SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

School District: ……..…CUYAMA JOINT UNIFIED
County:……SANTA BARBARA
Application Number:……...…… 58/75010-00-001
School Name:……....CUYAMA ELEMENTARY
Total District Enrollment:……261
Project Grade Level:…….……...K-8
Financial Hardship:…….……...……NO

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Type of Request	State Allocation Board Rehabilitation and unfunded approval for a School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship Rehabilitation Project.
Estimated Total Project Cost	$ 466,590
Estimated Cost to the State	$ 279,954

DESCRIPTION

Description of Health and Safety Threat	The Cuyama Elementary School and well system were originally constructed in the 1950's. The campus consists of ten classrooms and core facilities. Through time, the original well walls failed to the point of collapse of the wall casings. The collapse resulted in sand entering into the well water causing contamination and an inadequate water supply. This situation represented a significant threat to the health and safety of the students and violated health codes and standards making it necessary to temporarily provide the students with bottled water.
Scope of Project	A new well was constructed in a different and approved area on the campus. Reports of the assessment and mitigation measures were performed by a licensed well water rehabilitation specialist (Specialist).
Status of School Site	The well replacement is complete.

QUALIFYING CRITERIA

Government/State Level Concurrence	The Santa Barbara Public Health Department provided written concurrence that supports the Specialist's findings that a health and safety threat existed and concurred with the recommended mitigation measures.
Site Visit Completed by Staff	No
Staff Supports the District's Request	Yes

(Continued on Page Two)

AUTHORITY

The SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e) provides for excessive costs "for rehabilitation of facilities the Board has determined are a health and safety risk to the pupils pursuant to Section 1859.82(a)(1)…". The district is required to provide a cost/benefit analysis, which must indicate that the cost to mitigate the problem and remain in the facility is less than 50 percent of the current replacement cost of the facility. If the district qualifies, the district is eligible for funding of rehabilitation costs as a modernization project, and the funding is based upon the cost estimate provided rather than the district's eligibility. The grant amount provided is 60 percent of the amount of the cost estimate required in Section 1859.82(a)(1) that has been reviewed by the OPSC and approved by the Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the District's request for an unfunded approval for a rehabilitation project to replace the well at the Cuyama Elementary School, pursuant to SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e), as provided on the Attachment.

2. Provide that the State portion of any and all project savings realized from the funding of this rehabilitation project must be returned to the State.

BOARD ACTION

In considering this Item, the State Allocation Board approved the staff's recommendations, which but is not limited to, an unfunded approval in the amount of $279,954.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 58/75010-00-001
County: Santa Barbara
School District: Cuyama Joint Unified
School Name: Cuyama Elementary

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project: Elementary School
Application Filing Basis: Site Specific
Pupils Assigned Under 50 Yrs **K-6:**
7-8:
9-12:
Non-Severe:
Severe:
Financial Hardship Requested: No
Recommended Acres:
Alternative Education School: No
Existing Acres:

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Rehabilitation	$	279,954.00
Total State Share (60%)		279,954.00
District Share (40%)		186,636.00
Total Project Cost	$	**466,590.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	279,954.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		186,636.00
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**466,590.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share				
Modernization/Additional Grant	**957-570**	$	$ 279,954.00	$ 279,954.00
District Share				
Cash Contribution			186,636.00	
Total		$	$ **466,590.00**	$ **279,954.00**

Pursuant to the Board's action on March 11, 2009, this application has been approved and placed on the Unfunded List. This approval does not constitute a guarantee or commitment of future State funding.

The District shall ensure that it is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and certifications it made on the program forms.

Provide that the State portion of the project savings which may be realized from the funding of a facility hardship or rehabilitation project must be returned to the State.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, March 23, 2011

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: .....WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED	County:……..…CONTRA COSTA
Application Number:..... 51/61796-02-001	School Name:.....PORTOLA MIDDLE SCHOOL
Total District Enrollment:…….30,817	Project Grade Level:……6-8
District Baseline Eligibility: ……...K-6, 234; 7-8, -448; 9-12, -329; Non-Severe, 24; Severe, 22	

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the District's request:

1. for conceptual approval for the replacement of the main building at the Portola Middle School pursuant to the Seismic Mitigation Program (SMP) under the Facility Hardship (FH) regulations.
2. to construct the replacement Portola main building at the Castro Elementary School site that is a District-owned and closed school site.

DESCRIPTION

The District is requesting conceptual approval for the replacement of the main building that is located at the Portola Middle School under the SMP within the FH regulations. The facility was originally constructed in 1950 and consists of classrooms, administration, multi-purpose, and library facilities.

The District is also requesting consideration and approval to construct the replacement building at a District-owned site that is closed and was previously called the Castro Elementary School (Castro). The District has stated that they will not be requesting site acquisition for the Castro site.

