Resolution: 2016-05-04

State of California
State Allocation Board
School Facility Program

This Resolution of the State Allocation Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") is applicable to the appropriate sections of the Education Code and is described and filed in the office of the Executive Officer and will be made available to all interested parties as the Resolution pertains to the documents attached hereto. Said documents were acted upon by the Board at its meeting on May 25, 2016.

WHEREAS, the Board has previously approved or determined to be approvable a number of projects for construction or modernization eligibility of facilities for school districts and is making apportionments and/or unfunded approvals for the grant amounts for projects that meet the Board's criteria for the apportionment of grants pursuant to Education Code Sections 17072.10, 17078.52, 17078.70, 17079 or 17074.10 or Board Regulations 1859.81.1 or 1859.83;

WHEREAS, Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2 require the State (on whose behalf the Board is acting) to declare its reasonable intent to provide grant funding to school districts, in accordance with Board policy and law, for costs of the projects with proceeds of State bonds;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. This Resolution is adopted by the Board for the purposes of establishing compliance with Treasury Regulations Section 1.150-2, and this Resolution does not bind the Board to make any additional apportionment, or bind the State to incur any indebtedness.

2. The Board anticipates that some or all of the school districts listed on the list of "Projects" referred to in this Resolution will pay certain capital expenditures in connection with some or all of the project costs prior to the issuance of bonds by the State to pay for the grants for the projects. The reimbursement of such costs is consistent with the State's budgetary and financial circumstances, and in accordance with Board policy, as no other funds or accounts of the State have been budgeted or are available to pay the costs of the projects on either a short-term or a long-term basis.

3. The Board, acting on behalf of the State, hereby declares that it is the State's official intent to use proceeds of general obligation bonds that may become available for such purpose, consistent with the requirements of law that are in effect at the time the funds are available, to provide grants in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

4. This Resolution shall be continuously available for inspection by the general public during normal business hours at the offices of the Board at 707 3rd Street, West Sacramento, California, commencing within one week after the date of enactment of this Resolution.

5. Any eligibility determination does not constitute a commitment of future funding by the Board.

I, the undersigned, duly authorized as the Executive Officer of the State Allocation Board, do hereby certify the foregoing to be true and correct, and that this Resolution was adopted at a meeting of said Board on May 25, 2016 at Sacramento, California.

Lisa Silverman
Executive Officer
State Allocation Board

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM UNFUNDED APPROVALS
(Lack of AB 55 Loans)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present to the State Allocation Board (Board) a list of School Facility Program (SFP) applications for unfunded approval.

DESCRIPTION

At the February 2016 Board meeting, the Board elected to provide an increase adjustment of 2.79 percent to SFP projects for calendar year 2016. The projects listed on the Attachment reflect the Board's action of the adoption of the 2.79 percent increase based on the corrected RS Means Construction Cost Index. In addition, the project applications represent SFP New Construction, Modernization, Charter School, and Overcrowded Relief Grant projects in date order of a complete application being received by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC).

AUTHORITY

SFP Regulation Section 1859.2 defines an Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) as an information list of unfunded projects that was created due to the State's inability to provide interim financing from the Pooled Money Investment Account (AB 55 loans) to fund school construction projects as declared in the Department of Finance Budget Letter #33 issued on December 18, 2008.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.95 states:

"When the Board has no funds to apportion …, the Board will also accept and process applications for apportionment for purposes of developing an Unfunded List based on the date the application is ready for Apportionment, with the exception of New Construction funding applications that utilize eligibility generated by the Alternative Enrollment Projection.

An application for funding included on an Unfunded List is eligible for reimbursement subject to adjustments in the New Construction Grants amount pursuant to Section 1859.77."

BACKGROUND

At the March 11, 2009 SAB meeting, the Board requested that Staff continue to process applications to the Board for unfunded approval, up to the bonding authority. The Attachment reflects applications being presented for unfunded approval, including SFP modernization and new construction projects in date order of a complete application being received by the OPSC. The list also includes health and safety facility hardship applications for funding that have been processed and are ready for approval regardless of received date. The unfunded approval of the applications as reflected on the Attachment does not constitute a guarantee of future funding.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the SFP applications as presented on the Attachment.

2. Provide that these unfunded approvals do not constitute a guarantee of future funding.

ATTACHMENT
UNFUNDED APPROVALS
(Lack of AB 55 Loans)
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	District	School Site	Application Number	Received Date	Grant Amount
LOS ANGELES	NEWHALL ELEMENTARY	VALENCIA VALLEY ELEMENTARY	56/64832-00-001	7/30/2013	$1,157,110.00
LOS ANGELES	NEWHALL ELEMENTARY	MEADOWS ELEMENTARY	56/64832-00-002	7/30/2013	$1,371,392.00
LOS ANGELES	PASADENA UNIFIED	SIERRA MADRE MIDDLE	56/64881-00-002	7/30/2013	$358,948.00
CONTRA COSTA	MARTINEZ UNIFIED	VICENTE MARTINEZ CONTINUATION HIGH	51/61739-00-002	12/22/2015	$3,519,661.00
CONTRA COSTA	MARTINEZ UNIFIED	BRIONES ALTERNATIVE HIGH	51/61739-00-003	12/22/2015	$465,637.00
NEVADA	GRASS VALLEY ELEMENTARY	YUBA RIVER CHARTER	54/66332-00-002	2/23/2016	$8,103,906.00
SACRAMENTO	NATOMAS UNIFIED	NATOMAS CHARTER	54/75283-00-003	3/18/2016	$3,158,955.40
SACRAMENTO	NATOMAS UNIFIED	NATOMAS CHARTER	54/75283-00-004	3/18/2016	$2,752,898.20

Overcrowding Relief Grant: $2,887,450.00

Facility Hardship: $3,985,298.00

Charter: $14,015,759.60

Total: $20,888,507.60

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 56/64832-00-001
School District: Newhall Elementary
County: Los Angeles
School Name: Valencia Valley Elementary

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	Elementary School
K-6:	97
7-8:	
9-12:	
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	11
Master Acres:	9.6
Existing Acres:	6.46
Proposed Acres:	
Recommended Acres:	9.6
Financial Hardship Requested:	No
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Overcrowding Relief Grant	$	1,031,498.00
Fire Detection Alarm		1,164.00
Service Site		96,397.00
Utilities		26,606.00
Prevailing Wage Monitoring		1,445.00
Total State Share (50%)		1,157,110.00
District Share (50%)		1,157,110.00
Total Project Cost	$	**2,314,220.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	1,157,110.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		1,157,110.00
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**2,314,220.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition		Authorized This Action		Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Overcrowding/Add. Grant	**957-531**	**1D**	$	1,157,110.00	$	1,157,110.00
District Share						
Cash Contribution				1,157,110.00		
Total			$	**2,314,220.00**	$	**1,157,110.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.183, the District is required to remove from the eligible site and from classroom use all portables replaced in this project.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements.
Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 56/64832-00-002
School District: Newhall Elementary
County: Los Angeles
School Name: Meadows Elementary

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	Elementary School
K-6:	112
7-8:	
9-12:	
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	8
Master Acres:	9.6
Existing Acres:	7.15
Proposed Acres:	
Recommended Acres:	9.6
Financial Hardship Requested:	No
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Overcrowding Relief Grant	$	1,191,008.00
Fire Detection Alarm		1,344.00
Service Site		109,264.00
Utilities		20,424.00
Small Size		47,640.00
Prevailing Wage Monitoring		1,712.00
Total State Share (50%)		1,371,392.00
District Share (50%)		1,371,392.00
Total Project Cost	$	**2,742,784.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	1,371,392.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		1,371,392.00
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**2,742,784.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition		Authorized This Action		Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Overcrowding/Add. Grant	**957-531**	**1D**	$	1,371,392.00	$	1,371,392.00
District Share						
Cash Contribution				1,371,392.00		
Total			$	**2,742,784.00**	$	**1,371,392.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.183, the District is required to remove from the eligible site and from classroom use all portables replaced in this project.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements.
Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 56/64881-00-002
School District: Pasadena Unified
County: Los Angeles
School Name: Sierra Madre Middle

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	Middle School
K-6:	
7-8:	
9-12:	25
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	1
Master Acres:	8.1
Existing Acres:	7.87
Proposed Acres:	
Recommended Acres:	8.1
Financial Hardship Requested:	No
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Overcrowding Relief Grant	$	357,775.00
Fire Detection Alarm		725.00
Prevailing Wage Monitoring		448.00
Total State Share (50%)		358,948.00
District Share (50%)		358,948.00
Total Project Cost	$	**717,896.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	358,948.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		358,948.00
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**717,896.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition		Authorized This Action		Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Overcrowding/Add. Grant	**957-531**	**1D**	$	358,948.00	$	358,948.00
District Share						
Cash Contribution				358,948.00		
Total			$	**717,896.00**	$	**358,948.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.183, the District is required to remove from the eligible site and from classroom use all portables replaced in this project.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements.
Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 51/61739-00-002
School District: Martinez Unified
County: Contra Costa
School Name: Vicente Martinez Continuation High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High School
K-6:	
7-8:	
9-12:	95
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	7
Master Acres:	3.82
Existing Acres:	1.3
Proposed Acres:	0
Recommended Acres:	3.82
Facility Hardship (a):	Yes
Financial Hardship Requested:	No
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

New Construction Grant	$	1,359,545
Fire Detection Alarm		2,755
Sprinkler System		20,900
Site Acquisition		628,774
Service Site		247,976
Off-Site		128,400
Utilities		15,931
General Site		101,988
New School		1,013,392
Total State Share (50%)		3,519,661
District Share (50%)		3,519,661
Total Project Cost	$	**7,039,322**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	3,519,661
District Share		
Cash Contribution		3,519,661
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**7,039,322**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Add. Grant	**957-500**	**1D**		$ 3,519,661.00	$ 3,519,661.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution				3,519,661.00	
Total			$	**$ 7,039,322.00**	**$ 3,519,661.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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 any and all project savings realized from the funding of this Facility Hardship Program project will be returned to the State.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 51/61739-00-003
School District: Martinez Unified
County: Contra Costa
School Name: Briones Alternative High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High School
K-6:	
7-8:	
9-12:	27
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	1
Master Acres:	3.82
Existing Acres:	1.3
Proposed Acres:	0
Recommended Acres:	3.82
Facility Hardship (a):	Yes
Financial Hardship Requested:	No
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

New Construction Grant	$	386,397
Fire Detection Alarm		783
Sprinkler System		5,940
Service Site		35,425
Off-Site		18,343
Utilities		2,276
General Site		16,473
Total State Share (50%)		465,637
District Share (50%)		465,637
Total Project Cost	$	**931,274**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	465,637
District Share		
Cash Contribution		465,637
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**931,274**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Add. Grant	**957-500**	**1D**		$ 465,637.00	$ 465,637.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution				465,637.00	
Total			$	$ **931,274.00**	$ **465,637.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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 any and all project savings realized from the funding of this Facility Hardship Program project will be returned to the State.

SAB Meeting: **May 25, 2016**

Charter School Facilities Program
New Construction Adjusted Grant

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No	54/66332-00-002	**County**	Nevada
School District	Grass Valley Elementary	**Charter School**	Yuba River Charter
		School Name	Yuba River Charter

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:		Middle School
Pupils Assigned	**K-6:**	225
	7-8:	54
	9-12:	
	Non-Severe:	
	Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:		Charter
Number of Classrooms:		11
Master Plan Acres:		12.8
Existing Acres:		
Proposed Acres:		11.5
Recommended Acres:		12.8

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

CSFP New Construction Grant		$	2,999,988
Fire Alarm			3,618
Automatic Sprinkler			51,498
Site Acquisition			817,537
Service-Site			272,045
Off-Site			71,967
Utilities			28,865
General Site			392,130
Geographic	5%		171,681
Total State Share (50%)			4,809,329
Charter School Share (50%)			4,809,329
Total Project Cost		$	**9,618,658**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	4,809,329
Charter School Share		
CSFA Lease Amount		4,809,329
Cash Contribution		
Total Project Cost	$	**9,618,658**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Preliminary Apportionment	Preliminary Apportionment This Action	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Charter School Grant	**957-540**	**1D**	$ 2,826,158.26	$ (2,826,158.26)	$ 3,384,231.26	$ 3,384,231.26
Charter School Grant	**057-540**	**1D**	1,425,097.74	(1,425,097.74)	1,425,097.74	
Charter School Share						
CSFA Lease Amount	**957-540**	**1D**	4,161,601.74	(4,161,601.74)	4,719,674.74	4,719,674.74
CSFA Lease Amount	**057-540**	**1D**	89,654.26	(89,654.26)	89,654.26	
Cash Contribution						
Total Project Cost			$ **8,502,512.00**	$ **(8,502,512.00)**	$ **9,618,658.00**	$ **8,103,906.00***

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-November

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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014 repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts and charter schools to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts and charter schools awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works contract awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts and charter schools are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

*The Applicant previously received $1,514,752.00 for advance design and site costs.

SAB Meeting: **May 25, 2016**

Charter School Facilities Program
New Construction Adjusted Grant

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No	54/75283-00-003	**County**	Sacramento
School District	Natomas Unified	**Charter School**	Natomas Charter
		School Name	Natomas Charter

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:		High School
Pupils Assigned	**K-6:**	25
	7-8:	27
	9-12:	54
	Non-Severe:	13
	Severe:	0
Application Filing Basis:		Charter
Number of Classrooms:		5
Master Plan Acres:		
Existing Acres:		13.69
Proposed Acres:		0.0
Recommended Acres:		35.2

ADJUSTEDGRANT DATA

CSFP New Construction Grant	**$**	1,602,105
Fire Alarm		2,806
Service-Site		130,904
Utilities		47,609
Total State Share (50%)		1,783,424
Charter School Share (50%)		1,783,424
Total Project Cost	**$**	**3,566,848**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	**$**	1,783,424
Charter School Share		
CSFA Lease Amount		1,783,424
Cash Contribution		
Total Project Cost	**$**	**3,566,848**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Preliminary Apportionment	Preliminary Apportionment This Action	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Charter School Grant	**947-510**	**47**	$ 1,835,516.70	$ (1,835,516.70)	$ 1,579,477.70	$ 1,579,477.70
Charter School Grant	**047-510**	**47**	203,946.30	(203,946.30)	203,946.30	
Charter School Share						
CSFA Lease Amount	**947-510**	**47**	1,835,516.70	(1,835,516.70)	1,579,477.70	1,579,477.70
CSFA Lease Amount	**047-510**	**47**	203,946.30	(203,946.30)	203,946.30	
Cash Contribution						
Total Project Cost			**$ 4,078,926.00**	**$ (4,078,926.00)**	**$ 3,566,848.00**	**$ 3,158,955.40***

Funding Source: Proposition 47 Bonds/2002-November

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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014 repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts and charter schools to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts and charter schools awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works contract awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts and charter schools are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

*The Applicant previously received $407,892.60 for advance design costs.

