

ADVISORY ACTIONS

Inside

- » Welcome, Rob Cook, to the State Allocation Board ...2
- » California Department of Education's Report on Defining a "Complete School"2
- » New School Groundbreakings.....3
- » School Facility Program Funding Reporting Requirements3
- » Regulations Update.....4
- » Implementation of Assembly Bill 607: The SAB approves the Facility Inspection Tool.....5
- » Status of Funds6
- » Implementation Committee Insert

OPSC Reminders

State Allocation Board Meetings*

- » July 25, 2007
- » August 22, 2007
- » September 26, 2007

Implementation Committee Meetings*

- » August 3, 2007
- » September 7, 2007

Interest Earned Report (Form SAB 180)

- » Due quarterly (March 31, June 30, September 30 and December 31) from each county for all districts that earned interest from the Leroy F. Greene Lease-Purchase Program

Critically Overcrowded Schools

- » Final Conversion Application Submittals for Projects Apportioned in August 2003 due by:..... August 27, 2007
- » Final Conversion Application Submittals for Projects Apportioned in October 2004 due by: October 27, 2008

Charter School Facilities

- » Final Conversion Application Submittals for Projects Apportioned on February 23, 2005 due by:..... February 23, 2009

Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP)

- » DMP Funding targeted SAB date: December 2007

Reports Due On September 1, 2007

- » Community School Facilities Report (Form SAB 406C)
- » Expelled Pupils Facilities Report (Form SAB 406E)

California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) Updates

- » Due by November 1, 2007 with Application submittals

* For the latest meeting dates, times and locations, check the OPSC Web site.



from the desk of Rob Cook, Executive Officer

On June 21, 2007, I was honored to have been appointed as the Executive Officer of the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC). Since 2004, I have served as a Deputy Director for the Department of General Services (DGS). In that capacity, I represented the Director of DGS on the State Allocation Board (SAB) and was responsible for the Interagency Support Division that includes the Office of State Publishing, the Office of Fleet and Asset Management, and the OPSC.

I now have a great opportunity to focus on building on the best aspects of the SAB, the School Facility Program, and the dedicated staff of the OPSC. As executive officer of the SAB and OPSC, I will focus on ensuring equity, integrity, and measuring outcomes as we allocate billions of dollars in State bond money for school facilities. I want to make sure that we are efficient, effective, customer-friendly, and that we deliver the results that taxpayers expect.

We all share the mission of building schools for our children. I look forward to working with all of you to fulfill that mission.

WELCOME, ROB COOK, TO THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD!

By Lisa Jones, Administrative Services Supervisor

On June 21, 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger appointed Rob Cook as the Executive Officer of the OPSC, an office within the Interagency Support Division of the DGS. At the June 27, 2007 SAB meeting, the Board adopted a Resolution delegating authority to Mr. Cook as the SAB's Executive Officer. This delegated authority includes, but is not limited to, the signing of contracts authorized by the Board, the authority to file regulations on behalf of the Board, and prior to any action by the Board shall bring forth any matter of policy or procedure that represents a departure from standard practice.

The OPSC staff and the SAB welcome you, Rob, and we look forward to working with you!

California Department of Education's Report on Defining a "Complete School"

By Karen Sims, Policy and Specials Analyst

At the March 2007 SAB meeting, the Board requested that the California Department of Education (CDE) provide a definition of a complete school and examples of complete schools approved by the CDE. The CDE presented its report at the June 2007 SAB meeting.

In the report, the CDE identified 60 schools that met Title 5 standards and reported the average per pupil square footage to what was allowed under the former Lease-Purchase Program (LPP). The results showed that while school districts are building more square footage per pupil in the middle and high school projects than what was allowed under the LPP, the per pupil square footage being built is still under the national average.

The CDE stated that they have not yet completed the second objective of the report which is to determine if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable. Once that study is complete, the CDE will bring a subsequent report to the Board to outline its findings.

School Facility Program Funding Reporting Requirements

By Lori Namba, Audit Supervisor

After a school district or County Office of Education (COE) receives School Facility Program (SFP) funds, the regulations require two reporting processes that run concurrently, with different due dates:

1. Annual Expenditure Report and cumulative Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures.
2. Substantial Progress Checklists.

Reporting Requirements

A. Annual Expenditure Report (Form SAB 50-06) and Detailed Listing of Project Expenditure, Regulation 1859.104

» An annual Expenditure Report and a cumulative Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures are due each year on the anniversary of the first fund release date until the project is complete. A project is complete when the school district or COE submits an Expenditure Report indicating 100% complete, or the three or four year window expires*, whichever occurs first.

* *Elementary schools have three years from the date of the final (adjusted grant) fund release to incur expenditures. Middle and high schools have four years from the date of the final fund release to incur expenditures.*

» The SAB does not approve extension requests.