AUTHORITY

Education Code Section 17075.10(a) states, "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 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."

The SFP provides for Facility Hardship grant funding for replacement of classrooms and related facilities if a district demonstrates that the condition of the facilities is a threat to the health and safety of the pupils, per Regulation Section 1859.82(a). When replacement facilities are requested a cost/benefit analysis must be prepared by the district and submitted to the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC). The analysis must indicate that the total cost required to mitigate the existing problems is at least 50 percent of the current replacement cost of the facilities. Regulation Section 1859.82(a) provides that if the entire school is to be replaced, the eligible funding shall be based on the actual enrollment or school capacity, whichever is less. Additionally, this regulation specifies that 50 percent of any proceeds collected by the District for displaced facilities must be applied to the project.

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff supports the District's request to abandon and replace the existing main building located at the Portola Junior High School. The District has provided structural engineer's reports, geological survey reports, and the required letters of concurrence from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) that verifies that the Portola main building qualifies as a "Most Vulnerable Category 2 Building" as established by the DSA for purposes of the SMP. Staff has verified that the costs to mitigate the health and safety issues related to seismically retrofitting the building are greater than 50 percent of the costs to replace the building.

The construction of the replacement building is limited to the 67,218 square feet of "other" area and 2,417 square feet of "toilet" area. The replacement building will include classrooms, administration, multi-purpose, and library facilities. The total estimated construction project cost is $28,605,992 of which the estimated State share is $14,302,996. The square footage and final costs are subject to OPSC verification at the time that the District submits the complete funding application and construction plans.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the District's request for conceptual approval to replace the main building located at the Portola Junior High School Based due health and safety issues as related to the SMP criteria and pursuant to the SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a).

2. Seek the Board's direction regarding the District's FH request to replace the building at an alternate school site that is closed and known as the Castro Elementary School site.

3. Require that the replacement facilities not exceed 67,218 square feet of "other" area and 2,417 square feet of "toilet" area with the total estimated construction project cost of $28,605,992 of which the estimated State share is $14,302,996. The square footage and costs are subject to the OPSC verification at the time of the complete funding application and construction plans.

4. If the District sells the existing Portola Junior High School site, require that the District sell the site and facilities at fair market value and remit 50 percent of the proceeds to the State.

5. Provide that the District must file a complete SFP new construction funding application for the facility hardship replacement finding application within 18 months of this approval, pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.82 (c).

6. Provide that this conceptual approval does not constitute a commitment for funding by the Board. Any possible future funding will be subject to all governing laws and regulations, and the availability of funds.

7. Provide that the State portion of any and all savings which may be realized from the funding of this facility hardship project must be returned to the State.

BOARD ACTION

In considering this Item, the State Allocation Board (SAB) approved the staff's recommendations, which included, but is not limited to, the following: 1) abandonment and replacement of the existing main building at the Portola Junior High School site; and 2) the construction of the replacement main building (from the Portola site) at the Castro Elementary School site. The SAB also recognized that the District will not request site acquisition funding for the Castro School site since it is a district-owned site. Further, this approval provides that if the District sells the existing Portola Junior High School site, it is required to sell the site and facilities at fair market value and remit 50 percent of the proceeds to the State.

THESE PAGES INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

THE ITEM ENTITLED “CASH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM”
HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN

REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, March 23, 2011

SEISMIC MITIGATION FUNDING PROGRAM

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide the State Allocation Board (Board) with an update on the Seismic Mitigation Funding Program.

BACKGROUND

Proposition 1D, approved by California voters in 2006, provided $199.5 million in grant funds for seismic construction projects determined to have "most vulnerable California school facilities" status. As a result, the Board approved amendments to the School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship regulations to create the Seismic Mitigation Program (SMP). The SMP provides grant funds to repair, reconstruct, or replace the "most vulnerable" school facilities, as determined by the Division of the State Architect (DSA). To date, three schools received a total of approximately $4.7 million in SMP funding. To be eligible for SMP funding, school facilities must meet certain criteria such as structural deficiencies required by the DSA to be repaired and seismic mitigation of the most vulnerable Category 2 buildings that are verified by DSA.

A school district is eligible for Proposition 1D Facility Hardship grant funding to repair, replace or construct new classrooms and related facilities if the school district can demonstrate to the Board that the health and safety of the pupils are at risk. For a school district to receive seismic mitigation funding under the Facility Hardship provisions, the district must have buildings that 1) are classified as a Most Vulnerable Category 2 Building as verified by the DSA, and 2) are located in an area where a short term spectral response acceleration is 1.68g or more. If all other determining criteria listed in this report are met, the applicant school district qualifies for SMP Facility Hardship funding.