SAB Meeting: **May 25,2016**

Charter School Facilities Program
Rehabilitation Adjusted Grant

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No	54/75283-00-004	**County**	Sacramento
School District	Natomas Unified	**Charter School**	Natomas Charter
		School Name	Natomas Charter

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:		High School
Pupils Assigned	**K-6:**	
	7-8:	
	9-12:	
	Non-Severe:	
	Severe:	
	Non-Toilet sq. ft.:	4,800
	Toilet sq. ft.:	1,280
Application Filing Basis:		Charter
Number of Classrooms:		4
Master Plan Acres:		
Existing Acres:		13.69
Proposed Acres:		0.0
Recommended Acres:		35.1

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

CSFP Rehabilitation Grant		$	1,234,560
Urban/Security/Impacted Site			271,517
Access/Firecode	3%		37,037
Total State Share (50%)			1,543,114
Charter School Share (50%)			1,543,114
Total Project Cost		$	**3,086,228**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	1,543,114
Charter School Share		
CSFA Lease Amount		1,543,114
Cash Contribution		
Total Project Cost	$	**3,086,228**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Preliminary Apportionment	Preliminary Apportionment This Action	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share						
Charter School Grant	**947-510**	**47**	$ 103,308.10	$ (103,308.10)	$ 103,308.10	$ 103,308.10
Charter School Grant	**955-540**	**55**	1,396,676.00	(1,396,676.00)	1,273,141.00	1,273,141.00
Charter School Grant	**047-510**	**47**	166,664.90	(166,664.90)	166,664.90	
Charter School Share						
CSFA Lease Amount	**947-510**	**47**	103,308.10	(103,308.10)	103,308.10	103,308.10
CSFA Lease Amount	**955-540**	**55**	1,396,676.00	(1,396,676.00)	1,273,141.00	1,273,141.00
CSFA Lease Amount	**047-510**	**47**	166,664.90	(166,664.90)	166,664.90	
Cash Contribution						
Total Project Cost			$ **3,333,298.00**	$ **(3,333,298.00)**	$ **3,086,228.00**	$ ***2,752,898.20**

Funding Sources: Proposition 47 Bonds/2002-November; Proposition 55 Bonds/2004-March

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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014 repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts and charter schools to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts and charter schools awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works contract awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts and charter schools are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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

*The Applicant previously received $333,329.80 for advance design costs.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 51/62901-00-004
County: Humboldt
School District: Klamath Trinity Joint Unified
School Name: Hoopa Valley High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High School
K-6:	
7-8:	
9-12:	
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	Site Specific
Number of Classrooms:	0
Master Acres:	
Existing Acres:	20
Proposed Acres:	
Recommended Acres:	21
Facility Hardship (a):	Yes
Financial Hardship Requested:	Yes
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	No

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Service Site		$	769,843
Off-Site			312,536
Utilities			145,500
Fac. Hardship Toilets	2,553 Sq. Ft.		796,536
Fac. Hardship Other	11,148 Sq. Ft.		1,939,752
Geographic Percent Factor (10%)			306,464
Small Size Project (12%)			328,355
Project Assistance			6,504
Total State Share (50%)			4,605,490
District Share (50%)			4,605,490
Total Project Cost		$	9,210,980

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	4,605,490
District Share		
Cash Contribution		1,713,885
Financial Hardship		2,891,605
Total Project Cost	$	**9,210,980**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	State Apportionment This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Add. Grant	**055-500**	**55**		$ 4,605,490.00	$ 4,605,490.00
District Share					
Financial Hardship	**055-500**	**55**		902,997.58	902,997.58
Financial Hardship	**057-500**	**1D**		1,988,607.42	1,988,607.42
Cash Contribution				1,713,885.00	
Total			$	$ **9,210,980.00**	$ **7,497,095.00**

Funding Sources: Proposition 55 Bonds/2004-Mar.; Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.

The District is required to submit a valid *Fund Release Authoritzation* (Form SAB 50-05) within 18 months of the date of the apportionment; otherwise, the approtionment will be rescinded without further board action.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

The District qualifies for financial hardship pursuant to SFP Regulation Section 1859.81(c)(1). As of September 28, 2015, the current outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district issued for the purpose of constructing school facilities in accordance with Education Code Section 17072.35 or 17074.25 as appropriate, at the time of request for financial hardship status, is at least 60 percent of the district's total bonding capacity.

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 any and all project savings realized from the funding of this Facility Hardship Program project must be returned to the State.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No:	58/64725-00-006	**County:**	Los Angeles
School District:	Long Beach Unified	**School Name:**	Polytechnic High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High 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:**	52.7
Alternative Education School:	No	**Existing Acres:**	29.98

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Seismic Rehabilitation	$ 3,096,639.00
Total State Share (50%)	3,096,639.00
District Share (50%)	3,096,639.00
Total Project Cost	$ **6,193,278.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share	
This Project	$ 3,096,639.00
District Share	
Cash Contribution	3,096,639.00
Financial Hardship	
Total Project Cost	$ **6,193,278.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	State Apportionment This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Additional Grant	**057-505**	**1D**	$ 2,956,060.00	$ 140,579.00	$ 140,579.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution			2,956,060.00	140,579.00	
Total			$ **5,912,120.00**	$ **140,579.00**	$ **140,579.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.

Pursuant to the Board's action on May 25, 2016, the District is required to submit a complete Fund Release Authorization (Form SAB 50-05) on or before August 23, 2016; otherwise, the apportionment will be rescinded without further Board action and will receive a new Unfunded Approval date of August 23, 2016.

The Form SAB 50-05 submittal must contain an original signature from a designated District Representative and must be physically received by the Office of Public School Construction at 707 Third Street, West Sacramento, CA 95605 prior to the close of business on August 23, 2016.

Errors and Omissions: This project is amended to correct the Seismic Rehabilitation amount previously approved at the February 24, 2016 State Allocation Board (SAB) meeting and will maintain its original SAB approval date of June 30, 2015.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014 repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works contract awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

Provide that the State portion of any and all project savings realized from the funding of a Seismic Mitigation Program project must be returned to the State.

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 50/10199-00-039
School District: Los Angeles County Office of Education
County: Los Angeles
School Name: Jonas Salk

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High School
K-6:	
7-8:	
9-12:	206
Non-Severe:	
Severe:	
Application Filing Basis:	District Wide
Number of Classrooms:	8
Master Acres:	6.29
Existing Acres:	
Proposed Acres:	5.2
Recommended Acres:	6.29
Facility Hardship (a):	No
Financial Hardship Requested:	Yes
Alternative Education School:	No
Addition to Existing Site:	Yes

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

New Construction Grant	$	2,239,838.00
Fire Detection Alarm		4,738.00
Labor Compliance		19,612.00
Site Acquisition		1,963,307.00
Service Site		88,045.00
Off-Site		2,859.00
Utilities		11,778.00
General Site		156,556.00
Total State Share (50%)		4,486,733.00
District Share (50%)		4,486,733.00
Total Project Cost	$	**8,973,466.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	4,486,733.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		66,000.00
Financial Hardship		4,420,733.00
Total Project Cost	$	**8,973,466.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	State Apportionment This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Add. Grant	**055-500**	**55**	$ 2,354,354.00		
New Construction/Add. Grant	**119-500**	**1A**	163,879.00		
New Construction/Add. Grant	**119-501**	**1A**	2,034,500.00	$ (66,000.00)	$ (66,000.00)
District Share					
Cash Contribution			132,000.00	(66,000.00)	
Financial Hardship	**055-500**	**55**	2,222,354.00		
Financial Hardship	**119-612**	**1A**	163,879.00		
Financial Hardship	**119-617**	**1A**	2,034,500.00		
Total			$ **9,105,466.00**	$ **(132,000.00)**	$ **(66,000.00)**

Funding Sources: Proposition 1A Bonds/1998-Nov.; Proposition 55 Bonds/2004-Mar.

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

Staff is requesting an adjustment to the apportionment for this project made at the December 12, 2007 State Allocation Board meeting. The Site Acquisition grant has been reduced by $66,000 for improvements of six existing classrooms on the site.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No:	57/66613-00-020	**County:**	Orange
School District:	Ocean View Elementary	**School Name:**	Star View Elementary

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:		Elementary School	**Application Filing Basis:**	Site Specific
Pupils Assigned Under 50 Yrs:	**K-6:**	341		
	7-8:			
	9-12:			
	Non-Severe:	13		
	Severe:			
Financial Hardship Requested:		No	**Recommended Acres:**	10.5
Alternative Education School:		No	**Existing Acres:**	13.15

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA

Modernization Grant - Under 50 Yrs	$	1,279,418.00
Fire Detection Alarm		40,555.00
Accessibility/Fire Code Req.		53,217.00
Prevailing Wage Monitoring		2,060.00
Total State Share (60%)		1,375,250.00
District Share (40%)		916,833.00
Total Project Cost	$	**2,292,083.00**

PROJECT FINANCING

State Share		
This Project	$	1,375,250.00
District Share		
Cash Contribution		916,833.00
Financial Hardship		
Total Project Cost	$	**2,292,083.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	State Apportionment This Action
State Share					
			$	$	
Modernization/Additional Grant	**057-570**	**1D**	1,414,014.00	(38,764.00)	$ (38,764.00)
District Share					
Cash Contribution			942,676.00	(25,843.00)	
Total			$ **2,356,690.00**	$ **(64,607.00)**	$ **(38,764.00)**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.

Assembly Bill 436 (Solorio), Chapter 378, Statutes of 2011, requires school districts to notify the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) of School Facility Program projects with a public works contract awarded on or after January 1, 2012. Except for projects exempt pursuant to Labor Code Section 1771.3(b)(3), the DIR is required to provide prevailing wage monitoring services for the projects.

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

Staff is requesting an adjustment to the apportionment for this project made at the April 7, 2014 State Allocation Board meeting. The excessive cost hardship grant for Accessibility/Fire Code has been reduced by $38,706 as unnecessary fire, life safety and accessibility work has been removed from the scope of work. As a result of the reduction in the Accessibility/Fire Code grant, the Prevailing Wage Monitoring grant has also been reduced by $58.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……50/67686-00-030 School District:…..……..……..Colton Joint Unified

County:……..……San Bernardino School Name:…..……..……...Joe Baca Middle

Financial Hardship……..……..……..……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. The District incurred additional eligible expenditures per SFP Regulation Section 1859.74 and 1859.106 and may receive additional Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) costs in the amount of $685. Sufficient bond authority has now become available; therefore this project shall be funded in order of receipt of an Approved Application for funding per SFP Regulation Section 1859.93.1. The District has concurred with these findings and is eligible for an additional apportionment in the amount of $342.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 11,192,758	$ 0	$ 11,192,758
SFP Site Acquisition	912,500	0	912,500
SFP Site Other	36,500	0	36,500
SFP Service Site	1,195,011	0	1,195,011
SFP General Site	919,374	0	919,374
SFP Offsite	669,151	0	669,151
SFP Utilities	38,902	0	38,902
SFP Site DTSC Fee	4,020	342	4,362
SFP Fire Detection Alarm	14,291	0	14,291
SFP Fire Sprinklers	196,646	0	196,646
SFP Labor Compliance	68,750	0	68,750
Total State Apportionment	$ 15,247,903	$ 342	$ 15,248,245
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 15,247,903	$ 343	$ 15,248,246
State (SFP)	15,247,903	342	15,248,245
Total Project Costs	$ 30,495,806	$ 685	$ 30,496,491

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve an increase of $685 in the total project cost from $30,495,806 to $30,496,491.
2. Approve an increase of $343 in the District Contribution from $15,247,903 to $15,248,246.
3. Approve an increase of $342 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-500] from $15,247,903 to $15,248,245.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..50/68106-00-010 School District:…..……Escondido Union High
County:……..……..……San Diego School Name:...Del Lago Academy (Formerly Citacado HS)
Financial Hardship:……...No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. The District received $544,315 in excess funding for site acquisition. The District has concurred with the findings and has returned the State funds in the amount of $272,158.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 12,364,812	$ 0	$ 12,364,812
SFP Multi Level Construction	1,483,777	0	1,483,777
SFP Site Acquisition	1,326,538	(272,158)	1,054,380
SFP Service Site	2,545,728	0	2,545,728
SFP General Site	801,182	0	801,182
SFP Offsite	571,201	0	571,201
SFP Utilities	358,949	0	358,949
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	24,300	0	24,300
SFP Fire Sprinklers	190,512	0	190,512
SFP High Performance	984,239	0	984,239
SFP Labor Compliance Program	86,799	0	86,799
Total State Apportionment	$ 20,738,037	$ (272,158)	$ 20,465,879
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 20,738,037	$ (272,157)	$ 20,465,880
State (SFP)	20,738,037	(272,158)	20,465,879
Total Project Costs	$ 41,476,074	$ (544,315)	$ 40,931,759

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $544,315 in the total project cost from $41,476,074 to $40,931,759.
2. Approve a decrease of $272,157 in the District Contribution from $20,738,037 to $20,465,880.
3. Approve a decrease of $272,158 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2004-Mar.; 055-500] from $20,738,037 to $20,465,879.
4. Recognize the District has returned State funds in the amount of $272,158.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:.....50/63594-00-003 School District:.....Lost Hills Unified

County:.....Kern School Name:.....A. M. Thomas Middle

Financial Hardship.....No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. A review of expenditures reported by the District indicates that per SFP Regulation Sections 1859.74 and 1859.106, the District was over-funded for Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) in the amount of $7,032. The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $3,516.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 859,413	$ 0	$ 859,413
SFP Service Site	38,489	0	38,489
SFP Site DTSC Fee	3,516	(3,516)	0
SFP Labor Compliance Program	14,366	0	14,366
Total State Apportionment	$ 915,784	$ (3,516)	$ 912,268
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 915,784	$ (3,516)	$ 912,268
State (SFP)	915,784	(3,516)	912,268
Total Project Costs	$ 1,831,568	$ (7,032)	$ 1,824,536

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $7,032 in the total project cost from $1,831,568 to $1,824,536.
2. Approve a decrease of $3,516 in the District Contribution from $915,784 to $912,268.
3. Approve a decrease of $3,516 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/ 2004-Mar.; 055-500] from $915,784 to $912,268.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $3,516.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..……50/68965-00-001 School District:…..……Menlo Park City Elementary

County:……..……..……..San Mateo School Name:…..……Encinal Elementary

Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. The District incurred additional eligible expenditures per SFP Regulation Sections 1859.74 and 1859.106 and may receive additional Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) funding in the amount of $1,685. Sufficient bond authority has now become available; therefore this project shall be funded in order of receipt of an Approved Application for funding per SFP Regulation Section 1859.93.1. The District has concurred with these findings and is eligible for additional funding in the amount of $842.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 4,450,275	$ 0	$ 4,450,275
SFP Service Site	923,004	0	923,004
SFP Offsite	184,397	0	184,397
SFP Utilities	31,242	0	31,242
SFP Project Assistance	5,653	0	5,653
SFP Site DTSC Fee	6,119	842	6,961
SFP Site Hazardous Removal	44,736	0	44,736
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	5,225	0	5,225
Total State Apportionment	$ 5,650,651	$ 842	$ 5,651,493
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 5,650,651	$ 843	$ 5,651,494
State (SFP)	5,650,651	842	5,651,493
Total Project Costs	$ 11,301,302	$ 1,685	$ 11,302,987

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve an increase of $1,685 in the total project cost from $11,301,302 to $11,302,987.
2. Approve an increase of $843 in the District Contribution from $5,650,651 to $5,651,494.
3. Approve an increase of $842 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-500] from $5,650,651 to $5,651,493.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..50/69120-00-008

School District:……..…… ..……..Santa Maria-Bonita

County:……..……..……..Santa Barbara

School Name:……..……..Liberty II – Sanchez Elementary

Financial Hardship……..……Yes

Date of Financial Hardship Status:.....March 7, 2002

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation 1859.81(c)(3).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $955. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project … any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." Further, the District incurred additional eligible expenditures per SFP Regulation Section 1859.74 and 1859.106 and may receive additional Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) costs in the amount of $2,893. Sufficient bond authority has now become available; therefore this project shall be funded in order of receipt of an Approved Application for funding per SFP Regulation Section 1859.93.1. The District has concurred with these findings, agrees to return State funds in the amount of $955 and is eligible for an additional apportionment in the amount of $2,893. The net amount to be returned to the District is $1,938.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 4,638,794	$ (1,924)	$ 4,636,870
SFP SDC Therapy	98,880	0	98,880
SFP Site Acquisition	612,000	0	612,000
SFP Site Other	25,000	0	25,000
SFP Service Site	296,506	0	296,506
SFP Offsite	22,836	0	22,836
SFP Utilities	46,134	0	46,134
SFP Urban Security	371,104	0	371,104
SFP Financial Hardship	6,314,597	969	6,315,566
SFP Therapy Toilet	91,680	0	91,680
SFP Site DTSC Fee	7,363	2,893	10,256
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	25,140	0	25,140
SFP Site Fire Sprinklers	79,160	0	79,160
Total State Apportionment	$ 12,629,194	$ 1,938	$ 12,631,132
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 6,314,597	$ 969	$ 6,315,566
Financial Hardship	6,314,597	969	6,315,566
Total Project Costs	$ 12,629,194	$ 1,938	$ 12,631,132

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve an increase of $1,938 in the total project cost from $12,629,194 to $12,631,132.
2. Approve an increase of $969 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-500] from $6,314,597 to $6,315,566.
3. Approve an increase of $969 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-500] from $6,314,597 to $6,315,566.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:.....53/64733-00-135 School District:.....Los Angeles Unified

