Team

- The DSA project closeout team is reviewing two policy documents that are being revised. Once revisions are complete documents are required to go to legal counsel to complete the vetting process.
- **Offsite Final Report**
 - Per Dave Zian, Jenny Hannah has agreed that the offsite items have been resolved to her satisfaction.
 - It was discussed the 15% General Requirements allowance covers items not listed in the site development worksheet. The more common items covered by the 15% allowance are: mobilization, permits, licenses and

fees, temporary utilities and structures, material handling equipment, non-manual labor, and insurance and risk management. The 15% general requirements allowance can be used to fund the costs of site improvements deemed ineligible by Project Verification Team (PVT). The OPSC's PVT offers pre-submittal meetings to discuss and identify cost eligibility prior to project submittal.

- It was discussed that the “adjacent” PVT review side-by-side normal protocol is generally for consistently shaped sites. Sites with odd configurations should be reviewed case by case on an individual basis to determine 100% of eligible site development costs that will be shared equally with the school district. This case by case approach is fair and equitable and is within current regulations and statutes.
- It was discussed that OPSC allows school districts to request special off-site considerations on certain projects upon submittal of complete site development documentation. OPSC will review special consideration requests to determine if they are within the current regulations and statutes and the total eligible costs will still be split 50/50.
- It was discussed that the option of requesting special site review will be communicated through a future statewide article. This will allow districts to have the knowledge and understanding to request a special PVT site develop review consideration and provide acceptable additional information. It was suggested that regulations should be clarified pertaining to special considerations. Other EWG members communicated regulations should not be over clarified as the scope of the applicability could get smaller and limit flexibility. Therefore, no changes will be made to the site development regulations.
- **Discuss Quarterly Training by CDE/DSA/OPSC**
 - **Date**
 - The next scheduled training will be July 13, 2011, in the Ziggurat auditorium from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
 - Training will be provided by webcast from Sacramento.
 - It was discuss that there is a freeze on statewide travel. Only mission critical travel is allowed at this time.

Open Agenda Items

- **New Administration**

DGS has a new Director, Fred Klass, who supports the group objective and is committed to the EWG, the value of this team, and their continued work through the items identified in the MOU.

- **EWG Roles and Responsibilities**

- It was discussed that the roles and responsibilities of the EWG members will review, and comment, on recommendations brought to the EWG.
- It was discussed that the EWG may explore a more formal process by each team dealing with identified tasks on the MOU that provides a work plan, expectations, objectives, timeframes, and recommendations.
- It was asked if there was an opportunity to open more information to the public through our systems. It was communicated that DSA has a firewall issue and CDE is developing an offsite cloud environment. It was

suggested that DSA and CDE get together to see if sharing the cloud environment is tangible. It was communicated that there is off the shelf software that is available to roll information out to the public.

- **2011 Meeting Calendar**

- The Director is suggesting the EWG go to quarterly meetings. The next meetings would be in September and December. The majority of the work is performed in the sub-groups and they should continue to meet to move their items forward. The EWG is the forum to review sub-group reports
- Because of the budget everyone is impacted, decisions are getting harder and this format is appreciated.

- **Interagency Issues**

- It was discussed that as topics or issues came up that EWG members wanted to discuss at the EWG meetings that they would provide the information to Lindle or Delcy.

- Note: To ensure time is given to respond, please provide information or concerns a minimum of seven days prior to the next EWG.

Next Steps

- The EWG will be meeting quarterly. Meeting invites will be emailed out with the next two meetings held on September 8, 2011 and December 8, 2011.

Conclusion

- As previously stated, special site review communications consideration will be communicated through a future statewide article. This will allow districts to have the knowledge and understanding to request a special PVT site develop review consideration and provide acceptable additional information. The Cost of Building Schools sub-group was not on the agenda, but provided a handout and would like to be added to the next agenda.