At the May 6, 2010 Implementation Committee meeting, a discussion was held concerning the barriers school districts encounter accessing SMP funds and how these barriers could be eliminated. One primary concern Stakeholders identified as a barrier to accessing SMP funding is a lack of funding for up-front costs associated with preparing the necessary structural engineering evaluations.

Stakeholders recommended that the State provide an up-front grant for soft costs such as engineering assessments of structural systems. Stakeholders also recommended that the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) engage in more outreach efforts to assist districts in securing SMP funding. Stakeholders considered minimum requirements that districts would have to meet, such as the spectral response acceleration threshold, in order to receive an up-front grant. Without an up-front grant, stakeholders stated that, many districts would be unable to provide funding for structural engineering evaluations of facilities and would therefore be unable to access SMP funding.

The OPSC also notified all school districts that had been preliminarily identified SMP candidates that up to 100 percent of the project costs could be funded by the State if the school district qualified for Financial Hardship (FH) funding. To date, none of the SMP candidates have expressed interest in the FH program. However, the OPSC is more than willing to provide outreach to explore whether they would qualify for the additional FH funding to meet their funding share on their SMP project.

(Continued on Page Two)

BACKGROUND (cont.)

In November 2009, the California Seismic Safety Commission (CSSC) provided the OPSC with a $200,000 grant to contract for structural engineering services to conduct seismic evaluations. Evaluations were conducted at California public K-12 school sites preliminarily identified by DSA as meeting SMP funding eligibility requirements. The evaluations are designed to ascertain the seismic vulnerability of certain K-12 school buildings that may be at risk during a seismic event. The contracts also resulted in the development of a seismic evaluation report template (template) which provides a more systematic and cost effective approach for determining the seismic safety status of school facilities within the State.

STAFF COMMENTS

Seismic Evaluations and Creation of Template

Using the grant funds provided by the CSSC, the OPSC, through the competitive bidding process, awarded two California engineering firms contracts to assist the OPSC and the DSA in the development of a standardized template and to perform seismic evaluations of preliminarily identified K-12 schools facilities.

This seismic template has been successfully used in the field for seismic structural evaluations of preliminarily identified qualified school facilities. The template provided a standardized procedure for evaluating the structural risk of facilities, which resulted in rapid seismic evaluations at minimal cost.

Of the 16 school districts with 48 preliminarily qualifying buildings, nine school districts, containing 38 preliminarily qualified buildings, chose to participate in this evaluation process. The participating school districts are listed below:

District	County
Aromas-San Juan	San Benito
Fillmore Unified	Ventura
Fortuna Union High	Humboldt
Hemet Unified	Riverside
Redlands Unified	San Bernardino
Oakland Unified	Alameda
San Bernardino City Unified	San Bernardino
William S. Hart Union	Los Angeles
Santa Paula Elementary	Ventura

(Continued on Page Three)

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

The remaining seven schools districts, containing ten qualifying school buildings, are already participating in the SMP or have chosen not to participate in this evaluation program. Piedmont City Unified School District (USD), San Ramon Valley USD, and West Contra Costa USD (total of four buildings in all three districts) either have received or are approved to receive SMP or other grant program funding to rehabilitate their qualified buildings. Hayward USD and Jefferson Elementary School District of San Mateo County (total of three buildings in both districts) do not currently have the required district matching funds for a SMP rehabilitation project as required by the grant program. Alameda County Office of Education reported their one identified building is being sold. The Los Angeles USD reported that it is not participating due to logistical feasibility challenges involving their two identified buildings. Lastly, the OPSC reviewed the seven districts listed and the districts did not historically participate in the FH program. However, these districts could consider working with OPSC to assess if they qualify for FH program and potentially qualify for additional State funding.

To date, all nine participating school districts have received site visits from the contractors and all seismic evaluation reports have been received by the OPSC and the DSA to complete the review process. Of the preliminarily qualified school buildings, 20 out of 38 have met the eligibility requirements for funding under Proposition 1D SMP while 18 school buildings have not met eligibility requirements. The remaining 18 school buildings were ineligible due to the buildings not being of the pre-determined structural types.

Potential Impact on Bond Authority

Structural engineers have provided preliminary repair estimates as a result of the seismic reviews. These estimates are preliminary and not inclusive of other potentially qualified buildings and eligible School Facility Program Additional and Excessive Cost Hardship costs that will significantly increase total projects costs. Accurate cost estimates will require Architectural and Construction Cost Estimators which, as stated, was beyond the scope of these contracts.

As part of this agenda, Staff is presenting to the Board a new SMP application (West Contra Costa USD) that is seeking a conceptual approval of a $28.6 million project with an approximate State share of $14.3 million.