County:.....Los Angeles School Name:.....Valley Region Elementary #10

Financial Hardship.....No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. The District incurred additional eligible expenditures per SFP Regulation Section 1859.74 and 1859.106 and may receive additional hazardous waste/materials removal funding in the amount of $1,218,177. Per SFP Regulation Section 1859.106(d), "Any adjustments made pursuant to this Section will be made only if sufficient bond authority is available for the adjustment. If an Unfunded List has been created by the Board, then any adjustments made pursuant to this Section will be placed on the Unfunded List." If sufficient bond authority becomes available in the future, this project shall be funded in order of the receipt of an Approved Application for funding per SFP Regulation 1859.93.1. The District has concurred with these findings and is eligible for an additional apportionment in the amount of $609,088.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 5,745,350	$ 0	$ 5,745,350
SFP Multi Level Construction	689,442	0	689,442
SFP Service Site	784,960	0	784,960
SFP Offsite	183,338	0	183,338
SFP Utilities	121,313	0	121,313
SFP Urban Security	2,858,128	0	2,858,128
SFP Site Hazardous Removal	250,971	609,088	860,059
SFP Fire Detection Alarm	6,500	0	6,500
SFP Fire Sprinklers	96,850	0	96,850
SFP High Performance	132,143	0	132,143
SFP Labor Compliance Program	53,596	0	53,596
Total State Apportionment	$ 10,922,591	$ 609,088	$ 11,531,679
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 10,922,591	$ 609,089	$ 11,531,680
State (SFP)	10,922,591	609,088	11,531,679
Total Project Costs	$ 21,845,182	$ 1,218,177	$ 23,063,359

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve an increase of $1,218,177 in the total project cost from $21,845,182 to $23,063,359.
2. Approve an increase of $609,089 in the District Contribution from $10,922,591 to $11,531,680.
3. Approve an increase of $609,088 in the State Apportionment from $10,922,591 to $11,531,679.
4. Approve and place this increase on the Unfunded List for this project per School Facility Program Regulation Section 1859.106(d). This approval does not constitute a guarantee or commitment of future State funding and should not be relied on in any manner as any kind of representation or indication of future State funding. The State cautions any kind of reliance on the fact that an application is placed on this list.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:.....54/64733-00-026 School District:.....Los Angeles Unified

County:.....Los Angeles School Name:.....Los Angeles 6-12 Charter

Financial Hardship.....No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Charter School Facilities Program (CSFP) project and has savings in the amount of $ 1,016,204. SFP Regulation Section 1859.169.1 states "Projects funded under the CSFP do not generate savings pursuant to Section 1859.103. In addition, State funds remaining at the completion of the project may not be used to satisfy the local matching share obligation. Remaining funds must be returned to the State." The District has concurred with the findings and has already returned the State funds in the amount of 1,004,986.54. In addition the District will return the remaining State funds balance in the amount of $11,217.46.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 4,761,760	$ (508,102)	$ 4,253,658
SFP Multi Level Construction	571,411	0	571,411
SFP Site Acquisition	1,317,125	0	1,317,125
SFP Site Other	52,685	0	52,685
SFP Service Site	285,906	0	285,906
SFP General Site	235,503	0	235,503
SFP Offsite	96,208	0	96,208
SFP Utilities	32,146	0	32,146
SFP Urban Security	2,335,203	0	2,335,203
SFP Site DTSC Fee	4,456	0	4,456
SFP Hazardous Removal	42,233	0	42,233
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	8,920	0	8,920
SFP Fire Sprinklers	77,560	0	77,560
SFP Prevailing Wage Monitoring	13,797	0	13,797
SFP CSFA Lease Amount	9,298,722	(508,102)	8,790,620
Total State Apportionment	$ 19,133,635	$ (1,016,204)	$ 18,117,431
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 9,834,913	$ (508,102)	$ 9,326,811
CSFA Lease Amount	9,298,722	(508,102)	8,790,620
District Contribution	536,191	0	536,191
Total Project Costs	$ 19,669,826	$ (1,016,204)	$ 18,653,622

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $1,016,204 in the total project cost from $19,669,826 to $18,653,622.
2. Approve a decrease of $508,102 in the CSFA Lease Amount from $9,298,722 to $8,790,620.
3. Approve a decrease of $508,102 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2004-Mar.; 055-540] from $9,834,913 to $9,326,811.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $1,004,986.54. However, the District is required to return remaining State funds in the amount of $11,217.46.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..55/61804-02-001 School District:…..……San Ramon Valley Unified

County:……..……..…...Contra Costa School Name:…..……..……...Monte Vista High

Financial Hardship……....No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $328,480. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states "an applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $164,240.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 351,624	$ (164,240)	$ 187,384
SFP Site Acquisition	157,626	0	157,626
SFP CTE Equipment	35,343	0	35,343
Total State Apportionment	$ 544,593	$ (164,240)	$ 380,353
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 544,593	$ (164,240)	$ 380,353
State (SFP)	544,593	(164,240)	380,353
Total Project Costs	$ 1,089,186	$ (328,480)	$ 760,706

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $328,480 in the total project cost from $1,089,186 to $760,706.
2. Approve a decrease of $164,240 in the District Contribution from $544,593 to $380,353.
3. Approve a decrease of $164,240 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $544,593 to $380,353.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $164,240.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……55/67934-00-001
School District:…..……Victor Valley Union High
County:……..San Bernardino
School Name:……....Victor MS Medical CTE
Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $613,991. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states that "An applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return State funds in the amount of $306,996.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
New Construction	$ 942,925	$ (306,996)	$ 635,929
Site Other	171,759	0	171,759
SFP CTE Equipment	81,212	0	81,212
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,195,896	$ (306,996)	$ 888,900
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 1,195,896	$ (306,995)	$ 888,901
State (SFP)	1,195,896	(306,996)	888,900
Total Project Costs	$ 2,391,792	$ (613,991)	$ 1,777,801

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $613,991 in the total project cost from $2,391,792 to $1,777,801.
2. Approve a decrease of $306,995 in the District Contribution from $1,195,896 to $888,901.
3. Approve a decrease of $306,996 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $1,195,896 to $888,900.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $306,996.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:…….55/67934-00-004 School District:…..…….....….Victor Valley Union High

County:……..San Bernardino School Name:……...Silverado HA Medical CTE

Financial Hardship…… …No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $515,042. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states that "An applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $257,521.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
New Construction	$ 942,925	$ (257,521)	$ 685,404
Service Site	171,759	0	171,759
SFP CTE Equipment	81,211	0	81,211
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,195,895	$ (257,521)	$ 938,374
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 1,195,895	$ (257,521)	$ 938,374
State (SFP)	1,195,895	(257,521)	938,374
Total Project Costs	$ 2,391,790	$ (515,042)	$ 1,876,748

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $515,042 in the total project cost from $2,391,790 to $1,876,748.
2. Approve a decrease of $257,521 in the District Contribution from $1,195,895 to $938,374.
3. Approve a decrease of $257,521 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $1,195,895 to $938,374.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $257,521.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..56/61259-12-001
School District:……..……..……Oakland Unified
County:……..Alameda
School Name:…..……..……...Lincoln Elementary
Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is an Overcrowding Relief Grant (ORG) project and has savings in the amount of $1,749,737. SFP Regulation Section 1859.184.1(d) states "grants for ORG projects shall be limited to eligible expenditures, up to the State Apportionment for the project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return State funds in the amount of $874,869.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 2,810,700	$ (874,869)	$ 1,935,831
SFP Multi Level Construction	337,284	0	337,284
SFP Service Site	80,869	0	80,869
SFP Offsite	93,267	0	93,267
SFP Utilities	17,230	0	17,230
SFP Urban Security	1,965,202	0	1,965,202
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	3,300	0	3,300
Total State Apportionment	$ 5,307,852	$ (874,869)	$ 4,432,983
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 5,307,852	$ (874,868)	$ 4,432,984
State (SFP)	5,307,852	(874,869)	4,432,983
Total Project Costs	$ 10,615,704	$ (1,749,737)	$ 8,865,967

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $1,749,737 in the total project cost from $10,615,704 to $8,865,967.
2. Approve a decrease of $874,868 in the District Contribution from $5,307,852 to $4,432,984.
3. Approve a decrease of $874,869 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-531] from $5,307,852 to $4,432,983.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $874,869.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..56/68411-01-003
School District:……..……..…….Sweetwater Union High
County:……...San Diego
School Name:…..……..……Hilltop Senior High
Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is an Overcrowding Relief Grant (ORG) project and has savings in the amount of $519,295. SFP Regulation Section 1859.184.1(d) states "grants for ORG projects shall be limited to eligible expenditures, up to the State Apportionment for the project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return State funds in the amount of $259,648.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP New Construction	$ 3,491,829	$ (259,648)	$ 3,232,181
SFP Multi Level Construction	304,741	0	304,741
SFP Service Site	489,163	0	489,163
SFP Urban Security	621,490	0	621,490
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	6,831	0	6,831
SFP High Performance	107,199	0	107,199
Total State Apportionment	$ 5,021,253	$ (259,648)	$ 4,761,605
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 5,021,253	$ (259,647)	$ 4,761,606
State (SFP)	5,021,253	(259,648)	4,761,605
Total Project Costs	$ 10,042,506	$ (519,295)	$ 9,523,211

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $519,295 in the total project cost from 10,042,506 to $9,523,211.
2. Approve a decrease of $259,647 in the District Contribution from $5,021,253 to $4,761,606.
3. Approve a decrease of $259,648 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-531] from $5,021,253 to $4,761,605.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $259,648.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:…….57/10249-00-002 School District:…...…….Merced County Office of Education

County:…….……..……..Merced School Name:…..……Schelby

Financial Hardship…….……..……Yes Date of Financial Hardship Status:…….November 21, 2007

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation 1859.81(c)(3).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $2,795. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project … any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $2,795.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 493,212	$ (1,398)	$ 491,814
SFP Small School	59,185	0	59,185
SFP Fire Code Compliance	68,722	0	68,722
SFP Project Assistance	2,843	0	2,843
SFP Fire Protection/Alarm	13,800	0	13,800
SFP Financial Hardship	425,175	(1,397)	423,778
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,062,937	$ (2,795)	$ 1,060,142
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 637,762	$ (1,398)	$ 636,364
Financial Hardship (SFP)	425,175	(1,397)	423,778
Total Project Costs	$ 1,062,937	$ (2,795)	$ 1,060,142

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $2,795 in the total project cost from $1,062,937 to $1,060,142.
2. Approve a decrease of $1,398 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $637,762 to $636,364.
3. Approve a decrease of $1,397 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $425,175 to $423,778.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $2,795.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:…….57/10330-98-001

School District:……Riverside County Office of Education

County:……...Riverside

School Name:……Ina Arbuckle Elementary

Financial Hardship……Yes

Date of Financial Hardship Status:…….November 18, 2008

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation 1859.81(c)(3).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $38,834. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project … any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $38,834.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 159,124	$ (19,417)	$ 139,707
SFP Small School	19,095	0	19,095
SFP Fire Code Compliance	4,774	0	4,774
SFP Financial Hardship	107,961	(19,417)	88,544
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	4,452	0	4,452
Total State Apportionment	$ 295,406	$ (38,834)	$ 256,572
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 187,445	$ (19,417)	$ 168,028
Financial Hardship (SFP)	107,961	(19,417)	88,544
District Contribution	17,002	0	17,002
Total Project Costs	$ 312,408	$ (38,834)	$ 273,574

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $38,834 in the total project cost from $312,408 to $273,574.
2. Approve a decrease of $19,417 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.;057-570] from $187,445 to $168,028.
3. Approve a decrease of $19,417 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $107,961 to $88,544.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $38,834.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:…….57/10330-98-002 School District:….....Riverside County Office of Education

County:…….……..……...Riverside School Name:…..……..……John Kelley Elementary

Financial Hardship……..……..……Yes Date of Financial Hardship Status:……November 18, 2008

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation 1859.81(c)(3).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $263,525. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project … any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." The District has concurred with the findings and agrees to return the State funds in the amount of $263,525.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 420,542	$ (131,763)	$ 288,779
SFP Small School	50,465	0	50,465
SFP Fire Code Compliance	94,702	0	94,702
SFP Financial Hardship	135,728	(131,762)	3,966
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	11,766	0	11,766
Total State Apportionment	$ 713,203	$ (263,525)	$ 449,678
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 577,475	$ (131,763)	$ 445,712
Financial Hardship (SFP)	135,728	(131,762)	3,966
District Contributrion	249,255	0	249,255
Total Project Costs	$ 962,458	$ (263,525)	$ 698,933

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $263,525 in the total project cost from $962,458 to $698,933.
2. Approve a decrease of $131,763 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $577,475 to $445,712.
3. Approve a decrease of $131,762 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $135,728 to $3,966.
4. Require the District to return State funds in the amount of $263,525.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:…….57/10330-99-001

School District:…….. Riverside County Office of Education

County:…….……..……..Riverside

School Name:……..…..……Grindstaff Center

Financial Hardship……..……..……Yes

Date of Financial Hardship Status:…...November 18, 2008

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation Section 1859.81(c)(3).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $38,619. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project … any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." The District has concurred with the findings and has returned the State funds in the amount of $38,619.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 385,320	$ (19,310)	$ 366,010
SFP Small School	46,238	0	46,238
SFP Fire Code Compliance	37,409	0	37,409
SFP Financial Hardship	288,549	(19,309)	269,240
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	8,892	0	8,892
Total State Apportionment	$ 766,408	$ (38,619)	$ 727,789
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 477,859	$ (19,310)	$ 458,549
Financial Hardship (SFP)	288,549	(19,309)	269,240
District Contribution	30,024	0	30,024
Total Project Costs	$ 796,432	$ (38,619)	$ 757,813

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $38,619 in the total project cost from $796,432 to $757,813.
2. Approve a decrease of $19,310 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $477,859 to $458,549.
3. Approve a decrease of $19,309 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $288,549 to $269,240.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $38,619.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..57/67876-00-055 School District:…..……...San Bernardino City Unified

County:……..……..San Bernardino School Name:…….....…….. California Elementary

Financial Hardship……..……....Yes

Qualifying Financial Hardship Criteria: SFP Regulation 1859.81(c)(1).

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Financial Hardship project and has savings in the amount of $40,527. SFP Regulation Section 1859.103 states that "the State's portion of any savings declared by the district or determined by the OPSC by audit must be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant of that project…any interest earned on a financial hardship project not expended on eligible project expenditures will be treated as savings and will be used to reduce the SFP financial hardship grant for that project." The District has concurred with the findings and has returned the State funds in the amount of $40,527.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 1,093,950	$ (24,316)	$ 1,069,634
SFP Fire Compliance	163,727	0	163,727
SFP Financial Hardship	780,548	(16,211)	764,337
SFP Fire Detection/Alarm	34,775	0	34,775
SFP Labor Compliance Program	19,431	0	19,431
Total State Apportionment	$ 2,092,431	$ (40,527)	$ 2,051,904
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 94,041	$ 0	$ 94,041
State (SFP)	1,311,883	(24,316)	1,287,567
Financial Hardship (SFP)	780,548	(16,211)	764,337
Total Project Costs	$ 2,186,472	$ (40,527)	$ 2,145,945

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $40,527 in the total project cost from $2,186,472 to $2,145,945.
2. Approve a decrease of $24,316 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $1,311,883 to $1,287,567.
3. Approve a decrease of $16,211 in the Financial Hardship Contribution [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-570] from $780,548 to $764,337.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $40,527.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……...59/71043-00-002 School District:……..…Ceres Unified

County:…….……..……..Stanislaus School Name:…..……Ceres High

Financial Hardship…….……..No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $133,933. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states "an applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and has returned the State funds in the amount of $66,967.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP Modernization	$ 969,069	$ (66,967)	$ 902,102
SFP CTE Equipment	226,594	0	226,594
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,195,663	$ (66,967)	$ 1,128,696
Financing			
State (SFP)	$ 1,195,663	$ (66,967)	$ 1,128,696
District Contribution	1,195,663	(66,966)	1,128,697
Total Project Costs	$ 2,391,326	$ (133,933)	$ 2,257,393

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $133,933 in the total project cost from $2,391,326 to $2,257,393.
2. Approve a decrease of $66,967 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $1,195,663 to $1,128,696.
3. Approve a decrease of $66,966 in the District Contribution from $1,195,663 to $1,128,697.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $66,967.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..59/68759-00-001 School District:……..……..……...…Lucia Mar Unified

County:…….……San Luis Obispo School Name:…..……..……Arroyo Grande High

Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $147,671. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states "an applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and has returned State funds in the amount of $73,836.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP CTE Modernization	$ 1,386,123	$ (73,836)	$ 1,312,287
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,386,123	$ (73,836)	$ 1,312,287
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 1,386,123	$ (73,835)	$ 1,312,288
State (SFP)	1,386,123	(73,836)	1,312,287
Total Project Costs	$ 2,772,246	$ (147,671)	$ 2,624,575

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $147,671 in the total project cost from $2,772,246 to $2,624,575.
2. Approve a decrease of $73,835 in the District Contribution from $1,386,123 to $1,312,288.
3. Approve a decrease of $73,836 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $1,386,123 to $1,312,287.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $73,836.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application Number:……..59/68759-00-002 School District:……..……..……...…Lucia Mar Unified

County:…….……San Luis Obispo School Name:…..……..……Arroyo Grande High

Financial Hardship……No

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend accounting revisions to close out a completed project.