B. Substantial Progress Checklist

Design Phase, Regulation Section 1859.105(c)

» A school district or COE must submit the completed Substantial Progress Checklist within 18 months of the fund release date, certifying to one of the following:

- a. An approved adjusted grant funding application has been filed with the OPSC.
- b. District certification that the final building plans for the project have been submitted to, and accepted by, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for review and approval (DSA Number must be indicated on the document.).
- c. An approved separate site funding or an approved environmental hardship funding application has been filed with the OPSC.

» The SAB has authority to approve a one-time extension up to 18 months. The extension request must be submitted in writing to the OPSC, and an explanation and/or supporting documentation must be provided. If the SAB approves the time extension, the district or COE must submit an approved adjusted grant application within the approved time extension.

Site Phase, Regulation Section 1859.105(b)

» A school district or COE must submit the completed Substantial Progress Checklist within 18 months of the fund release date, certifying that all of the following has been completed:

- a. Obtained final appraisal of the site.
 - b. Completion of all California Environmental Quality Act requirements.
 - c. Obtained final approval of the site by the CDE.
 - d. Obtained final escrow instructions or evidence the district has filed condemnation proceedings and intends to request an order of possession of the site.
- » The SAB has authority to approve a one-time extension up to 18 months. The extension request must be submitted in writing to the OPSC, and an explanation and/or supporting documentation must be provided.

Exception: Environmental Hardship, Regulation 1859.104(c)

A school district or COE must submit the completed Substantial Progress Checklist within 12 months of the State apportionment date. The SAB has authority to grant more than one extension. Extension requests must be submitted to the OPSC in writing, and an explanation and/or supporting documentation must be provided.

Adjusted Grant Phase, Regulation 1859.105(a)

» A school district or COE must submit the completed Substantial Progress Checklist within 18 months of the fund release date, certifying to one of the following:

- a. At least 75 percent of all site development work (that is necessary prior to building construction activity) is complete

Continued on page 4

New School Groundbreakings

By Don Littlefield, Project Manager

The OPSC would like to congratulate Los Angeles Unified School District on two recent groundbreaking ceremonies.

PROJECT	GROUNDBREAKING
Crenshaw High School	May 16, 2007
Ramona Opportunity High School	May 31, 2007

Did you know that you can highlight your district's new school dedications and groundbreaking ceremonies in the *Advisory Actions* newsletter? To have your event highlighted, please submit all information that is referenced above and the related SFP application number to the Office of Public School Construction, Attention: *New School Dedications and Groundbreakings*, or via e-mail at opscmultimedia@dgs.ca.gov.

School Facility Program Funding Reporting Requirements... *continued from page 3*

- b. At least 90 percent of the building construction activities are under contract, unless the building construction activities are delayed as a result of necessary site development work.
- c. All construction activities are at least 50 percent complete.

» The SAB does not approve time extension requests; however, it has the authority to accept other evidence of satisfactory progress when circumstances beyond the control of the district or COE precluded substantial progress from being made. Justification and supporting documentation must be submitted to the OPSC in writing.

New OPSC Procedures

Effective July 1, 2007, the changes below were made to increase OPSC efficiency, as well as to support the DGS' "Go Green" goal.

New Procedures	Former Procedures
The OPSC will not acknowledge receipt of the Expenditure Report (Form SAB 50-06) and Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures Worksheet in writing.	The OPSC mailed a letter to acknowledge receipt of each Expenditure Report and Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures Worksheet.
The OPSC will mail one reminder letter (at 11 months) to the District Representative, stating that the annual expenditure report due date is approaching.	The OPSC mailed two reminder letters (at 10 months and 12 months) to the District Representative, Superintendent and COE, stating that the annual expenditure report due date was approaching.
If the annual expenditure report is not submitted by the required date, the OPSC will mail a letter to notify the district or COE.	
The OPSC will provide the SAB with a list of districts and COEs that did not comply with the annual expenditure report requirement.	

If there are any questions or concerns regarding the expenditure report requirements, please contact Michael Watanabe at (916) 324-2557 or Michael.Watanabe@dgs.ca.gov, and for questions regarding substantial progress requirements, please contact Julie Ennis at (916) 445-0019 or Julie.Ennis@dgs.ca.gov.

Regulations Update

By Melissa Ley, Project Manager

Good news! We are pleased to announce that regulations for the following programs have been approved by the Office of Administrative Law:

- » Emergency Repair Program (Changes to the Existing Program)
- » Repayment Schedules for Amounts Due to the State
- » Career Technical Education Facilities Program

Districts now have the ability to apply for these new funding opportunities. For more information regarding this program, please visit the OPSC Web site at <http://www.opsc.dgs.ca.gov>, or contact your OPSC Project Manager.