Seismic Program Workshop

On March 3, 2011, the OPSC hosted an inter-departmental Seismic Program Review Workshop to assess the scope and effectiveness of seismic building evaluations and to review how State agencies currently review, evaluate, and assess seismic risk. Main topics for discussion included: recent changes to seismic evaluations as provided by the new template, current methodology applied to determine seismic risk, comparisons/contrasts between the California and Oregon seismic evaluations and funding programs, and current spectral response acceleration threshold rating policies. These workshops will provide ongoing conceptual discussions with the ultimate goal of accelerating the process school districts follow in accessing SMP funds to mitigate California's most vulnerable seismic facility issues. Preliminarily, this technical workgroup indicated that the current ground shaking and building type protocols utilized in the SMP is the correct assessment vehicle to identify future SMP projects.

(Continued on Page Four)

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

OPSC Presentation to CSSC

On March 10, 2011, the OPSC conducted a presentation to the CSSC on the status of SMP and the $200,000 seismic evaluation grant (see attachment). The OPSC requested approval from CSSC to retain the $77,000 of unencumbered funds for such a time that will allow OPSC to outreach to those school districts that chose not to participate in the seismic evaluation program and allow those districts a "second chance" to participate in both identifying and assessing seismic risk potential. Retention of unencumbered funds will also be useful in the event of possible prospective revisions to SMP eligibility requirements. This request was granted by the CSSC. The OPSC will be amending the structural engineering contracts to allow sufficient time to perform these additional seismic reviews.

RECOMMENDATION

Acknowledge this report.

BOARD ACTION

In considering this Item, the State Allocation Board (SAB) acknowledged the report. A motion was made, and seconded, to establish a new sub-committee, which will be known as the "Seismic Mitigation Sub-Committee." The members assigned to this new sub-committee are: Scott Harvey, who will be the Chair, Assembly Member Joan Buchanan, and Ms. Kathleen Moore. In addition, the SAB requested that final recommendations come back to the full SAB in May 2011, relating to perhaps new building types and the lowering of the spectral response acceleration threshold (currently at 1.68 g).

ATTACHMENT

REPORT TO CALIFORNIA SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

SEISMIC MITIGATION PROGRAM

PRESENTED BY

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

MEETING DATE: MARCH 10, 2011

INDEX

Title Page	i
Index	ii
<u>Report</u>	
Executive Summary	1
Seismic Mitigation Program Background	1
The State Allocation Board	1-2
The Office of Public School Construction	2
Seismic Evaluation Grant and Contracts	2
Seismic Evaluation Contractors	2-3
Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings	3
Seismic Evaluation Template	4
Participating and Non-Participating School Districts	5
Current Status of Seismic Evaluation Contracts	5-6
Repair Cost Estimates	6
Residual Grant Funds	6
Retention of Grant Funds Request	7
A Note to the Commission	7
<u>Attachments</u>	
List of Evaluated School Buildings	A
Seismic Evaluation Template	B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Funding authorized by the voters in 2006 to address the most serious public school seismic issues has been languishing with only three projects approved to date. California's most vulnerable seismic facility issues continued to not be adequately identified or assessed in certain school districts. These school districts cited the costs of hiring an engineering firm with no guarantee of funding as a major impediment to moving forward in assessing risks associated with their seismic projects. To that end, the California Seismic Safety Commission (CSSC) provided to the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) and the State Allocation Board (SAB) a $200,000 grant to contract for structural engineering services to facilitate seismic risk assessments of previously identified school buildings and to jumpstart the identification and processing of more seismic projects . The services required the development of a seismic evaluation report template and site evaluations at California public K-12 schools. Of the 16 school districts in California with preliminarily qualified buildings, nine school districts, containing 38 identified buildings, chose to participate in this seismic assessment program. To date, the seismic evaluation report template has been successfully utilized by structural engineers in the inspection and reporting process of all 38 preliminarily qualified school buildings, thus successfully completing the contracts. As a result of these reviews, 20 additional seismic high risk facilities have been identified as being eligible for State seismic funding. Information associated with specific school districts involved in the seismic reviews and the structural engineering contracts is delineated in detail in this report.

SEISMIC MITIGATION PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Proposition 1D, approved by California voters in November, 2006, provided $199.5 million in grant funds for Seismic Mitigation Program (SMP) construction projects determined to have "most vulnerable California school facilities" status. These grant funds are provided to repair, reconstruct, or replace the "most vulnerable" school facilities. (Please see the definition of "Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings" on page three). To date, three school districts have received approximately $4.7 million in SMP funding. To be eligible for SMP funding, school facilities must meet certain criteria and pose an unacceptable risk of injury to their occupants in the event of a seismic occurrence. As a result of Proposition 1D, the SAB approved amendments to the School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship funding regulations that created the SMP.

A school district is eligible for Proposition 1D grant funding to replace or construct new classrooms and related facilities if the school district can demonstrate to the SAB that the health and safety of the pupils is at risk. For a school district to receive seismic mitigation funding the district must, 1) have a building classified as a Most Vulnerable Category 2 Building as verified the Division of the State Architect (DSA), and 2) be in a location with a spectral response acceleration rating that equals or exceeds 1.68g. If all other determining criteria listed in this report are met, the applicant school district qualifies for SMP Facility Hardship funding.