DESCRIPTION

A review of expenditures reported by the District has been made and the revisions indicated are necessary to close out this completed project. This is a Career Technical Education Facilities Program project and has savings in the amount of $405,610. SFP Regulation Section 1859.199 states "an applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project." The District has concurred with the findings and has returned State funds in the amount of $202,805.

Detail of Final Cost & Financing

Budget Item	Currently Approved	Required Change	Revised Approval
SFP CTE Modernization	$ 1,402,172	$ (202,805)	$ 1,199,367
Total State Apportionment	$ 1,402,172	$ (202,805)	$ 1,199,367
Financing			
District Contribution	$ 1,402,172	$ (202,805)	$ 1,199,367
State (SFP)	1,402,172	(202,805)	1,199,367
Total Project Costs	$ 2,804,344	$ (405,610)	$ 2,398,734

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve a decrease of $405,610 in the total project cost from $2,804,344 to $2,398,734.
2. Approve a decrease of $202,805 in the District Contribution from $1,402,172 to $1,199,367.
3. Approve a decrease of $202,805 in the State Apportionment [Bonds/2006-Nov.; 057-600] from $1,402,172 to $1,199,367.
4. Recognize the District has already returned State funds in the amount of $202,805.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM
SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS RESCISSION

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present School Facility Program (SFP) project apportionments for rescission.

DESCRIPTION

The SFP projects listed on the Attachment are financial hardship County Office of Education (COE) that received a separate design. The COE's have either requested to have their projects reduced to costs incurred, rescinded or have not met the substantial progress requirement and have indicated that they will be unable to move forward with the SFP projects listed on the Attachment. The COE's have requested that the apportionments be rescinded or reduced to costs incurred to recognize eligible costs for the separate design phase.

AUTHORITY

Pursuant to Education Code Section 17076.10(b), sufficient evidence of substantial progress for the design grant apportionments shall be due 18 months from the date any funds were released to the district. The SFP Regulation Section 1859.105 requires that when an apportionment is reduced to project costs incurred or rescinded, all State funds not used to finance eligible expenditures are to be returned to the State Allocation Board (SAB). The SFP Regulations also stipulate that interest earned on State funds, which is not used to finance eligible expenditures, is due to the SAB.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Find that the COE's are unable to meet the substantial progress requirements or indicated that they will be unable to move forward with the projects listed on the Attachment.
2. Rescind the funded apportionments for the projects listed on the Attachment.
3. Direct Staff to adjust the COE's baseline eligibility, according to the increases (identified in the "Pupils Returned to the District's Baseline" column) on the Attachment, once all funds due to the State have been received.

ATTACHMENT
SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM
SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS RESCISSION
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

	District/ County/ Application Number	Pupil Grant Adjustments: Original Pupils Assigned to Apportionment: Type of Pupils	Number of Pupils	Pupils Returned to the District's Baseline: Number of Pupils	Grant Adjustments: Original Apportionment	Interest	Amount of Eligible Expenditures	Reduction in Apportionment
Design Grant	Contra Costa County Office of Education 50/10074-99-006	9-12	101	101	$495,304	$4,915	$0	$500,219
Design Grant	Stanislaus County Office of Education 50/10504-00-020	7-8 9-12 Non-Severe	27 81 13	27 81 13	$607,030	$33,956	$0	$640,986
							TOTAL	$1,141,205

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

CHARTER SCHOOL FACILITIES PROGRAM
EXTENSION TO CONVERSION DEADLINE

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present Magnolia Public Schools (Charter School) request for a one-year extension to the conversion deadline for its new construction project (Application Number 54/68338-02-002).

DESCRIPTION

Charter schools participating in the Charter School Facilities Program (CSFP) must convert a preliminary apportionment (PA) within a four-year period. This item requests a one-year extension to the conversion deadline for Magnolia Science Academy San Diego, as provided for in regulation.

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A.

BACKGROUND

The CSFP provides PAs (reservations of bond authority) for new construction and rehabilitation projects. The PA for a CSFP project must be converted within a four-year period to an adjusted grant apportionment meeting all the School Facilities Program (SFP) criteria, unless a single one-year extension is granted.

Charter schools may request the State Allocation Board (Board) approve a one-year extension. The request will be approved when a charter school meets one of the following sets of criteria:

- The charter school has provided evidence of both of the following:
    - The California Department of Education (CDE) has made a contingent or final approval of the proposed site; and,
    - The Division of the State Architect (DSA) has confirmed that the final plans for the project have been submitted to the DSA for review and approval.
- Other evidence satisfactory to the Board justifying the extension.

STAFF ANALYSIS/COMMENTS

The Charter School's current conversion deadline is May 2, 2016. The Charter School is requesting an extension to this deadline due to delays caused by difficulties in identifying a suitable school site. A site has currently been identified and the Charter School anticipates receiving final CDE and DSA approval by February 2017. The Charter School plans to submit a complete conversion application to OPSC by April 2017. Staff has reviewed the Charter School's request (Attachment B), which provides satisfactory evidence to justify the extension. Staff supports the Charter School's request for a one-year extension to the conversion deadline. The new conversion deadline would be May 2, 2017.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the Charter School's request for a single one-year extension to its conversion deadline. Require that the PA for Magnolia Science Academy San Diego be converted to a final apportionment by May 2, 2017, or it will be rescinded and the bond authority returned to the CSFP.

ATTACHMENT A

AUTHORITY

School Facility Program (SFP) Section 1859.166. Time Limit on Preliminary Charter School Apportionment.

(a) A complete request to convert a Preliminary Charter School Apportionment to a Final Charter School Apportionment pursuant to Section 1859.165 shall be made within four years of the date of the Preliminary Charter School Apportionment unless the Charter School received approval of an extension pursuant to Section 1859.166.1.
(b) If (a) is not met, and the Charter School has not received an advance release of funds as provided in Section 1859.164.2, the following will occur:
(1) the Preliminary Charter School Apportionment shall be rescinded and any remaining Preliminary Charter School Apportionment, not released to the Charter School, shall be transferred to the Unrestricted Charter School Fund within the appropriate Charter School Facility Account, and;
(2) the SFP New Construction Eligibility will be increased by the number of unhoused pupils pursuant to Section 1859.162.2 for the school district that physically contains the Charter School within its geographical boundaries.
(c) If (a) is not met, and the Charter School has received an advance release of funds as provided in Section 1859.164.2, the following will occur:
(1) The Preliminary Charter School Apportionment shall be rescinded and any remaining Preliminary Charter School Apportionment, not released to the Charter School, shall be transferred to the Unrestricted Charter School Fund within the appropriate Charter School Facility Account, and;
(2) Funds released pursuant to Section 1859.164.2(a) shall be reduced to cost incurred and closed-out pursuant to Section 1859.106 with a corresponding SFP new construction baseline eligibility adjustment for the pupils assigned to the Preliminary Charter School Application. The adjustment to the baseline eligibility shall be based on the ratio of the number of unhoused pupils pursuant to Section 1859.162.2 and the project capacity which generated the project funding to the eligible expenditures. Any funds released are subject to the fifty percent local matching share requirement as required by EC 17078.54(d). Funds returned pursuant to Section 1859.106 shall be transferred to the Unrestricted Charter School Fund within the appropriate Charter School Facility Account, and;
(3) Funds released pursuant to Section 1859.164.2(b) shall be subject to the provisions of Section 1859.171.

SFP Section 1859.166.1. Preliminary Charter School Apportionment Time Limit Extension.

A Charter School that has received a Preliminary Charter School Apportionment may request a single one-year extension of the time limit prescribed in Section 1859.166(a). The Board shall approve the request provided the criteria in (a) or (b) are met:
(a) The Charter School has provided evidence of both of the following:
(1) The CDE has made a contingent or final approval of the proposed site; and,
(2) The DSA has confirmed that the final plans for the project have been submitted to the DSA for review and approval.
(b) Other evidence satisfactory to the Board justifying the extension.

April 27, 2016

Dr. Caprice Young
CEO and Superintendent
Magnolia Public Schools
250 E. 1st Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Erin Cuneen
Project Manager
Office of Public School Construction
State of California, Department of General Services
707 Third Street, West Sacramento, CA 95605

RE: Extension Request for Magnolia Science Academy San Diego, 54/68338-02-002

Dear Ms. Cuneen,

Please consider this an official request for a one-year extension for application number 54/68338-02-002 for the Magnolia Science Academy San Diego ("MSA San Diego") project.

The San Diego Unified School District has sold the subject school site that the preliminary apportionment was awarded for, which is located at 6365 Lake Atlin Avenue, San Diego, CA 92119. The parcel was sold to a private housing developer, Preface Lake Atlin LLC. While MSA San Diego has been able to negotiate an extension of the use agreement for the 2016-2017 school year with the private developer, it will be the last school year that the school will occupy the space.

Moving forward, the San Diego Unified School District has offered a vacant school site, the former DeAnza Elementary School at 6525 Estrella Avenue, San Diego, CA 92120. The school district and MSA San Diego have agreed on the terms of the agreement and have executed a term sheet. Currently a CEQA analysis is being conducted and it is expected that the board of the school district will vote to adopt the CEQA study and the use agreement in the next few months. The lease agreement is for five (5) years with a renewal clause that is coterminous with the charter petition. MSA San Diego will occupy the site in DSA PC modular classrooms beginning in the 2017-2018 school year. We hope that we are able utilize the

Proposition 1D funding on this site to improve the space per the approved project and the preliminary apportionment.

We are aiming to receive CDE and DSA approvals by February 2017 and we anticipate that a complete conversion application will be submitted to OPSC in April 2017.

If you need additional information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your assistance and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Caprice Young
CEO and Superintendent
Magnolia Public Schools

CC: Frank Gonzalez, Chief Growth Officer, Magnolia Public Schools

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: ..... SCOTIA UNION ELEMENTARY	County:.....HUMBOLDT
Application Number:.....58/63024-00-004	School Name: ..... MURPHY ELEMENTARY
Total District Enrollment:..... 220	Project Grade Level: K-8
Financial Hardship: .....YES	

The District qualified for financial hardship pursuant to School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.81(c)(4). The District has demonstrated it is financially unable to provide all or part of the matching funds and is levying the developer fees or equal alternative revenue source justified by law. The District's total bonding capacity at the time of its request for financial hardship funding was $5 million or less.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the District's request for a time extension to submit a complete SFP funding application for the previously approved and extended conceptual approval for a Facility Hardship Rehabilitation project at Murphy Elementary.

DESCRIPTION

The District received a conceptual approval for Facility Hardship rehabilitation work for the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary at the October 2012 State Allocation Board (Board) meeting, for a total project cost of approximately $4.1 million, as well as an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment totaling $583,703. The conceptual approval was extended for 12 months at the March 2014 Board meeting and for another 12 months at the April 2015 Board meeting. The second extension of the conceptual approval required the District to submit a complete SFP new construction application for full funding by April 24, 2016. The District is requesting a third time extension to this deadline.

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A1.

BACKGROUND

On April 22, 2016, the Office of Public School Construction received the District's request for extension of a conceptual approval for a rehabilitation project at the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary School (See Attachment A2). This project was originally granted a conceptual approval for a facility hardship project to replace the boiler system and to make upgrades required by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility at the October 2012 Board meeting, as well as an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment. The unfunded approval was converted to a design apportionment in May 2013 through the Priority Funding process.

The District was delayed in beginning the design phase for this project due to an unexpected immediate need to replace the boiler system for the main school structure and complications that arose with that project. In March of 2014 and again in April of 2015, the District received 12-month extensions to the conceptual approval (see Attachment A3).

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

The District received design funds for this project in June 2013 and submitted plans and specifications to DSA in July of 2015. In April of 2016, DSA completed its initial review and returned the Fire and Life Safety, Structural Safety, and Access Compliance documents to the design team with comments. The District believes that its design team will be able to address DSA's comments and return the documents to DSA by May 2016, and anticipates that it will obtain DSA plan approval by June of 2016. The District states that it will have all the documents required in order to submit an *Application for Funding* (Form SAB 50-04) between July and August of 2016. Therefore, the District has submitted a letter requesting a further time extension of the deadline for submittal of a Form SAB 50-04 for full funding. Staff supports the District's request and recommends a six-month extension to October 24, 2016.

Financial Hardship Status
The District's financial hardship approval has expired. In order to qualify for financial hardship for the full grant funding phase for this project, the District will be required to submit a new request for financial hardship approval with the full grant funding application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Grant the District a six-month time extension from April 24, 2016 until October 24, 2016, for the submittal of a complete funding application for the Murphy Elementary School Gymnasium Building Facility Hardship rehabilitation project.

2. Provide that all other provisions contained in the District's original approval from October 24, 2012 shall remain in full effect, as shown in Attachment A3.

ATTACHMENT A1

AUTHORITY

Education Code (EC) 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 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.81 states:

Except for Joint-Use Projects and Career Technical Education Facilities Projects, a district is eligible for financial hardship to fund all or a portion of its matching share requirement after demonstrating the requirements of (a), (c), and (d) below:

(a) The district is financially unable to provide all necessary matching funds for an eligible project. To determine this, an analysis shall be made of the district's financial records by the OPSC including data and records maintained by the CDE and the County Office of Education….

(b) From the funds deemed available as a matching contribution, the district may retain $19,776 per classroom in each enrollment reporting period for the cost to provide interim housing for the currently unhoused pupils of the district.…

(c) The district has made all reasonable efforts to fund its matching share of the project by demonstrating it is levying the developer fee justified under law or an alternative revenue source equal to or greater than the developer fee otherwise justified under law at the time of request for hardship and the district meets at least one of the following:

(1) The current outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district issued for the purpose of constructing school facilities in accordance with Education Code Section 17072.35 or 17074.25 as appropriate, at the time of request for financial hardship status, is at least 60 percent of the district's total bonding capacity. Outstanding bonded indebtedness includes that part of general obligation bonds, Mello-Roos Bonds, School Facility Improvement District Bonds and certificates of participation which the district is paying a debt service that was issued for capital outlay school facility purposes.

(2) The district had a successful registered voter bond election for at least the maximum amount allowed under Proposition 39 within the previous two years from the date of request for financial hardship status. The proceeds from the bond election that represent the maximum amount allowed under the provisions of Proposition 39 must be used to fund the district's matching share requirement for SFP project(s).

(3) It is a County Superintendent of Schools.

(4) The district's total bonding capacity at the time of the request for financial hardship status is $5 million or less.

(5) Other evidence of reasonable effort as approved by the SAB….

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "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."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for Facility Hardship grant funding when:

> 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.

AUTHORITY (cont.)

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(A) states:

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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 further states:

A district may request a determination of eligibility for facility hardship funding in advance of project funding.

(c) A district seeking replaced facilities as a result of either (a) or (b) above must submit Form SAB 50-04 for the replaced facilities:

(1) Within 18 months if the replacement facilities will be located on the same site.

(2) Within 24 months if the replacement facilities will be located on a replacement site.

If an Approved Application for the replaced facility is not accepted within the time periods identified in (c)(1) or (c)(2) above, the Board shall re-review the criteria submitted by the district for replacement of the facility prior to apportionment of the replaced facility.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e) provides for:

Excessive Cost for rehabilitation of facilities the Board has determined are a health and safety risk to the pupils pursuant to Section 1859.82(a)(1) and the cost/benefit analysis to mitigate the problem and remain in the facility is less than 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost of the facility. 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 district qualifies, the district is eligible for funding of Rehabilitation Costs as a modernization project. …. If the Approved Application is received after April 29, 2002, 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. An additional grant may be provided for 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. For any project funded in whole or in part from Proposition 47 or Proposition 55 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 1859.78.1(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 1859.78.1(b) and subject to the limitations established in Section 1859.78.1(c).

