

**DSA/OPSC Program Review Expert Workgroup
Meeting Minutes**

September 29, 2010

2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Ziggurat, 8th Floor Executive Board Room

In attendance:

Expert Workgroup Members

Stephen Amos, DGS (Chair)
Kathleen Moore, CDE (Vice Chair)
Lindle Hatton, CSUS (Facilitator)
Howard “Chip” Smith, DSA
Lisa Silverman, OPSC
Fred Yeager, CDE
Chris Ferguson, DOF
Ted Toppin, PECG
Eric Bakke, LAUSD (Delegate for James Sohn, also
Closeout Sub-Group Chair)
Bill Savidge, West Contra Costa USD (Also Design
Sub-Group Chair)
Tom Duffy, CASH
Stuart Drown, LHC
Gary Gibbs, CBIA
Joel Montero, FCMAT
Scott Gaudineer, Flewelling & Moody Architects

Additional Attendees

Kathy Hicks, DSA
Lisa Kaplan, SAB
Chris Martin, DSA/LAUSD
Patty Herrera, MWH
Shanna Everts, SAB
Rebecca Kirk, OPSC
Jordan Aquino, DSA (Note-taker)

Welcome:

- After a round of introductions, the Chair emphasized that the focus of the meeting would be on identifying fatal flaws in the final report. The final report is intended to be a living document that will outline an action plan.
- The “Resources” section was revised:
 - The Macias report was removed.
 - The CASH response to the OPSC New Construction Grant Adjustment Report will be included.
 - In response to the August 2007 Little Hoover Commission report, the SAB minutes from the meeting during which the report was discussed will be included as a resource.

Table Edits:

- Under Table 1, there was a question about the use of a single project tracking number. The table lists this as a “legislative” solution, but several

- individuals felt that this solution shouldn't require legislation. It was agreed that a new requirement on the agencies would require legislation, but the much simpler solution would be for the involved agencies (CDE, DSA, and OPSC) to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- Ultimately it was decided that the word "required" would be dropped from the solution and that this would become a procedural solution rather than legislative.
 - There was a question about the final item in Table 1 ("District design professionals certify..."). What is the real issue here and is this really a communication problem?
 - After some discussion, it became clear that this item was spawned from two separate issues that were merged together.
 - The real concern is that a project's need to be reviewed is based on a dollar value that was established at an earlier time.
 - PECG objects to the inclusion of this item, and it was requested that the objection be noted.
 - The Chair suggested that this solution be split into two components. The first is a legislative solution to raise the dollar threshold. The second is a procedural solution that can be implemented at the DSA intake process.
 - There was a concern over the term "one stop shop." It was the recollection of some that this was bifurcated into two solutions. The first solution would be that there is a single point of contact – an ombudsman – who could work with the client. The second solution is the much broader concept of a single agency.
 - It was suggested that the phrase "one stop shop" be completely eliminated and that the focus be placed on agreements and MOUs. The counter argument was to leave in the "one stop shop" concept as something to be strived for.
 - It was suggested that "one stop shop" refers to a customer-focused approach, and not necessarily to a single agency. The creation of a single point of contact is what matters from the customer's viewpoint.
 - There was a general comment that additional information should be added to the paragraphs before the tables to provide additional context for the tables.
 - There was also a general comment that the solutions be reorganized so that the short-term items appear at the top of the table and the longer-term solutions be placed at the bottom.
 - On Table 2, there was some question about the "health and safety" language in one of the solutions. Clarification was provided, but the measure needed to be redrafted.
 - On Table 2, there was discussion regarding the "contractual language" solution and whether it is appropriate for a State report to address a contractual obligation at the local level.

- It was suggested that the State should not be imposing contract language, but that the State can provide valuable suggested language.
- On Table 2, PEGG objects to items 1, 3, 4 and 5.
- On Table 2, CBIA objected to any proposed solution that would change the intent of Senate Bill 50 (1998 – Greene).
- On Table 3, the first solution’s language needs to be redrafted. The crux of the solution is that the model should be based on square feet rather than per pupil.
- On Table 3, the “cost index” solution needed additional language.
- On Table 3, the “adequately fund off site mitigations” solution needs an additional comment about the *Marina* decision. The decision should be included as a resource.

Edits to the Narrative:

- On Page 3, item 3 should be edited so that there is a reference to solutions that can be implemented administratively versus those that must be implemented legislatively.
- The background section regarding the roles of the OPSC and the SAB will be revised (Pages 4 & 5).
- It was suggested that “Local Educational Agencies” or “LEA” be used instead of “school district.” LEA is a more inclusive term which includes school districts and county offices of education.
 - Additionally, included with every reference to LEAs should be a reference to community college districts.
- It was reiterated that the paragraphs before the tables should be expanded to provide additional context for the table.
- There was a concern that objections need to be incorporated into the narrative. One suggestion was to incorporate footnotes on the tables to denote major objections. An alternative suggestion was to include a general statement in the executive summary. The Chair felt that the executive summary should generally note that there was not 100% agreement, and that this should be reiterated in the conclusion. There should not be a footnote for each and every objection.
- The “Accomplishments” section was included to recognize the “what is working” comments identified in the subgroups. There was general agreement from the Expert Workgroup that the information in the section is valuable, but it was suggested that it be shortened and incorporated in the background section, placed as a separate item in the appendix, or in a “grey box.”

Final Thoughts:

- The Chair noted that this is the last planned meeting for the Expert Workgroup, but that the Workgroup members may be asked to reconvene to ensure that the proposed solutions are being implemented.
- Proposed edits to the report not discussed during the meeting should be forwarded to Lindle Hatton, Wendy O'Donnell, or Rebecca Kirk.
- There had been discussion about implementing some solutions before the report is officially released. A request was made that the proposed solution for an interagency agreement/MOU not be signed until after a budget passes.