(Continued on Page Two)

THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

The SAB is responsible for determining the allocation of State resources, including proposition 1D funds for seismic mitigation, used for the construction, modernization and maintenance of California public school facilities. The SAB is also charged with responsibility for the administration of the State SFP, which is includes the SMP. The SAB is the policy level body for the programs administered by the OPSC.

THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The OPSC, as staff to the SAB, implements and administers the SFP and other programs of the SAB. It is incumbent on OPSC staff to prepare regulations, policies and procedures which carry out the mandates of the SAB and to work directly with school districts to assist them throughout the grant application and funding process. The OPSC is responsible for ensuring that grant funds are disbursed properly and in accordance with the decisions made by the SAB. The OPSC is also charged with the responsibility of verifying that all applicant school districts meet specific qualifying criteria based on the type of funding which is being requested. For SMP funding the OPSC and DSA are jointly charged with the responsibility of verifying that applicant school district meets the eligibility criteria for the program.

SEISMIC EVALUATION GRANT AND CONTRACTS

In November 2009**,** the CSSC provided to OPSC a $200,000 grant to contract for structural engineering services to conduct evaluations at California public K-12 school sites preliminarily identified by DSA as meeting eligibility requirements. The resulting evaluations ascertained the seismic vulnerability of certain K-12 school buildings that may be at risk during a seismic event. The contracts were designed to develop a seismic evaluation report template which provided a more systematic and cost effective approach for determining the seismic safety status of school facilities in the State.

The template and accompanying structural engineer evaluation reports will be used as an integral part of the application process of awarding seismic retrofit grant funding from the $199.5 million provided by Proposition 1D. Specifically, the Seismic Evaluation reports will provide applicant school districts the required documented information and analysis which determines if applicant school districts meet the criteria to qualify for SMP funding.

SEISMIC EVALUATION CONTRACTORS

Using the grant funds provided by the CSSC, the OPSC, through the competitive bidding process awarded two California engineering firms contracts to assist the OPSC and DSA in the development of a standardized seismic evaluation report template (template) and to perform seismic evaluations of preliminarily identified K-12 school facilities.

The two contractors chosen for the project, ZFA Structural Engineers (representing Northern California) and ABS Consulting (representing Southern California), worked as a team, along with OPSC and DSA staff, providing expertise in the development of the template for a focused application of ACSE 31, Tier 2 evaluation procedures.

(Continued on Page Three)

This template (see attachment "B") was successfully used for seismic structural evaluations of preliminarily identified school facilities that appeared to qualify as Most Vulnerable Category 2 buildings. The template provided a standardized procedure for evaluating the structural risk of facilities, which resulted in rapid seismic evaluations at minimal cost.

Upon authorization from the OPSC, the contractors performed on-site seismic structural evaluations of the preliminarily identified buildings at each participating school district (see page 5). The contractors' reports consisted of two parts, the completed Seismic Evaluation Template Report and the Structural Engineers' Report.

Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings

A school district is eligible for SMP Facility Hardship funding to replace or construct new classrooms and related facilities if the district demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the SAB, that the condition of the respective school facilities is a threat to the health and safety of the students. Factors to be considered by the SAB shall include, but are not limited to, seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 facilities that are in locations with a spectral "g" force response acceleration rating equal to or exceeding 1.68, as verified by the DSA.

There are four main eligibility requirements to qualify for Seismic Mitigation Facility Hardship funding under the definition of Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings. As defined by the DSA, Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings means:

- The building is located in an area where the short period spectral response acceleration equals or exceeds 1.68g based on the 2002 United States Geological Survey National Seismic Hazard Maps adjusted for site class factors.

- The building is designed for occupancy by students and staff.

- The building qualifies as one of the following structural types stipulated:
    1. C1 – Concrete Moment Frame,
    2. C1B – Reinforced Concrete Cantilever Columns with Wood Roofs,
    3. PC1 – Precast/Tilt-up Concrete Shear Wall with Concrete Floor and Roof Diaphragms,
    4. PC1A – Precast/Tilt-up Concrete Shear Wall with Flexible Roof,
    5. PC2A – Precast Concrete Frame without Concrete Shear Walls and with Rigid Floor and Roof Diaphragms,
    6. PC2 – Precast Concrete Frame and Roofs with Concrete Shear Walls,
    7. C3A – Concrete Frame with Infill Masonry Shear Wall and Flexible Floor and Roof Diaphragms,
    8. URM – Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Buildings.