SFP Regulation Section 1859.95.1(a) states:

When the Board has Insufficient Bond Authority to apportion the School District's funding request on the Form SAB 50-04, the following will apply:

(1) The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) will receive and determine if the Form SAB 50-04 is an Approved Application. To be placed on the Applications Received Beyond Bond Authority List, the Approved Application for funding shall be accompanied by a school board resolution, as specified in paragraph (b) of this Section. The OPSC will not determine if the Approved Application is ready for Apportionment.

Scotia Union School District

P.O. BOX 217
SCOTIA, CALIFORNIA 95565
(707) 764-2212 FAX: (707) 764-5111

Ronan Collver
Superintendent/Principal

HOME OF THE SCOTIA BEARS

April 19, 2016

To: DGS Facility Hardship Team

From: Ronan Collver, Superintendent, Scotia Union Elementary Sch.

Re: Conceptual Approval Extension Request, Application Number 58/63024-00-004

Dear Colleagues,

The Scotia Union School District would like to request a Conceptual Approval Extension on the Facility Hardship rehabilitation project for our District's gymnasium building. We are very grateful that this project has had extensions over the past few years for a variety of unforeseen setbacks.

We submitted all completed plans to DSA on July 28, 2015. Our application number is 01-115133. DSA performed the intake on this project from its submittal day until early March 2016. The District requested that the project be expedited and DSA agreed to expedite our application on March 22, 2016.

Currently, DSA has reviewed and given feedback to all aspects of the project plans. The Fire and Life Safety, Structural Safety, and Access Compliance documents have all been returned to the design team with comments. At the time of this request, the Structural Safety documents had not arrived; however, DSA informed me that it was mailed on Friday, April 15, 2016.

It is my understanding that my team will be able to address all the comments and return a completed document to DSA within the month. It is my hopes that DSA will be able to work quickly with our team to approve our plans.

Sincerely,

Ronan Collver

Ronan Collver, Superintendent/Principal

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, April 15, 2015

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: ..... SCOTIA UNION ELEMENTARY	County:.....HUMBOLDT
Application Number:.....58/63024-00-004	School Name: ..... MURPHY ELEMENTARY
Total District Enrollment:..... 227	Project Grade Level: K-8
Financial Hardship: .....YES	

The District qualified for financial hardship pursuant to School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.81(c)(4). The District has demonstrated it is financially unable to provide all or part of the matching funds and is levying the developer fees or equal alternative revenue source justified by law. The District's total bonding capacity at the time of its request for financial hardship funding was $5 million or less.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the District's request (Attachment 1) for a 12-month time extension to submit a complete SFP funding application for the previously approved and extended conceptual approval for a Facility Hardship Rehabilitation project at Murphy Elementary.

DESCRIPTION

The District received a conceptual approval for rehabilitation work for the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary under the SFP Facility Hardship Regulations at the October 2012 State Allocation Board (Board) meeting, for a total project cost of approximately $4.1 million, as well as an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment totaling $583,703. The conceptual approval was extended for 12 months at the March 2014 Board meeting (Attachment 2). The extension of the conceptual approval required the District to submit a complete SFP new construction application for full funding by April 24, 2015. The District is requesting a second 12-month time extension to this deadline.

AUTHORITY

School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "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."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for facility hardship grant funding when:

> 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.

(Continued on Page Two)

AUTHORITY(cont.)

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 further states:

A district may request a determination of eligibility for facility hardship funding in advance of project funding.

(c) A district seeking replaced facilities as a result of either (a) or (b) above must submit Form SAB 50-04 for the replaced facilities:

(1) Within 18 months if the replacement facilities will be located on the same site.

(2) Within 24 months if the replacement facilities will be located on a replacement site.

If an Approved Application for the replaced facility is not accepted within the time periods identified in (c)(1) or (c)(2) above, the Board shall re-review the criteria submitted by the district for replacement of the facility prior to apportionment of the replaced facility.

BACKGROUND

At the October 2012 Board meeting, the District was granted conceptual approval for a facility hardship project to replace the boiler system for the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary School, and to make upgrades required by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility. The Board also issued an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment. The unfunded approval was converted to a design apportionment in May 2013 through the Priority Funding process. The District was delayed in beginning the design phase for this project due to an unexpected immediate need to replace the boiler system for the main school structure and complications that arose with that project. In March of 2014, the District received a 12-month extension to the conceptual approval. The Gymnasium Building was not originally part of the school and was not previously Field Act-compliant. Before the project architect can submit construction documents, the design and engineering team was required to submit plans for the rehab of existing non-conforming elements of the building to be approved through DSA. Due to time intensive nature of research, verification and re-testing of existing systems on the facility, the District is requesting a second extension of the conceptual approval.

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

The District received Design funds for this project in June 2013, and anticipates that it will be able to submit plans to DSA in March of 2015. The District states that it will have all the documents required in order to submit an *Application for Funding* (Form SAB 50-04) between August and November of 2015. Therefore, the District has submitted a letter requesting a 12-month time extension of the deadline for submittal of a Form SAB 50-04 for full funding. Staff supports the District's request for a 12-month time extension to April 24, 2016.

Financial Hardship Status

The District's financial hardship approval has expired. In order to qualify for financial hardship for the full grant funding phase for this project, the District will be required to submit a new request for financial hardship approval with the full grant funding application.

(Continued on Page Three)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Grant the District a 12-month time extension from April 24, 2015 until April 24, 2016, for the submittal of a complete funding application for the Murphy Elementary School Gymnasium Building Rehabilitation project.

2. Provide that all other provisions contained in the District's original approval from October 24, 2012 shall remain in full effect, as shown in Attachment 2.

ATTACHMENT A3

ATTACHMENT 1

Scotia Union School District

P.O. BOX 217

SCOTIA, CALIFORNIA 95565

(707) 764-2212 FAX: (707) 764-5111

Ronan Collver

Superintendent/Principal

HOME OF THE SCOTIA BEARS

January 27, 2015

To: DGS Facility Hardship Team

From: Ronan Collver, Superintendent, Scotia Union Elementary Sch.

Re: Conceptual Approval Extension Request, Application Number 58/63024-00-004

Dear Colleagues,

The Scotia School District has encountered circumstances which have made previously planned progress on the Gym project impossible, as explained in the following. The District, Architect and Staff are requesting an EXTENSION for this Design Phase. After an early set back, the District has worked very hard to move forward on this project and we are very confident that design plans will be submitted to DSA within the next few months.

HISTORY: Please recall that prior to 2008, the town of Scotia, Scotia Elementary School and gym were owned by the Pacific Lumber Company. That Company filed for Bankruptcy in 2007. In the spring of 2008 the State awarded the District money to purchase the school and the gym from the Company along with money to remodel the school. The School sales contract included a written commitment by the company to provide the School/Gym steam heat from the Company Co-Generation Plant and electricity until such time as the school had the resources and State approval to divorce its-self from the Company power sources.

PRIMARY PROGRESS PROBLEMS

In the fall of 2011 the District received an award from the State of California (Application Number 58/63024-00-003) to begin planning, seek approval and move independently from the Pacific Lumber Energy system. Our Architect designed a steam generation plant to be built next to our school to provide steam heat to the main campus. These plans were submitted to DSA in January of

ATTACHMENT 1

2012 and we prepared to wait the several months for changes and approval. Suddenly in mid January of 2012 the Pacific Lumber Company sold the Co-Generation Plant to an independent owner operator. Soon after, Superintendent Lampp, received a letter from the Attorney representing the Community and the new Power Plant owner informing us that all steam to the school, gym and town would be shut off on the first of April, 2012.

Needless to say we were in a panic when considering the possibility of having to shut school down for several months in the Spring. Working with our Architect and our Engineer, a new design and a system heating water with a series of tank-less water heaters was envisioned and designed to serve the school building. The system's cost was sufficiently low so that DSA's approval could be limited and the system was installed in February of 2012.

In September of 2012, the work required for the gymnasium building was split out from the work for the heating system, and application 58/63024-00-004 was submitted for the gymnasium. This application received an unfunded approval for Design funds in October of 2012, but the District did not actually receive the design funds until June of 2013.

The cost of the system to heat the school building was a fraction of the allocated money and we have discovered that its operating costs are considerably less, two great advantages. HOWEVER the marriage of this new system, with the old plus long distance computer monitoring/adjusting, failure to address Labor Compliance issues, and some unanticipated installation flaws resulted in ongoing flooding of ceilings and some instructional areas. These issues resulted in delays in the development of plans for the work required for the gymnasium building.

Much has been accomplished in the past 12 month including completing the marriage of the two heating systems for the school building. The District has also sent to the Department of Labor, the District's County Recorded "Notice of Completion" for this project as well as sending to OPSC the Form 50-05. Architectural plans are well underway, soils test have been performed, numerous engineers have inspected the facility and reports completed for our architect. Structural Concrete and reinforcing Steel tests as well as Wood Framing tests are scheduled for mid November. Unfortunately our gym still remains unheated and subject to deterioration. It should be noted that off-site ADA upgrades are currently being constructed by the Town of Scotia as part of the infrastructure repairs being down throughout the town. Our architect and engineers have worked in conjunction with the Town of Scotia so that these ADA improvements are done to meet the requirements of the State.

ARCHITECT'S STATEMENT:

ATTACHMENT 1

Since the Gym Complex had not been part of the school site it was never approved to school standards. Our design and engineering team is required to prepare, submit and have approved through DSA the rehab of the existing non conforming building's application prior to submittal of construction documents. We started some of this work during the purchase period and have since commenced with this phase of our documentation. Due to time intensive nature of research, verification and re-testing of existing systems on the Facility, we feel it is necessary to request an extension of the funding application date.

In order to provide a status update, and assurance that we are moving forward on the project, a preliminary projection of our anticipated timeline is as follows:

1. Submittal to DSA of rehabilitation of existing non-conforming building documentation-**Submitted** September of 2014
2. DSA review period (estimated 6 weeks): Response to submittal-**Completed** Early November 2014.
3. Respond to rehabilitation review and resubmit -**Completed** November 2014
4. Utilize input from review to finalize required testing and perform testing for inclusion in construction documents. February 2015
5. Finalize and submit to DSA construction documents-March 2015
6. DSA review period (estimated at 8 weeks), response to submittal-June 2015
7. Respond to review and schedule back-check appointment-July 2015
8. Documents approved and available for Bidding-August 2015
9. Receive bids/project costs-November 2015
10. Submit documentation (50-04) seeking funding release.

Mark Gaxiola, AIA
Matson & Vallerga Architects, Inc.
3224 T Street
Eureka, Ca.

These explanations of the school's unexpected heating issues combined with the extraordinary requirements regarding submittals to DSA combine to support the District's Extension Request on this VITAL PROJECT. Your consideration is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ronan Collver, Superintendent/Principal

cc. Mark Gaxiola AIA, Architect
Board of Trustees

ATTACHMENT 2

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, March 26, 2014

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: ..... SCOTIA UNION ELEMENTARY	County:.....HUMBOLDT
Application Number:.....58/63024-00-004	School Name: ..... STANWOOD MURPHY
Total District Enrollment:..... 238	Project Grade Level: K-8
Financial Hardship:	YES

The District qualified for financial hardship pursuant to School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.81(c)(4). The District has demonstrated it is financially unable to provide all or part of the matching funds and is levying the developer fees or equal alternative revenue source justified by law. The District's total bonding capacity at the time of its request for financial hardship funding was $5 million or less.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the District's request (Attachment A) for a 12-month time extension to submit a complete SFP funding application for the previously approved conceptual approval for a Facility Hardship Rehabilitation project at Murphy Elementary.

DESCRIPTION

The District received a conceptual approval for rehabilitation work for the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary under the SFP Facility Hardship Regulations at the October 2012 State Allocation Board (Board) meeting, for a total project cost of approximately $4.1 million, as well as an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment totaling $583,703 (Attachment B). The conceptual approval required the District to submit a complete SFP application for full funding within 18 months by April 24, 2014. The District is requesting a 12-month time extension to this deadline.

AUTHORITY

School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "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."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for facility hardship grant funding when:

> 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.

(Continued on Page Two)

ATTACHMENT 2

AUTHORITY (cont.)

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 further states:

A district may request a determination of eligibility for facility hardship funding in advance of project funding.

(c) A district seeking replaced facilities as a result of either (a) or (b) above must submit Form SAB (50-04 (Application for Funding) for the replaced facilities:

(1) Within 18 months if the replacement facilities will be located on the same site.

(2) Within 24 months if the replacement facilities will be located on a replacement site.

If an Approved Application for the replaced facility is not accepted within the time periods identified in (c)(1) or (c)(2) above, the Board shall re-review the criteria submitted by the district for replacement of the facility prior to apportionment of the replaced facility.

BACKGROUND

At the October 2012 Board meeting, the District was granted conceptual approval for a facility hardship project to replace the boiler system for the Gymnasium Building at Murphy Elementary School, and to make upgrades required by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility. The Board also issued an unfunded approval for a financial hardship design apportionment. This approval was for 18 months, and will expire as of April 24, 2014. The unfunded approval was converted to a design apportionment in May 2013 through the priority funding process. The District was delayed due to an unexpected need to replace the boiler system for the main school structure and complications that arose with that project.

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

The District received Design funds for this project in June 2013, and has recently submitted its required preliminary rehabilitation report to DSA. The first substantial progress report for the Design apportionment will be due to the Office of Public School Construction by June 3, 2014. The District states that it will have all the documents required in order to submit an *Application for Funding* (Form SAB 50-04) by January or February 2015. Therefore, the District has submitted a letter requesting a 12-month time extension of the deadline for submittal of a Form SAB 50-04 for full funding. Staff supports the District's request for a 12-month time extension to April 24, 2015.

Financial Hardship Status

The District's financial hardship approval has expired. In order to qualify for financial hardship for the full grant funding phase for this project, the District will be required to submit a new request for financial hardship approval at least 90 days prior to submitting a full grant funding application.

Bond Authority

Any future funding application will be subject to bond authority and funds available.

(Continued on Page Three)

ATTACHMENT 2

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Grant the District a 12-month time extension for the conceptual approval to rehabilitate the gym complex at Stanwood Murphy School due health and safety issues pursuant to the SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a) and 1859.83(e), as shown on Attachment B. This extension will change the due date from April 24, 2014 until April 24, 2015 for the submittal of a complete funding application

2. Provide that this conceptual approval does not guarantee 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.

3. 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

SCOTIA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 217
SCOTIA, CA 95565
PHONE: (707) 764-2212 FAX: (707) 764-5111

Ronan Collver
Superintendent/Principal

HOME OF THE SCOTIA BEARS

December 5, 2013

To: DGS Facility Hardship Team

Through: Hannah Konnoff, Program Services Analyst

From: Ronan Collver, Superintendent, Scotia Union Elementary Sch.

Re: Extension Request, Application Number 58/63024-00-004

Dear Colleagues,

The Scotia School District is in receipt of a letter from Mr. Thayne Gunther dated November 5, 2013 where in the District is required to submit a complete funding package for our 58/63024-00-004 Gym Design Project to OPSC by April 24, 2014.

The Scotia School District has encountered circumstances which have made previously planned progress on the Gym project impossible, as explained in the following andhe District, Architect and Staff are requesting an EXTENSION for this Design Phase.

HISTORY: Please recall that prior to 2008, the town of Scotia, Scotia Elementary School and gym were owned by the Pacific Lumber Company. That Company filed for Bankruptcy in 2007. In the spring of 2008 the State awarded the District money to purchase the school and the gym from the Company along with money to remodel the school. The School sales contract included a written commitment by the company to provide the School/Gym steam heat from the Company Co-Generation Plant and electricity until such time as the school had the resources and State approval to divorce its-self from the Company power sources.

PRIMARY PROGRESS PROBLEMS:
In the fall of 2011 the District received an award from the State of California to begin planning, seek approval and move independently from the Pacific Lumber Energy system. Our Architect designed a steam generation plant to be built next to our school to provide steam heat to the main campus. These plans were submitted to DSA in January of

2012 and we prepared to wait the several months for changes and approval. Suddenly in mid January of 2012 the Pacific Lumber Company sold the Co-Generation Plant to an independent owner operator. Soon after, Superintendent Lampp, received a letter from the Attorney representing the Community and the new Power Plant owner informing us that all steam to the school, gym and town would be shut off on the first of April, 2012.