Implementation of Assembly Bill 607: The SAB Approves the Facility Inspection Tool

By Dawn Barnhisel, Project Manager and Masha Lutsuk, Project Management Supervisor

At the June 27, 2007 meeting of the SAB, the Board adopted the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT). Required by Assembly Bill 607 (Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 – Goldberg), the FIT replaces the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) with a permanent school facilities inspection instrument. As with the IEI, the tool will be used by school districts and COEs to assess school facilities in ensuring that all California school children have access to clean, safe, and functional school facilities.

The development of the evaluation instrument to be used in school assessments was required by the settlement legislation in the case of *Williams vs. California*. This legislation also required the OPSC to report to the Governor and Legislature on recommendations for a permanent State standard of good repair. AB 607 responded to these recommendations by providing a description of good repair criteria in statute and requiring the OPSC to develop an evaluation instrument that allows for ranking of the facility components on the scale of good, fair, and poor. It also provides an overall facility score on the scale of exemplary, good, fair, and poor. These evaluation methods, as developed in the newly adopted FIT, will allow for uniform assessments of school facilities across the State and provide schools with an effective snapshot of the condition of facilities to be captured in the annual School Accountability Report Cards.

Developing the FIT...

To assist in the development of the permanent evaluation instrument, the OPSC formed a workgroup of experts and practitioners from across the State, who contributed a significant amount of knowledge, expertise, time and effort to this project. In addition to OPSC staff members, the workgroup was comprised of representatives from four COEs, one school district, an attorney from the American Civil Liberties Union, two CDE staff members, and two public health advocates.

In developing the evaluation tool, the workgroup members reviewed the good repair criteria implemented in statute and singled out those facility conditions that are most critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. The workgroup then considered various rating schemes, field tested several versions of the tool, and developed detailed user instructions.

Using the FIT...

As well as a General Information section and User Instructions, the FIT is comprised of three parts:

Part 1: Good Repair Standard is designed to be a reference for examples of good repair. When one or more standards is not met, there exists a deficiency, or, in case of critical health and safety concerns, an extreme

deficiency. The list of examples is not exhaustive. If an evaluator notes a deficient condition that is not addressed in the examples, the evaluator can note such deficiency in the applicable category as “other,” and provide details in the Comments section.

Part 2: Evaluation Detail is a site inspection template to be used to evaluate the areas of a school on a category by category basis. The design of the inspection template allows for the determination of the scope of conditions across campus. In evaluating each area or space, the user should review each of the 15 categories identified in the Good Repair Standard and make a determination of whether or not a particular area is in good repair. Once the determination is made as to the condition of the area evaluated, it is recorded in the space provided.

Part 3: Category Ranking and Overall Rating directs the evaluator to compute the percentage of good repair in each of the 15 categories, taking into account the number of areas evaluated. This section also provides the evaluator with a means to compute the overall facility score. The FIT allows the evaluator to downgrade the overall score if the evaluator identifies any critical facility conditions that result in a rating that does not reflect the urgency, severity, and/or frequency of those deficiencies.

Using the FIT as the Minimum Standard...

As previously stated, the FIT is designed to represent the minimum standard of good repair required by law. However, other considerations could be included in the evaluation at the local level. For instance, Local Educational Agencies may opt for the addition of more categories, or prefer a tool that automatically integrates the information captured in the tool with maintenance systems. But it is important to note that any “hybrid” assessment tool must contain the minimum standards identified in the FIT and the rating required by law.

We hope this overview has been helpful and urge your school district or COE to review the new FIT, including the user instructions, which are available on the OPSC Web site at www.opsc.dgs.ca.gov. Field tests indicated a slight learning curve associated with its use. With minimal practice, users will be well on their way with successful school site assessments as an important step in ensuring that California’s school sites are clean, safe, and functional.

AS OF JUNE 27, 2007

Proposition Funds Put to Work

PROGRAM	BOND ALLOCATION	APPORTIONED	RELEASED/CONTRACTED
PROPOSITION 1D			
New Construction	\$ 1,900,000,000	\$ 0	\$ 0
Modernization	3,300,000,000	439,550,154	197,364,327
Career Technical Education	500,000,000	0	0
High Performance Schools	100,000,000	0	0
Overcrowding Relief	1,000,000,000	0	0
Charter School	500,000,000	0	0
Joint Use	29,000,000	0	0
Total Proposition 1D	\$ 7,329,000,000	\$ 439,550,154	\$ 197,364,327

PROGRAM	BOND ALLOCATION	APPORTIONED	RELEASED/CONTRACTED
PROPOSITION 55			
New Construction	\$ 4,960,000,000	\$ 3,886,191,866	\$ 3,328,596,824
Modernization	2,250,000,000	2,172,298,919	2,111,067,217
Charter School	300,000,000	262,786,721	21,445,845
Critically Overcrowded Schools	2,440,000,000	1,883,411,940	0
Joint Use*	65,547,233	64,047,233	27,700,457
Total Proposition 55	\$ 10,015,547,233	\$ 8,268,736,679	\$ 5,488,810,343

*Includes \$15,547,233 transferred into this category.