(Continued on Page 4)

- A structural report is provided by a structural engineer that details, 1) the lateral force-resisting system of the building which does not meet collapse prevention performance objectives, 2) the specific deficiencies, and 3) thereason(s) for concluding that the building has a potential for catastrophic collapse.

SEISMIC EVALUATION TEMPLATE

The template was used for Seismic Structural Evaluations of preliminarily identified California public school facilities that appeared to qualify as the Most Vulnerable Category 2 buildings. The template, as intended, ensures complete and consistent seismic evaluation reports. The template was also designed to quickly and effectively address the first three eligibility requirements (bullet points listed on page three) utilizing questions that require only yes/no answers.

The fourth eligibility requirement (fourth bullet point) identifies critical deficiencies in the design and construction of the building that could contribute to local or global collapse if the building is subjected to the threshold 1.68g force acceleration or greater.

As previously stated, one of the goals of the template development was to reduce the cost of the seismic safety evaluation. If critical deficiencies in meeting SMP criteria are quickly identified the cost of providing a more detailed evaluation (see mitigation plan below) will not be needed and the evaluation can be halted.

The DSA, upon receipt of the completed template and accompanying structural engineers' report, verifies the information provided. The DSA reviews the identified critical deficiencies and the structural engineer's justification that there is a potential for collapse in the event of an earthquake. If the DSA concurs with the engineer's description of the critical deficiencies, the DSA will send a letter to the school district, the structural engineer, and the OPSC that states the building meets the eligibility requirements for SMP funding.

The letter also informs the school district that to continue the funding process for seismic replacement/rehabilitation under the SFP, the school district must submit its mitigation plan to DSA. This mitigation plan must be accompanied by detailed project cost estimates. These project cost estimates, once approved by DSA, allow the OPSC to calculate the estimated SMP grant qualification for each school.

If the template and structural engineer report information cannot be verified by the DSA, the report will be rejected and a disapproval letter will be sent to the school district, the structural engineer, and the OPSC. Also, if a building does not meet all eligibility requirements, the DSA will send a disapproval letter to the parties involved.

(Continued on Page 5)

PARTICIPATING and NON-PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Of the 16 school districts in California with preliminarily qualified buildings, nine school districts chose to participate in this evaluation process. These participating districts are listed below along with their County of location:

District	County
Aromas-San Juan	San Benito
Fillmore Unified	Ventura
Fortuna Union High	Humboldt
Hemet Unified	Riverside
Redlands Unified	San Bernardino
Oakland Unified	Alameda
San Bernardino City Unified	San Bernardino
William S. Hart Union	Los Angeles
Santa Paula Elementary	Ventura

These nine school districts contain 38 buildings that were preliminarily identified by DSA as possibly meeting the qualification standards.

There are seven school districts with preliminarily identified school facilities, (total of ten buildings) that have chosen not to participate in this evaluation program. Piedmont City Unified School District (USD), San Ramon Valley USD, and West Contra Costa USD (total of four buildings) have either received or are approved to receive SMP or other grant program funding to rehabilitate their qualified buildings. Hayward USD and Jefferson Elementary School District of San Mateo County (total of three buildings) do not currently have the required district matching funds for a SMP rehabilitation project as required by the grant programs. Alameda County Office of Education reported that their one identified building is being sold. The Los Angeles USD reported that is not participating due to logistical feasibility challenges involving their two identified buildings.

CURRENT STATUS OF SEISMIC EVALUATION CONTRACTS

As of the date of the CSSC meeting of March 10, 2011, all nine participating school districts have received site visits from the contractors and all seismic evaluation reports have been received by OPSC and DSA to complete the review process. Of the preliminarily qualified school buildings, 20 out of 38, have met all qualification standards and 18 school buildings have not met qualification standards. The 18 disqualified school buildings were due to the buildings not being of the pre-determined structural types listed on page three. Please see the detailed list of evaluated buildings, including inspection results, provided in attachment “A” of this report.

(Continued on Page 6)

Below is a listing of each participating school district, the site review and report preparation costs (not finalized), and preliminary repair/rehabilitation construction cost estimates as provided by the seismic evaluation contractors.

District	Review/Rpt Cost	Repair Estimates
Aromas-San Juan	$16,995	$900,000-$1,800,000
Fillmore Unified	20,105	not qualified
Fortuna Union High	10,350	200,000-400,000
Hemet Unified	32,430	895,000-1,370,000
Redlands Unified	6,295	not qualified
Oakland Unified	29,460	3,600,000-7,200,000
San Bernardino City Unified	11,748	not qualified
William S. Hart Union	9,700	350,000-550,000
Santa Paula Elementary	18,305	1,700,000-2,300,000
Template Development	7,420	NA
Total Costs	$162,808	$7,645,000-$13,620,000

REPAIR COST ESTIMATES

As indicated in the above chart, the structural engineers' repair estimates range from $7,645,000 to $13,620,000. These estimates are preliminary and not inclusive of all qualified buildings. As stated in one report, "a rough opinion of the cost range to design and install mitigation measures for these identified deficiencies is difficult to develop without further analysis and investigation, which is beyond the scope of this evaluation." Therefore, the cost estimates, which were included in the reports, are not to be considered an accurate estimate of mitigation costs. Accurate cost estimates would require Architectural and Construction Cost Estimators which, as stated, was beyond the scope of these contracts.