Needless to say we were in a panic when considering the possibility of having to shut school down for several months in the Spring. Working with our Architect and our Engineer, a new design and a system heating water with a series of tank-less water heaters was envisioned and designed. The system's cost was sufficiently low so that DSA's approval could be limited and the system was installed in February of 2012.

The cost of the system was a fraction of the allocated money and we have discovered that it's operating costs are considerably less, two great advantages. HOWEVER the marriage of this New system, with the old plus long distance computer monitoring/adjusting, the Project Manager's failure to address Labor Compliance issues, and some unanticipated installation flaws resulted in ongoing flooding of ceilings and some instructional areas.

This has been a 12 month long, though now solved problem and the complexity of the marriage of old and new has proven workable. I have just sent the Department of Labor the District's County Recorded "Notice of Completion" for this project and we will be submitting to OPSC the Form 50-05 in the near future. Unfortunately our gym still remains unheated and subject to deterioration.

ARCHITECT'S STATEMENT: "During the time line since purchase of the school/gym we were also actively pursuing development of an alternative heating system for the Rec. Gym Center Facility, but it could not be installed due to DSA requirements to upgrade the entire facility prior to the inclusion of this work.

Since the Gym Complex had not been part of the school site it had never been approved with school construction standards. Now our design and engineering team is required to prepare, submit and have approved through DSA, the rehab of the existing non conforming building's application prior to submittal of construction documents. We started some of this work during the purchase period and have since commenced with this phase of our documentation. Due to time intensive nature of research, verification and re-testing of existing systems on the Facility, we feel it is necessary to request an extension of the funding application date.
In order to provide a status update, and assurance that we are moving forward on the project, a preliminary projection of our anticipated timeline is as follows:

1. Submittal to DSA of rehabilitation of existing non-conforming building documentation-Early January of 2014
2. DSA review period (estimated 6 weeks): Response to submittal-Early March 2014.

3. Respond to rehabilitation review and resubmit (estimated 30 days)—Early April 2014

4. DSA re-review and approval of rehabilitation documents (estimated at 30 days) –May 2014
5. Utilize input from review to finalize required testing and perform testing for inclusion in construction documents. (Estimated at 60 days).
6. Finalize and submit to DSA construction documents-July 2014
7. DSA review period (estimated at 8 weeks), response to submittal-September 2014
8. Respond to review and schedule back-check appointment-October 2014
9. Documents approved and available for Bidding-November 2014
10. Receive bids/project costs-January 2015
11. Submit documentation (50-04) seeking fund release Jan.-Feb. 2015"

Mark Gaxiola, AIA
Matson & Vallerga Architects, Inc.
3224 T Street
Eureka, Ca.

These explanations of the school's unexpected heating issues combined with the extraordinary requirements regarding submittals to DSA combine to support the District's Extension Request on this VITAL SCHOOL, COMMUNITY PROJECT. Your consideration is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ronan Collver, Superintendent/Principal

cc. Mark Gaxiola AIA, Architect
Board of Trustees
Thayne Gunther, Project Manager, OPSC
Dennis J. Hanson, Project Manager

ATTACHMENT A3

ATTACHMENT B

ATTACHMENT 2

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

State Allocation Board Meeting, October 24, 2012

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: .....SCOTIA UNION	County:.....HUMBOLDT
Application Number:..... 58/63024-00-004	School Name:.....STANWOOD MURPHY
Total District Enrollment:.....234	Project Grade Level:.....K-8
Financial Hardship:.....YES	

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Type of Request	State Allocation Board amended conceptual approval for a School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship rehabilitation project and unfunded approval for design.
Estimated Total Project Cost	$ 4,052,500
Estimated Cost to the State	$ 4,052,500

DESCRIPTION

Description of Health and Safety Threat	The gym complex for Stanwood Murphy School was built in 1959. On February 23, 2011 the State Allocation Board (SAB) granted conceptual approval for the replacement of the boiler heating system for both the main classroom building and gym complex at Stanwood Murphy school. The District received Division of the State Architect (DSA) plan approval for the boiler for the classroom building in early 2012. However, DSA is unable to approve the plans for the boiler for the gym complex due to required structural and seismic upgrades as well as ancillary work that was not included in the plans. At the request of the District the OPSC administratively split the original project into two applications enabling the District to receive an unfunded approval at the August 2012 SAB meeting for the boiler for the classroom building. The District is requesting an amended conceptual approval for the gym complex to include the DSA required structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility components, as well as the previously approved boiler system.
Scope of Project	The project scope includes replacing the boiler system in the gym complex as well as the DSA required structural safety, fire and life safety, and accessibility upgrades.
Status of School Site	The gym complex is closed to students and staff until the required rehabilitation work is completed.

QUALIFYING CRITERIA

Government/State Level Concurrence	The Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services provided concurrence for the necessity of replacing the boiler heating system and DSA guided the District in the necessary rehabilitation for the gym to be able to be operational again.

(Continued on Page Two)

Site Visit Completed by Staff	Staff accepted photographs and reports by industry specialists in lieu of a site visit.
Staff Supports the District's Request	Yes

AUTHORITY

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "A district may request a determination of eligibility for facility hardship funding in advance of project funding"

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for Facility Hardship grant funding when, "...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."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.83 "Excessive Cost Hardship Grant" states in part, "In addition to any other funding authorized by these Regulations, a district is eligible for funding as a result of unusual circumstances that created excessive project costs beyond the control of the district."

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) and the cost/benefit analysis 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." The funding is based upon the cost breakdown provided rather than the replacement square footage calculation. If the Approved Application is received after April 29, 2002, the grant amount provided is 60 percent of the eligible project costs which have been reviewed by the OPSC and approved by the Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the District's request for conceptual approval to rehabilitate the gym complex at Stanwood Murphy School due health and safety issues pursuant to the SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a) and 1859.83(e).

2. 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).

3. Provide that this conceptual approval does not guarantee 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.

4. 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.

5. Approve the unfunded approval for design funding in the amount of $583,073 as shown on the attachment.

ATTACHMENT A3

ATTACHMENT B

ATTACHMENT 2

SAB Meeting: **October 24, 2012** **Modernization - Separate Design**

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No: 58/63024-00-004 **County:** Humboldt
School District: Scotia Union Elementary **School Name:** Stanwood Murphy

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project: 9-12 School **Application Filing Basis:** Site Specific
Pupils Assigned Under 50 Yrs: **K-6:**
7-8:
9-12:
Non-Severe:
Severe:
Financial Hardship Requested: Yes

GRANT DATA

Estimated Total Grant		Separate Design Grant	
Rehabilitation	$ 2,431,500.00	**Total Design (25% of Grant)**	$ 607,875.00
Total State Share (60%)	2,431,500.00	**Design State Share (60%)**	364,725.00
District Share (40%)	1,621,000.00	**Design District Share (40%)**	243,150.00
Total Project Cost	$ **4,052,500.00**	**District Cash Contribution**	0.00
		Financial Hardship	$ 243,150.00

DESIGN PROJECT FINANCING

State Share	
Modernization Design	$ 364,725.00
District Share	
Cash Contribution	24,802.00
Financial Hardship	218,348.00
Total Design Cost	$ **607,875.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share					
Modernization Design Grant	**957-570**	**1D**	$	$ 364,725.00	$ 364,725.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution				24,802.00	
Financial Hardship	**957-570**	**1D**		218,348.00	218,348.00
Total			$	$ **607,875.00**	$ **583,073.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.
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.

Assembly Bill 436 (Solorio), Chapter 378, Statutes of 2011, requires school districts to notify the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) of School Facility Program projects with a public works contract awarded on or after January 1, 2012. Except for projects exempt pursuant to Labor Code Section 1771.3(b)(3), the DIR is required to provide prevailing wage monitoring services for the projects.

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

Amounts shown for financial hardship assistance are subject to adjustment as a result of a review of the District's financial records pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.81(a) at the time of apportionment.

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
APPROVAL ❖ ❖ ❖ October 24, 2012

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

ADDITIONAL GRANT FOR GENERAL SITE DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval from the State Allocation Board (Board) to extend the General Site Development grant for one year.

DESCRIPTION

The regulations authorizing the General Site Development grant will expire on January 1, 2017. This item provides the Board the option to extend the authority to provide the grant until January 1, 2018. This item also includes a correction to a reference in the definition of a "Portable Classroom".

AUTHORITY

Education Code (EC) 17070.35 states:
(a) In addition to all other powers and duties as are granted to the board by this chapter, other statutes, or the California Constitution, the board shall do all of the following:

(1) Adopt rules and regulations, pursuant to the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, for the administration of this chapter. However, the board shall have no authority to set the level of the fees of any architect, structural engineer, or other design professional on any project. The initial regulations adopted pursuant to this chapter shall be adopted as emergency regulations, and the circumstances related to the initial adoption are hereby deemed to constitute an emergency for this purpose. The initial regulations adopted pursuant to this chapter shall be adopted by November 4, 1998. If the initial regulations are not adopted by that date, the board shall report to the Legislature by that date, explaining the reasons for the delay.

BACKGROUND

When an applicant applies for School Facility Program (SFP) New Construction funding, supplemental site grants such as Service Site Development, Off-Site Development, Utilities, and General Site Development, may be requested. A description of what is included in each of these grant categories follows.

Service Site Development prepares the site for building or infrastructure construction and is performed within school property lines. This includes items such as site demolition, rough grading, soil compaction, drainage and eligible erosion control.

Utility costs are associated with installation of water, sewer, gas, electricity, and communication lines necessary to serve the master-planned capacity of the site.

General Site includes, but is not limited to; finish grading, on-site hard surfaced areas for foot traffic, driveways, walkways, outdoor instructional play facilities, permanent playground equipment, athletic fields, and landscaping.

(Continued on Page Two)

BACKGROUND (Cont.)

In December 2005, the Board requested that the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) create a committee to look at the adequacy of new construction grants. Specifically, the Board asked that the committee address two issues: the equity of the SFP new construction base grant compared to the equivalent allowances provided under the Lease Purchase Program (LPP) when the State converted programs in 1998; and, if the grants are sufficient to build a complete new school.

In response, OPSC assembled the Grant Adequacy Ad Hoc Committee (Committee), which included representatives from several school districts, architectural, construction and construction management firms, consultants, the California Building Industry Association, the Department of Finance, the California Department of Education, and OPSC staff. The Committee took a two-step approach to the Board's request and its first step concentrated on determining if the SFP new construction base grant was equitable at the time of conversion from the LPP.

The report back to the Board in April 2006 identified that additional analysis was warranted to fully explore the complexities of the funding model and how the additional grants may make up for differences seen when comparing the SFP base grant to the LPP base grants. However, during the course of the analysis the Committee also determined that it was unable to definitively conclude whether the general site allowance was included in the SFP base grant. The Board requested that OPSC return the following month to present a proposal and recommendations regarding general site additional grants.

In May 2006 an item was presented to the Board for consideration of adding an additional grant for general site development. In the report, OPSC staff stated that "if general site development costs *were* factored into the development of the new construction base grant, then the new construction base grant does not take into account the size of the site." Because larger sites would incur more costs related to general site development, it was considered a reasonable conclusion that the general site costs were not fully factored into the development of the SFP new construction base grant. The Board adopted a temporary general site grant until a complete analysis of the new construction base grant could be completed.

At the May 28, 2008 meeting, Staff presented an item 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.76(d) implementing this additional grant was effective on September 5, 2006 with a suspension date of "no later than January 1, 2008, unless otherwise extended by the amendments as adopted by the Board."

Subsequent Extensions
At the December 2007 meeting, the Board made its first extension of the General Site Grant. Since then the Board has approved single year extensions every year with one exception; in July 2011, the Board approved a two-year extension.

.

(Continued on Page Three)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

Approval of an extension to the General Site Development grant regulation would prevent a lapse in regulatory authority and would continue to allow applications to be processed with the grant, provided that the regulation extension is approved by the Board, filed with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in effect before the regulations expire. While there is no bond authority remaining to fund additional New Construction projects, there is available bond authority for the Charter School Facilities Program and some Facility Hardship projects whose applications could qualify for the General Site Development grant. Funding applications received after January 1, 2017 would not be able to request this supplemental grant without the extension.

Technical Correction
Additionally, Staff has included a proposed regulatory change to SFP Regulation Section 1859.2 to correct the reference to the EC within the definition of a "Portable Classroom". In SFP Regulation Section 1859.2 titled *Definitions* the definition of "Portable Classroom" currently refers to EC Section 17070.15.(k) titled "Property", when it should be referring Education Code 17070.15 (j) titled "Portable classroom".

Summary
Staff recommends extending the General Site Development grant one year to sunset on January 1, 2018 and approval of the proposed regulations as shown in the Attachment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Adopt the proposed regulations as shown in the Attachment, which extends the General Site Development grant for one year, January 1, 2018 and corrects the definition of a "Portable Classroom".

2. Authorize the Executive Officer to file the proposed regulations with the OAL.

ATTACHMENT

SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM REGULATORY AMENDMENTS

School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.2 *Definitions*
For the purpose of these regulations, the terms set forth below shall have the following meanings, subject to the provisions of the Act:
…
"Portable Classroom" shall have the meaning set forth in Education Code Section 17070.15~~(k)~~(j).
…

Section 1859.76. New Construction Additional Grant for Site Development Costs.

In addition to any other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall provide funding equal to 50 percent of the following approved site development and applicable design costs:
…
(d) General Site Development costs within school property lines for an addition to an existing school site project wherein additional acreage is acquired, with the exception of existing school site acreage that is leased pursuant to Section 1859.22, or a new school project, determined as follows:
(1) $19,200 per Useable Acre as approved by the CDE. This sum may be increased by the percentage identified in Section 1859.83(b). The per acre amount shown above shall be adjusted annually in the manner prescribed in Section 1859.71.
(2) 6 percent of the State and district share for Elementary School Pupils and Middle School Pupils and 3.75 percent of the State and district share for High School Pupils of the New Construction Grant. For purposes of this calculation, the percentage amount for Severely Disabled Individuals with Exceptional Needs and Non-Severely Disabled Individuals with Exceptional Needs pupils shall be based on the type of project selected by the district on the Form SAB 50-04.
(3) 6 percent of the State and district share for Elementary School Pupils and Middle School Pupils and 3.75 percent of the State and district share for High School Pupils of the funding provided by Sections 1859.71.2, 1859.72, 1859.73, 1859.73.2, 1859.82, 1859.83(a), (b) and (c) and 1859.125(a)(1) through (a)(2).

Subsection (d) of this section shall be suspended no later than January 1, ~~2017~~2018, unless otherwise extended by amendments as adopted by the Board.
…

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

REPEAL OF THE STATE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM REGULATIONS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present to the State Allocation Board (Board) an updated item that repeals the State Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP) regulations in their entirety.

DESCRIPTION

This item requests the Board's approval to repeal the DMP regulations in their entirety and to supersede the Board's April 2015 action approving the regulations as inoperative.

AUTHORITY

Assembly Bill (AB) 97, Chapter 47, Statutes of 2013 and Senate Bill (SB) 971, Chapter 923, Statutes of 2014, repealed Education Code Sections 17583, 17584, 15784.1, 17584.2, 17584.3, 17585, 17586, 17587, 17588 and 17592, and amended Education Code Sections 17582, 17592.74, 35292.5, and 41003.3. These sections pertain to the administration of the DMP and the allocation of funds from state sources.

BACKGROUND

AB 97 and SB 971 repealed and amended Education Code sections that essentially ended the DMP. As a result, at its April 2015 meeting, the Board approved regulatory amendments to the DMP regulations to declare the program inoperative. Staff then submitted the regulation changes to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL).

STAFF ANALYSIS / STATEMENTS

The OAL reviewed the rulemaking file and established that there was a clarity issue. The OAL has stated that regulations cannot be printed in the California Code of Regulations as inoperative; either regulations are in effect or they are repealed. Staff withdrew the regulatory amendments to make the necessary change. Pursuant to the guidance of OAL, Staff is presenting regulatory amendments to repeal the DMP regulations. The regulatory text on the Attachment strikes out the DMP language in its entirety, along with the associated DMP forms. Once the Board has approved these regulations, Staff will work closely with OAL to resubmit the rulemaking file and obtain approval repealing the DMP regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the repeal of the DMP regulations and forms, as shown on the Attachment.
2. Authorize the Executive Officer to resubmit the regulations, including forms, to the OAL.