PROGRAM	BOND ALLOCATION	APPORTIONED	RELEASED/CONTRACTED
PROPOSITION 47			
New Construction	\$ 6,250,000,000	\$ 6,139,394,754	\$ 6,114,201,029
Modernization	3,300,000,000	3,287,123,986	3,284,664,200
Charter School	100,000,000	57,105,424	9,517,018
Critically Overcrowded Schools	1,700,000,000	1,604,214,653	90,977,963
Joint Use	50,000,000	49,869,397	44,844,991
Total Proposition 47	\$ 11,400,000,000	\$ 11,137,708,214	\$ 9,544,205,201
Grand Total	\$ 28,744,547,233	\$ 19,845,995,047	\$ 15,230,379,871

AS OF JUNE 27, 2007

Status of Funds

PROGRAM	BALANCE AVAILABLE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS
PROPOSITION 1D	
New Construction	\$ 1,894.0
Modernization	2,860.3
Career Technical Education	500.0
High Performance Schools	100.0
Overcrowding Relief	1,000.0
Charter School	500.0
Joint Use	50.0
Total Proposition 1D	\$ 6,904.3

PROGRAM	BALANCE AVAILABLE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS
PROPOSITION 55	
New Construction	\$ 1,296.6
Energy	0.0
Small High School	20.0
Modernization	52.8
Energy	0.0
Small High School	5.0
Critically Overcrowded Schools	
15% COS Unrestricted Fund	287.6
Charter School	14.1
DTSC/Relocation	13.1
Hazardous Material	2.6
Joint Use	1.5
Total Proposition 55	\$ 1,693.3

PROGRAM	BALANCE AVAILABLE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS
PROPOSITION 47	
New Construction	\$ 24.7
Energy	0.6
Charter School	40.4
Modernization	8.7
Energy	0.0
Critically Overcrowded Schools	
Reserved	95.8
Joint Use	0.1
Total Proposition 47	\$ 170.3

Grand Total – Propositions 1D, 55 and 47 \$ 8,767.9



STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

Implementation Committee

MAVONNE GARRITY, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER, STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING...

The following topics were discussed at the State Allocation Board (SAB) Implementation Committee meeting on June 1, 2007.

ASSEMBLY BILL (AB) 607 – THE PERMANENT EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

By Dawn Barnhisel, Project Manager

The Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) was presented by Staff to the Implementation Committee for review and discussion.

Discussions by the Implementation Committee centered on the methodology used by the special workgroup formed for the purpose of developing the instrument and the rating system. The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) staff also discussed the pros and cons of the instrument, clarified that the resulting instrument represents the minimum standard of good repair, and described the tool along with the ranking and scoring system. In response to comments from Committee members and the audience, staff made several minor revisions to the draft FIT before presenting it to the SAB for approval.

The SAB adopted the FIT at the June 27, 2007, meeting. For more detailed information on the new instrument, please see the article on page 5 of this newsletter.

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

By Kelly Long, Project Manager

At the June 1, 2007 meeting of the Implementation Committee, the Chair presented a request to include a Construction Management representative on the Committee. The suggestion was made in response to a request from the Association of California Construction Managers (ACCM). The ACCM believes a representative from their profession would provide another unique perspective to the Committee.

The item presented by the Implementation Committee Chair reviewed the history and composition of the Committee, noting that the membership has changed several times since its inception in 1986. The mechanism for changing the membership has fluctuated over time, but in the past, one member was added by the SAB while all others were approved by the SAB Chair. The ensuing discussion highlighted the fact that the composition and the role of the Committee were viewed differently. While the OPSC was clear on the purpose of the Committee, some members of the Committee and the audience presented markedly different accounts of the Committee's mission.

The Committee and the audience agreed that the SAB should provide direction regarding the role and responsibility of the Committee before changes to the composition of the group were considered. To this end, the discussion was held over.

WATCH FOR...

The next items scheduled for discussion at the Implementation Committee are:

Implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 127, Chapter 35, Statutes of 2006 (Nunez and Perata)

- » Continued discussion on the proposed regulations for Seismic Mitigation.
- » Continued discussion on the proposed regulations for the High Performance Schools Grant Program.

THE NEXT MEETING...

The next Implementation Committee meeting is scheduled for:

- » Friday, August 3, 2007 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at the Legislative Office Building, 1020 N Street, Room 100, in Sacramento