RESIDUAL GRANT FUNDS

Following completion of all current review and template report contractual requirements indicated above, it is estimated that the amount of remaining grant funds will range from $37,000 to $60,000. Based on the contactors' original inspection and report cost estimates, the OPSC had projected that approximately $37,000 of the CSSC grant funds would remain. However, as stated on page 5 of this report, "one of the goals of the template development was to reduce the cost of the seismic safety evaluation. If critical deficiencies are quickly identified, the cost of providing a more detailed evaluation will not be needed and the evaluation can be halted." This template development goal also applied to these contracts. The resulting contract cost savings have, as yet, to be finalized. As a result, the CSSC grant funds remaining upon completion of all current contractual requirements could reach approximately $60,000.

(Continued on Page 7)

RETENTION OF FUNDS REQUEST

The OPSC is requesting approval from the CSSC to retain the unencumbered funds for such a time that will allow OPSC to outreach to those school districts that chose not to participate in the seismic evaluation program and allow those districts a "second chance" to participate in both identifying and assessing seismic risk potential.

Retention of unencumbered funds will also be useful in the event of possible prospective revisions to SMP eligibility requirements. These seismic reviews indicate the total projected repair/replacement cost of all qualified buildings to be significantly less than the $194.8 million in bond funds remaining in the SMP. To facilitate the expenditure of these bond funds, it is highly probable that the 1.68g threshold will be reduced, thereby increasing the number of potentially eligible SMP school buildings in California. The remaining contractual funds could then be utilized to provide future seismic engineering evaluations for these school facilities.

A NOTE TO THE COMMISSION

The OPSC wishes to express its heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the California Seismic Safety Commission for providing the seismic template and engineering assessment funding to assist school districts in assessing their school facilities that may be at risk. As previously discussed, the grant funding has facilitated the identification of 20 additional SMP projects. Once these projects are completed, these school districts will benefit by having safer and more secure learning environments for California's school children.

THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD RULES AND PROCEDURES SUB-COMMITTEE ITEM WAS POSTPONED TO THE APRIL 2011 SAB MEETING

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, March 23, 2011

ADDITIONAL GRANT FOR GENERAL SITE DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request direction from the State Allocation Board (Board) regarding the General Site Development grant.

DESCRIPTION

The regulations authorizing the General Site Development grant expired on January 1, 2011. Regulation amendments were approved by the SAB on June 23, 2010, to extend the expiration date to January 1, 2012, but have yet to be approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). As the regulations are currently in the public comment period, staff estimates that the regulations may be effective by approximately May 1, 2011.

As of March 15, 2011, three new construction projects have been received by the OPSC that are requesting the General Site Development grant. Staff is requesting direction from the Board on how to process these applications.

AUTHORITY

SFP Regulations Section 1859.76 states in part that the Board shall provide funding equal to 50 percent of approved site development and applicable design costs. Subsection (d) provides specifics in applying general site costs and includes that subsection (d) shall be suspended no later than January 1, 2011, unless otherwise extended by amendments as adopted by the Board.

BACKGROUND

As part of grant adequacy discussions in 2006, a preliminary analysis done by the Grant Adequacy Ad Hoc Committee concluded that a supplemental grant for General Site Development may not have been considered in the pupil grant in Senate Bill 50. The Board approved regulations to provide an additional grant for General Site Development for new construction projects that are new schools or additions to existing sites where additional acreage is being acquired.

The regulations authorize the Board to adopt amendments to extend the time period for which school districts may request this additional grant, in order to provide Staff time to complete a full analysis of the adjustment to the new construction base grant proposed in Assembly Bill 127, and the total SFP funding model.

The regulations implementing this additional grant were effective beginning September 5, 2006 with a suspension date of “no later than January 1, 2008.” Since then an extension has been approved by the board every year.

First Extension

At the December 12, 2007 meeting, these regulations were extended for the first time to have a new expiration date of “No later than January 1, 2009.” On March 3, 2008, the regulations became effective.

(Continued on Page Two)

At the May 28, 2008 meeting, Staff presented an item (Attachment A) to seek direction on applications that were received by OPSC during the period of time where the regulations were expired from January 1, 2008 to March 2, 2008.

Staff recommended that the board apportion the projects with the General Site Development grant included. Staff cited the December 2007 meeting where the Board indicated that "it wanted the general site development allowance to be seamless with no gaps in funding." The Board approved staff's recommendation.