~~Title 2. Administration~~
~~Division 2. Financial Operations~~
~~Chapter 3. Department of General Services~~
~~Subchapter 4. Office of Public School Construction~~
~~Group 1. State Allocation Board~~
~~Subgroup 12. State School Deferred Maintenance~~

~~Article 1. Definitions~~

~~Section 1866. Definitions.~~

~~(a) In connection with the administration of the provisions of California Education Code (EC) Sections 17582 through 17588 and 17591 through 17592.5, inclusive, of Article 1, Chapter 5, Part 10.5, Division 1, Title 1, and for the purpose of these regulations, the terms set forth below shall have the following meanings:~~
~~"The Act" means EC Sections 17582 through 17588 and 17591 through 17592.5, above.~~
~~"Board" means the State Allocation Board.~~
~~"Complete Application" means a district has submitted with the application, all documents to the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) that are required as identified in the General Information Section of the Form SAB 40-22 and the OPSC has accepted and completed a preliminary approval review.~~
~~"Critical Project" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 1866.5.~~
~~"Deferred Maintenance" means the repair or replacement work performed on school facility components that is not performed on an annual or on-going basis but planned for the future and part of the Form SAB 40-20.~~
~~"District or Applicant School District" shall mean an entity identified in Section 1866.1(a).~~
~~"Division of the State Architect" means the State office within the Department of General Services that reviews school building plans and specifications for structural, fire safety, and access compliance.~~
~~"Extreme Hardship Grant" means a grant provided by the State to complete the critical project, as provided by EC Section 17587 and Regulation Section 1866.5.2.~~
~~"Financial Test" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 1866.5(a).~~
~~"Five Year Plan" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 1866.4.~~
~~"Form SAB 40-20" means the *Five Year Plan*, Form SAB 40-20 (Rev. 01/05), which is incorporated by reference.~~
~~"Form SAB 40-21" means the *Certification Of Deposits*, Form SAB 40-21 (Rev. 02/05), which is incorporated by reference.~~
~~"Form SAB 40-22" means the *Extreme Hardship Funding Application*, Form SAB 40-22 (Rev. 10/07), which is incorporated by reference.~~
~~"Form SAB 40-23" means the *Fund Release Authorization*, Form SAB 40-23 (New 04/02), which is incorporated by reference.~~
~~"Form SAB 40-24" means the *Expenditure Report*, Form SAB 40-24 (New 04/02), which is incorporated by reference.~~
~~"Like-Kind Material/System" means a building material or system that is substantially identical in function to the existing building material or system to be replaced.~~
~~"Matching Funds" means an amount of funds the district deposits into the "district deferred maintenance fund" to receive either a maximum or prorated basic grant.~~
~~"Maximum Basic Grant" means an amount of State funds apportioned by the Board for purposes of the Form SAB 40-20. This amount is based on the formula specified in EC Section 17584(a).~~
~~"Prorated Basic Grant" means the prorated amount of the maximum basic grant apportioned by the Board due to insufficient funding for the Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP).~~
~~"Office of Public School Construction (OPSC)" means the State office within the Department of General Services that assists the Board as necessary and administers the DMP.~~
~~"OPSC Deferred Maintenance Extreme Hardship Workload List" means a list of extreme hardship funding applications authorized by EC Section 17587 for which the district has submitted all necessary application documents to the OPSC that are required to be submitted as identified in the General Information Section of the Form SAB 40-22 but not yet included on the DMP Extreme Hardship Unfunded List.~~
~~"OPSC Extreme Hardship Unfunded List" means an information list of unfunded critical projects awaiting an Extreme Hardship Grant under the provisions of the DMP.~~
~~"OPSC Modernization Workload List" means a list of School Facility Program (SFP) modernization projects for which the district has submitted all necessary application documents to the OPSC that are required to be submitted as identified in~~

~~the General Information Section of Form SAB 50-01, *Enrollment Certification/Projection,* (Revised 03/05); Form SAB 50-02, *Existing School Building Capacity,* (Revised 09/02); Form SAB 50-03, *Eligibility Determination,* (Revised 09/06); and Form SAB 50-04, *Application for Funding,* as appropriate, under the SFP.~~

~~"Repair" means the work necessary to restore deteriorated or damaged building systems such as plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical, roofing, flooring, and wall systems. The exterior and interior painting of school buildings, asphalt paving, the inspection, sampling and analysis of building materials to determine the presence of asbestos-containing materials, the encapsulation or removal of asbestos-containing materials, the inspection, identification, sampling, and analysis of building materials to determine the presence of lead-containing materials, the control, management, and removal of lead-containing materials, or such other items as may be approved by the Board, to such condition that the school buildings may be effectively utilized for their designated purposes.~~

~~"Replacement" means the work necessary to replace those school building systems itemized in "Repair" above, which are either worn out or obsolete to the extent that they no longer effectively perform their functions.~~

~~"Routine Maintenance" means the school facility component work performed on an annual or on-going basis each year to keep building facilities in proper operating condition.~~

~~"School Facility Program (SFP)" means the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998.~~

~~"SFP Modernization Unfunded List" means an information list of unfunded modernization projects approved under the provisions of the SFP.~~

~~"Total Estimated Cost" means an estimated cost of the critical project on which the extreme hardship grant is calculated.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582-17592.5, Education Code.~~

~~Article 2. Eligibility to Receive DMP Grants~~

~~Section 1866.1. Prerequisites to Receiving a Basic or Extreme Hardship Grant.~~

~~The prerequisites to receiving a grant, as provided by the Act and these regulations, include the following:~~

~~(a) Operate as one of the following:~~

~~(1) A public elementary, unified, or high school district that serves any combination of kindergarten through twelfth grade pupils; or~~

~~(2) A County Superintendent of Schools (CSS) that serves any combination of kindergarten through twelfth grade pupils; or~~

~~(3) A regional occupational center identified in EC Section 17592.5; and~~

~~(b) That the governing board of an applicant school district has established a restricted fund to be known as the "district deferred maintenance fund" for the specific purposes as specified in EC Section 17582(a) and these regulations; and~~

~~(c) That the applicant school district has a Board approved Form SAB 40-20 complying with Section 1866.4, which includes the fiscal year of funding.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17584, 17587, 17591, 17592.5, Education Code.~~

~~Article 3. DMP Application Procedure~~

~~Section 1866.2. DMP Application for Basic Grant.~~

~~An eligible district seeking funding for a DMP Basic Grant shall complete and file with the OPSC, the Form SAB 40-20.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17591, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.3. DMP Application for Extreme Hardship Grant.~~

~~An eligible district seeking funding for a DMP extreme hardship grant shall complete and file with the OPSC, the Form SAB 40-22.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Article 4. Basic Grant Request and Apportionment~~

~~Section 1866.4. Five Year Plan Requirements.~~

~~EC Section 17591 establishes the need of filing with the Board a five year plan for deferred maintenance needs of the district. The Form SAB 40-20 is a summary of proposed projects the district plans on completing annually over the next five fiscal years using the basic grant. The fiscal year the plan commences is determined by the fiscal year in which it was filed. New and revised plans are accepted on a continuous basis for the current fiscal year up to the last working day in June. Revisions are not accepted for prior fiscal years.~~

~~(a) Under the following circumstances, a revised plan would need to be submitted to the OPSC:~~

~~(1) The plan has expired.~~

~~(2) Work will be performed that is not listed on the plan or at a school not listed on the plan.~~

~~(3) If work listed on the plan was performed using an SFP modernization, CSFP Rehabilitation (as defined in SFP Regulation Section 1859.2) or Federal Renovation Program (FRP) grant, pursuant to Section 1866.13.~~

~~(b) A district submitting a new plan or revising a plan under (a) above must be able to certify that the plans and proposals for expenditures of funds, listed on the Form SAB 40-20 submitted to the OPSC, were discussed at a public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting with the district's governing board, pursuant to EC Section 17584.1(a).~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17584.1, 17591, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.1. Permissible Use of the DMP Basic Grant.~~

~~The district may include on its Form SAB 40-20 a repair or replacement project, provided it meets all the following criteria:~~

~~(a) Conforms to the deferred maintenance activities authorized in EC Section 17582(a) or these regulations, which has approached or exceeded its normal life expectancy or has a history of continued repairs indicating a shortened life expectancy, and;~~

~~(b) Performed at a district owned facility, which is used for school purposes. A district that is currently leasing relocatables from the State Relocatable Classroom Program may include deferred maintenance work on the Form SAB 40-20 for these facilities.~~

~~(c) Facilities owned by a CSS or leased facilities that are required to be maintained by the CSS, which it is authorized to use pursuant to Article 3 commencing with EC Section 17280, Chapter 3, may be included on the Form SAB 40-20.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17280, 17582 and 17591, Education Code~~

~~Section 1866.4.2. Calculation of Basic Grant and Apportionment of Basic Grant.~~

~~After December 1 of each year, the Board shall apportion to districts a DMP basic grant for the preceding fiscal year. A maximum basic grant is calculated as stated for each of the following:~~

~~(a) School districts and regional occupational centers using the formula set forth in EC Section 17584(a).~~

~~(b) CSSs who meet the provisions of EC Sections 17584, 17591 and, if applicable, 17585, an amount equal to one dollar ($1.00) for each one dollar ($1.00) of local funds up to a maximum of one-half percent of the total general funds and adult education funds budgeted by the CSSs for the fiscal year, exclusive of any amounts budgeted for capital outlay, debt service or revenues that are passed through to other local educational agencies, to the extent of funds legally available pursuant to EC Section 17080.~~

~~If sufficient State funding is not available, the Board shall apportion to all districts except those that are receiving a basic grant with an extreme hardship grant, a prorated amount of the maximum. This amount is known as the prorated basic grant.~~

~~A district's unresolved complaints, pursuant to EC Section 35292.5, will be presented to the Board prior to the annual basic grant apportionment for the fiscal year in which the complaint was filed. If the Board determines that a violation of EC Section 35292.5 has occurred, the district will receive a 30 day notice to correct the violation. Districts that do not correct~~

~~the violation within 30 days of the date of the written notice shall be deemed ineligible for the basic grant and the funds may be distributed to other eligible districts.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 2553 and 17584 Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.3. District Deposit of Matching Share.~~

~~To receive the basic grant pursuant to Section 1866.4.2, districts are required to deposit a matching share into their District Deferred Maintenance Fund established pursuant to EC Section 17582(a). The State will match this amount dollar-for- dollar not to exceed the basic grant apportioned by the Board. The district's deposit must be a cash contribution from unmatched carryover pursuant to Section 1866.4.4, or from the district's restricted Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account, or from any source not otherwise prohibited by law or regulation.~~

~~If the district has established an Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account under the provisions of EC Section 17070.75(b)(1), any annual deposits in excess of 2 ½ percent into that fund may be used towards the district's matching share. Districts may either:~~

~~(a) Report the excess amount in the Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account being used towards the match on the Form SAB 40-21. These funds are not available for eligible deferred maintenance projects listed on the Form SAB 40-20, until transferred into the District Deferred Maintenance Fund.~~

~~(b) Transfer the excess funds from the Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account to the District Deferred Maintenance Fund and report the total dollar matching share on the Form SAB 40-21. These funds are available to the district to perform work on the Form SAB 40-20.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code~~

~~Reference: Sections 17070.75, 17582, and 17584, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.4. Carryover of Unmatched State Funds.~~

~~Any funds deposited and not matched by the State can be carried over to the next fiscal year. A district can apply unexpended, unmatched balances past the next fiscal year under the provisions of EC Section 17583, and then reaffirm by specific action of the district's governing board the encumbrance of such funds for deferred maintenance purposes.~~

~~Carryover that has been reported on the Form SAB 40-21 is considered matched and therefore cannot be applied as carryover in subsequent fiscal years.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582 and 17583, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.5. County Superintendents of Schools Funding Limitations.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 2553, 39618-39619.2 and 39620, Education Code; and Sections 15502-15503, Government Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.6. Release of State Funds.~~

~~The CSSs shall report the district's deposit on the Form SAB 40-21. The Form is due to the OPSC no later than 60 days after the maximum or prorated basic grant is apportioned by the Board. Any Form SAB 40-21 received after 60 days will be brought to the Board on a case-by-case basis to determine if the funds will be released.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17584, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.4.7. Failure to Deposit Matching Funds.~~

~~A total deposit less than the maximum amount will require the district to comply with the reporting requirements of EC Section 17584.1. The OPSC will present to the Board in March reports received annually and request that any unmatched apportionments be adjusted to reflect actual amount of funds deposited.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17584 and 17584.1, Education Code.~~

~~Article 5. Extreme Hardship Grant Application and Apportionment~~

~~Section 1866.5. Eligibility Requirements.~~

~~(a) A district may be eligible for an extreme hardship grant, provided the district demonstrates to the Board that there is a critical project on the Form SAB 40-20, which meets all the following criteria:~~

~~(1) Financial Test.~~
~~The total estimated cost of the critical project is greater than two times the district's maximum basic grant.~~

~~(2) Health and Safety Test.~~
~~The project if not completed in one year could result in serious damage to the remainder of the facility or would result in a serious hazard to the health and safety of the pupils attending the facility.~~

~~(b) An extreme hardship grant is available to repair or replace an existing school building component, authorized by EC Section 17582 or these regulations, located within existing district owned classrooms and/or subsidiary facilities (corridors, toilets, kitchens and other non-classroom space located on a school site), if the district can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that the health and safety of the pupils is at risk. Replacement of a school facility component shall be limited to the use of a Like-Kind Material/System except in the following circumstances and with the concurrence of the OPSC:~~

~~(1) the work in the project proposes to use an alternative building material or system that performs the same function as a no longer available building material or system, or~~

~~(2) the work in the project proposes to use an alternative building material or system that performs the same function as a building material or system which is uneconomical to replace, or~~

~~(3) the work in the project proposes to use an alternative building material or system which is requested by the district and is less costly than a Like-Kind Material/System Replacement.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17587, and 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.1. Application Submittals.~~

~~(a) For the OPSC to deem an application complete, a district requesting an extreme hardship grant shall submit to the OPSC the Form SAB 40-22, along with all documents requested in the General Information Section of the Form. Additional documentation identifying how the request meets the requirements of EC Section 17587 may be required.~~

~~(b) More than one Form SAB 40-22 may be submitted by a district in a fiscal year provided each project meets the eligibility requirements set forth in Section 1866.5. The OPSC will present projects to the Board in the order of date received. Complete applications are accepted on a continuous basis; those received prior to the last working day in June are ensured consideration for funding by the Board in the next funding cycle.~~

~~(c) The district shall submit a detailed cost estimate supporting the construction costs and any justification documents that will support the work with the Form SAB 40-22. If the extreme hardship grant request contains work on relocatable facilities, a cost/benefit analysis must be prepared by the district and submitted to the OPSC that indicates the total cost to remain and mitigate the problem is less than 50 percent of the current replacement cost of the facility. The Board will approve reasonable and appropriate funds to mitigate the conditions, which makes the project qualify as a hardship under EC Section 17587, if the costs are consistent with the Saylor Current Construction Costs.~~

~~(d) If the work detailed in the cost estimate is for other than a Like-Kind Material/System Replacement the district may be required to submit substantiating evidence to the OPSC demonstrating that the alternative material or system meets the requirements of Section 1866.5(b)(1), (2), or (3). All costs of work in the project which exceed the cost of a Like-Kind Material/System Replacement or when appropriate, the cost of an acceptable alternative material or system replacement,~~

~~shall be paid by the district.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.2. Determination of Extreme Hardship Grant Amount and District Contribution.~~

~~(a) An extreme hardship grant for the first critical project in any given fiscal year for a district with a maximum Basic Grant and State matching share that is less than $1,000,000, shall be determined by either of the following:~~
~~(1) For a total project cost that is less than $1,000,000, the extreme hardship grant will be determined by taking the total project cost less the district's maximum basic grant, less the State's matching share.~~
~~(2) For a total project cost that exceeds $1,000,000, the extreme hardship grant will be determined by taking $1,000,000 less the district's maximum basic grant, less the State's matching share. The total of that amount plus 50 percent of any project costs above $1,000,000 will be the State's hardship contribution. The district's contribution will be 50 percent of the remaining excess above $1,000,000 and the district's maximum basic grant.~~
~~(b) An extreme hardship grant for the first critical project in any given fiscal year for a district with a maximum basic grant and State matching share that exceeds $1,000,000, shall be determined by the following:~~
~~(1) From the total project cost deduct the district's maximum Basic Grant and State matching share. The remaining amount will be divided in half between the district and the State.~~
~~The district shall be required to contribute the maximum basic grant and State's matching share at the time the Board apportions funding for the project.~~
~~(c) An extreme hardship grant for each additional hardship project beyond one in any given fiscal year shall be determined by dividing the total project cost in half. A cash contribution of 50 percent will be required from the district.~~
~~(d) A district with only one school may include other major repair or replacement work deemed essential for basic utilization and functioning of the school, without being subject to subsection (c).~~