Subsequent Extensions

At the February 25, 2009 meeting, regulations were approved to extend the expiration date to January 1, 2010. The amended regulations became effective September 18, 2009.

At the November 4, 2009 meeting, regulations were approved to extend the expiration date to January 1, 2011. The amended regulations became effective April 8, 2010.

STAFF COMMENTS

A policy decision was made, based on the initial regulation extension item (Attachment A) approved by the Board in May of 2008, that applications received during a lapse in the General Site Development regulation could be processed with the general site grant, provided that the regulation extension was approved by the Board and filed with OAL. However, any applications received during the lapse were only presented to the Board on a date after the respective amended regulations became effective.

Presently, the OPSC has received three applications during the lapse in regulation. At least one of these applications is scheduled to be presented to the Board on a date before Staff estimates the regulations will again become effective.

OPTIONS

Staff is seeking the Board's direction on how to proceed with the processing of applications received during the lapse in regulations and is presenting three options for the Board's consideration:

Option 1 – Process Applications without the General Site Development Grant and Amend after the Regulations are in Effect

As it was the Board's intention for the General Site Development grant to be seamless with no gaps in funding, the Board could direct Staff to present applications received during the lapse in regulations to the Board without the general site grant, but leave the approval open to be amended to include the grant once the regulations are in effect.

Option 2 – Request that Districts Withdraw and Resubmit Applications Requesting General Site Development once the Regulations are in Effect

The Board could direct Staff to notify districts requesting the General Site Development grant that their project is not eligible for the grant at this time. Districts would then be given the option to withdraw and resubmit when the regulations became effective, or proceed with the application approval without the General Site Development grant.

(Continued on Page Three)

OPTIONS (Cont.)

Option 3 – Hold Any Applications Received until the Regulations are in Effect

The Board could direct Staff to hold any applications that request the General Site Development grant and are received during the lapse in regulations until the regulations become effective. These applications would not receive an Unfunded Approval until the regulations allowing the grant were effective, which would cause them to receive a later approval date and a resulting lower place on the Unfunded Approvals list. This could put the districts at a disadvantage when cash becomes available to make full apportionments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopt Option 1.

BOARD ACTION

In considering this Item, the State Allocation Board (SAB) adopted staff's Option #1, which would allow staff to process applications without the General Site Development grant and bring the eligible projects back to the SAB to receive the additional grant once the regulations have become effective.

ATTACHMENT A

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 28, 2008

GENERAL SITE DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To authorize apportionments for general site development grants for six new construction projects.

DESCRIPTION

At the December 2007 State Allocation Board Meeting (SAB), the Board approved, on an emergency basis, an extension to the general site development allowance that was established for the 2007 calendar year to apply to qualifying new construction projects funded during the 2008 calendar year. The amended regulation was approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on March 3, 2008. The following five districts, representing six projects, have requested the general site development allowance for projects received January 1, 2008 through March 2, 2008*:

County	School District	School Name	Project Number	General Site Amount
Kern	Kern High	Mira Monte High	50/63529-00-005	$1,654,687
Kern	Kern High	Independence High	50/63529-00-006	$1,707,423
San Bernardino	Hesperia Unified	Oak Hills High #3	50/75044-00-028	$2,370,040
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	Peyton Elementary	50/68676-01-001	$602,617
Riverside	Coachella Valley Unified	Salton City Elementary	50/73676-01-007	$615,398
Madera	Golden Valley Unified	Ranchos Middle	50/75580-00-003	$578,702
				Total: $7,528,867

* There is one additional project for Heber Elementary School District/Imperial County, received within this time period that has requested the general site development allowance; however, it is still being reviewed and will be presented at the next available SAB meeting.

These projects have not received new construction funding approval. If the Board had approved these projects prior to March 2, 2008, the Board would have had to stipulate that the projects be left open until the general site development amendment was approved by the OAL. However, this was not necessary since the projects were still being reviewed by Staff.

AUTHORITY

The SFP Regulations Section 1859.76 states in part that the Board shall provide funding equal to 50 percent of approved site development and applicable design costs. Subsection (d) provides specifics in applying general site costs and includes that subsection (d) shall be suspended no later than January 1, 2009, unless otherwise extended by amendments as adopted by the Board.

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF COMMENTS

At the December 2007 SAB meeting, the Board indicated that it wanted the general site development allowance to be seamless with no gaps in funding. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the attached funding items for the six projects listed above in the amount of $141,367,487, which includes $7,528,867 for general site development. In addition, Staff requests authorization to present a consent item that includes general site development for Heber Elementary School District at a future SAB meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the attached funding items.

2. Authorize Staff to present the Heber Elementary School District project, including the general site development allowance, in the consent agenda of a future SAB meeting.

This Item was approved by the State Allocation Board on May 28, 2008.