~~If a district receives an unfunded approval pursuant to Section 1866.5.3, the extreme hardship grant will be an estimate based on the current maximum basic grant and state matching share and will be re-calculated using the maximum basic grant and state matching share at the time of funding by the Board.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code and Section 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17587 and 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.3. Project Priorities Due to Insufficient State Funds.~~

~~(a) When funds are not available, project requests that meet the criteria for funding are presented to the Board on a continuous basis throughout the fiscal year and are included on an unfunded list based on the date the complete critical hardship application was received by the OPSC.~~
~~(b) The Board shall utilize the following prioritized list to apportion extreme hardship grants for critical projects when funds become available:~~

~~Priority Description~~	~~Priority No.~~
~~A project that meets the requirements of (c) below.~~	~~1~~
~~All other eligible projects as defined in EC Section 17582(a) or these regulations.~~	~~2~~

~~(c) At the time the complete application is filed with the OPSC, a district requesting Priority One status shall submit a resolution passed by the district's governing board that includes the following:~~
~~(1) Describe in detail the health and safety or structural problems present that preclude the pupils from remaining in the facility and the proposed action by the district's governing board.~~
~~(2) Identify the facility or facilities on the school site that will be affected by the closure and the dates of closure.~~
~~(3) Identify how the board plans on housing the pupils until the facility can be re-opened.~~
~~An assessment will be made by the OPSC and the Board to determine if the critical project meets the Priority One requirements.~~
~~(d) When funds become available, the requests included on the OPSC Extreme Hardship Unfunded List will receive funding~~

~~in the following order, provided the project still meets Section 1866.5(a):~~

~~(1) Increases, if the original request has already received an apportionment.~~

~~(2) Priority One Projects.~~

~~(3) All other eligible projects as defined in EC Section 17582(a) or these regulations.~~

~~Within each category, projects will be funded in the order the project was placed on the unfunded list. Projects that do not receive funding will remain on the unfunded list for a future funding cycle.~~

~~(e) The Board may make exceptions to the priorities on a case-by-case basis for the benefit of the pupils affected.~~

~~(f) The Board shall maintain a sufficient reserve for unexpected emergencies and on-going cost increases.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code~~

~~Reference: Sections 17587 and 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.4. Reimbursement.~~

~~(a) Reimbursement of eligible architect/engineering expenditures will be allowed up to five months prior to the date that the hardship project is accepted for processing by the OPSC.~~

~~(b) After written determination by the OPSC that the project is approvable, reimbursement of eligible construction expenditures will be allowed. If a district incurs construction costs prior to that date, all construction expenditures for the project will not be reimbursed.~~

~~(c) In the case where a project meets the criteria of priority one hardship pursuant to Section 1866.5.3(c), districts can contact the OPSC to request an expedited determination of the eligibility of the hardship project. The OPSC will respond within five working days. If OPSC does not respond within five working days, the project will be deemed approvable for eligible construction expenditures.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.5. Permissible Uses of Extreme Hardship Grant Funds.~~

~~The extreme hardship grant shall be used for the critical project approved by the Board and only expenditures relating to the minimum work necessary to mitigate the problem shall be recognized as eligible project costs. Architect or engineer's fees up to 12 percent of the construction costs will be deemed eligible as well as reasonable testing, inspection, and plan checking fees. The grant may not be used for any of the following:~~

~~(a) Construction costs incurred prior to the OPSC determining that the project is approvable, except for costs associated with temporary measures necessary to immediately mitigate the problem.~~

~~(b) Expenditures required by local mandate that are not prescribed in State law.~~

~~(c) Asbestos abatement, sampling, testing necessary as a result of a SFP modernization project or a Federal Renovation Program project.~~

~~(d) Non-owned facilities.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.6. Ongoing Project Cost Increase.~~

~~A district may request an increase in funding for ongoing project costs under either one of the following conditions:~~

~~(a) The additional construction costs are a result of the lowest bidder exceeding the cost of the work approved by the Board for the extreme hardship grant. The OPSC may request that the project be re-bid prior to processing the increase for funding.~~

~~(b) Additional related work is encountered within the scope of the work originally approved by the Board for the extreme hardship grant.~~

~~Any Board approved increase to the extreme hardship grant will be subject to the requirements of Section 1866.5.2.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17587 and 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.7. Release of State Funds.~~

~~The OPSC will release State funds that have been apportioned by the Board to the district after submittal by the district of the Form SAB 40-23, and supporting documentation requested in the General Instruction Section of the form. A district must submit the Form SAB 40-23 within one year of the apportionment of the extreme hardship grant for the project. After reviewing the submittal, the OPSC may request to the Board, based on the supporting documentation, that the extreme hardship grant be adjusted to reflect the actual project costs.~~

~~Should the district only provide documentation to support the release of funding for a portion of the project, the OPSC shall prorate the fund release based on the supporting documentation.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587 ,Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.8. Progress Report and Time Limit on Extreme Hardship Grant Apportionment.~~

~~Within one year of the extreme hardship grant apportionment by the Board the district shall:~~
~~(a) Complete the critical project; and~~
~~(b) Submit the Form SAB 40-23 and supporting documentation pursuant to Section 1866.5.7.~~
~~(c) If (b) above has not been met within six months of Board apportionment, the district is required to submit a progress report in the form of a narrative to the OPSC. The report shall contain a timeline of the project showing the progress that has been made and how the district plans on completing the project by the one year deadline. Should the district not meet the one year deadline, the entire extreme hardship grant shall be presented to the Board for rescission and, if applicable, the portion of the Basic Grant the district received due to the extreme hardship grant funding unless the district submits a request for time extension.~~
~~(d) The Board may approve a time extension for the project based on the following:~~
~~(1) A provision for a six-month time extension if the district has completed the plans and they have been submitted to the DSA for approval.~~
~~(2) A provision for a six-month time extension when the plans are DSA approved and the project is currently out to bid.~~
~~(3) A provision for up to a nine-month time extension when the district can demonstrate to the Board that circumstances exists beyond the district's control.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17587 and 17588, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.5.9. Exemptions to District Contribution.~~

~~Monitoring costs required by a public agency relating to the removal of an underground toxic tank that cannot be funded by any other source, shall be exempted from a project's total cost for the purpose of determining the district contribution as required in Section 1866.5.2(a)(2) or (b)(1).~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.6. Method of Payment to School District.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 39618-39621, Education Code.~~

~~Article 6. Miscellaneous~~

~~Section 1866.7. Control of Expenditures.~~

~~EC Section 17582(c) provides that the governing board of each school district shall have complete control over the apportioned funds and the earnings of funds once deposited in the district deferred maintenance fund, provided that no~~

~~funds deposited in the district deferred maintenance fund pursuant to EC Section 17584(a) may be expended by the governing board for any purpose except those specified in EC Section 17582(a).~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17582, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.8. Expenditures by Districts Subject to Public Contract Code.~~

~~Any expenditures by a district from the proceeds of an apportionment made for the purposes set forth in EC Sections 17582 and 17587 must comply with all laws, specifically the Public Contract Code (PCC) and the California Code of Regulations (Title 24). An "emergency" contract must be awarded under the provisions of the PCC Section 20113.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17584, and 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.9. Program Reporting Requirements.~~

~~A district receiving funds in accordance with Section 1866.5.2 shall submit an expenditure report from the district on the Form SAB 40-24. The expenditure report shall be due no later than two years from the date any funds were released.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.9.1. Expenditure Audit.~~

~~When the district has received funds pursuant to Section 1866.5.2 the project will be audited to assure that the expenditures incurred by the district were made in accordance with the provisions of EC Sections 17582(a) and 17587, and Section 1866.5.5~~

~~When the OPSC receives the final expenditure report from the district on the Form SAB 40-24, an audit of the expenditures by the OPSC shall commence within one year of the report for all extreme hardship grant apportionments made by the Board after these regulations become effective. The OPSC shall complete the audit within six months, unless additional information requested by the district has not been received.~~

~~The district shall be required to maintain all appropriate records that support all district certifications and expenditures for all costs associated with the extreme hardship grant for a period of not less than four years from the date the notice of completion is filed for the project in order to allow other agencies, including, without limitation, the Bureau of State Audits and the State Controller to perform their audit responsibilities.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections and 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.10. Limitation of State Responsibility.~~

~~In making an apportionment, neither the State nor any department or agency thereof, shall be required to assume any responsibility not otherwise imposed upon it by law.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582-17592.5, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.11. Payment and Performance Bonds.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 39618-39621, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.12. Earned Interest on DMP Grants.~~

~~Earned interest on State funds received in accordance with the Act shall be treated as follows:~~

~~(a) One half of any interest earned on DMP grant funds provided pursuant to Section 1866.4.2 may be applied towards the district match in any given fiscal year.~~

~~(b) All interest earned on DMP grant funds provided pursuant to Section 1866.5 shall be applied to eligible project costs for the project pursuant to Section 1866.5.5 or returned to the State.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17584, and 17587, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.13. Duplication of Applications.~~

~~If the district's application for an extreme hardship grant involves proposed work also included in a SFP modernization project currently included on the SFP Modernization Unfunded List or the OPSC Modernization Workload List or in a CSFP Rehabilitation project, the district must certify that, after reducing the work to be funded with the extreme hardship grant from the SFP modernization or CSFP Rehabilitation project, the cost estimate for the remaining work in the modernization or CSFP Rehabilitation project is at least 60 percent of the total SFP or CSFP grant amount provided by the state and the district's matching share. The cost estimate may not include planning, tests, inspection or furniture or equipment. If the district cannot make this certification, the SFP modernization or CSFP Rehabilitation project must be withdrawn prior to the release of any extreme hardship grants to the district.~~

~~If the district's application for FRP grants, SFP modernization grants, or CSFP Rehabilitation grants involves work currently included on the district's Form SAB 40-20, pursuant to Education Code Section 17591, the district must eliminate the projects that will be funded with the FRP grants, SFP modernization grants, or CSFP Rehabilitation grants from the Form prior to the release of any FRP grants, SFP modernization grants, or CSFP Rehabilitation grants to the district.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Sections 17582, 17587 and 17591, Education Code.~~

~~Section 1866.14. Amending and Withdrawal of Extreme Hardship Funding Applications.~~

~~The district may not amend the Form SAB 40-22 submitted to the OPSC that has not received Board approval to increase the scope of work. At the option of the district, the funding application may be withdrawn and resubmitted to include the additional work. The district must request that the application be withdrawn and removed from the OPSC Deferred Maintenance Extreme Hardship Workload List. The resubmitted application will receive a new processing date by the OPSC.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Section 15503, Government Code.~~

~~Reference: Section 17587, Education Code.~~

FIVE YEAR PLAN

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

GENERAL INFORMATION

This Form is a summary of proposed deferred maintenance projects the applicant district plans on completing annually over the next five fiscal years using the Basic Grant, pursuant to Education Code Section 17591. The fiscal year the plan commences is determined by the fiscal year in which it was filed. New and revised plans are accepted on a continuous basis for the current fiscal year up to the last working day in June. Revisions are not accepted for prior fiscal years.

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

Part I—Authorized District Representative

Complete to designate or change the authorized district representative. Enter the name of the district employee that can act on behalf of the district. A consultant who is on contract with the district to communicate with the OPSC on behalf of the district's board may be listed.

Part II—Estimated Fiscal Year Data

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTIONS
1	Number of Projects	List the number of eligible projects in each of the project categories shown (refer to Regulation Section 1866.4.1).
2–6	Current and subsequent fiscal years	Enter the total estimated costs in each project category for each fiscal year identified for the projects reported in column 1.
7	Total Estimated Cost	For each project category enter the totals of columns 2–6.
8	Grand Total	Total all columns.
9	Remarks	Include any additional information for each category. If the district is applying for extreme hardship grants for any of the projects listed on the plan, identify those projects in this space. If additional space is needed, you may attach a separate sheet with your remarks to this form.
10	School Information	List the facilities where deferred maintenance projects are planned as reported in column 1 on this Five Year Plan (refer to Regulation Section 1866.4.1). If additional space is needed, you may attach a separate sheet.
11	Certification	Review and complete (refer to Regulation Section 1866.4.and EC Section 17584.1).

When completed mail this form to:

Office of Public School Construction
Attn: Deferred Maintenance Program
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

NOTE: Any Five Year Plan, SAB 40-20, not conforming to State Allocation Board (SAB) guidelines will be returned to the district. If you need assistance in completing this form, please contact the Office of Public School Construction, at 916.376.1771.

SCHOOL DISTRICT	FIVE-DIGIT DISTRICT CODE NUMBER (SEE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOL DIRECTORY)
COUNTY	CURRENT FISCAL YEAR

The district:

☐ has not previously submitted a Five Year Plan.

☐ is submitting this updated/revised Five Year Plan which supersedes the plan currently on file with SAB.

Part I—Authorized District Representative

The following individual has been designated as a district representative by the school board minutes:

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE	TITLE
BUSINESS ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER
E-MAIL ADDRESS	FAX NUMBER

Part II—Estimated Fiscal Year Data

PROJECT CATEGORY	1. NUMBER OF PROJECTS	2. CURRENT FISCAL YEAR	3. SECOND FISCAL YEAR	4. THIRD FISCAL YEAR	5. FOURTH FISCAL YEAR	6. FIFTH FISCAL YEAR	7. TOTAL ESTIMATE COST
Asbestos							
Classroom Lighting							
Electrical							
Floor Covering							
HVAC							
Lead							
Painting							
Paving							
Plumbing							
Roofing							
Underground Tanks							
Wall Systems							
8. Grand Total							

9. Remarks

10. List the school names where deferred maintenance projects are planned in this Five Year Plan:

11. Certifications

I certify as District Representative that:

- this work does not include ineligible items and that all work will be completed in accordance with program requirements, applicable laws and regulations. The district shall maintain proper documentation in the event of an audit; and,
- the district understands that should an audit reveal that these funds were expended for other than eligible deferred maintenance costs, the SAB will require the district to return all inappropriately expended funds; and,
- the plans and proposals for expenditures of funds as outlined in this report were discussed in a public hearing at a regularly scheduled school board meeting on _____; and the district has complied with all the other requirements of Education Code Sections 17584.1 and 17584.2; and,
- Beginning with the 2005/2006 fiscal year, the district has complied with Education Code Section 17070.75 (e) by establishing a facilities inspection system to ensure that each of its schools is maintained in good repair; and,
- This Form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the OPSC. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail.
- I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statements in this application and supporting documents are true and correct.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE	DATE

CERTIFICATION OF DEPOSITS

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

GENERAL INFORMATION

In order for each school district to be able to receive available State Deferred Maintenance funds, each County Superintendent of Schools (CSS) must certify the amount each district deposits in its Deferred Maintenance Fund for the fiscal year indicated on the form. The district's deposit must be a cash contribution from any non-restricted fund, unmatched carryover pursuant to Section 1866.4.4, or from the district's restricted Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account. This form is due to the OPSC no later than 60 days after the State Allocation Board (SAB) apportions the Basic Grant.

INSTRUCTIONS – (Refer to Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Sections 1866.4.3 through 1866.4.6.)

Column 1	District Code Number	Enter the "40" and the five digit District Code number. See the California Public School Directory.
Column 2	School District	Enter the name of the school district.
Column 3	Unmatched Carryover (EC Section 17583)	Report any unexpended balances not matched by the State in prior fiscal years that are being applied towards the district's current year deposit. Carryover that has previously been reported on the Form is considered matched and therefore cannot be applied as carryover in subsequent fiscal years. (Refer to Section 1866.4.4)
Column 4	Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account	Report annual deposits in the Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account established under the provisions of EC Section 17070.75(b)(1), in excess of 2½ percent that are being used towards the district matching share. (Refer to Section 1866.4.3[a])
Column 5	Transfers In	Report the amount of funds transferred into the District Deferred Maintenance Fund for the purpose of matching the Basic Grant apportioned by the SAB.
Column 6	Total Amount of Deposit (EC Section 17584)	Report total amount shown in Columns 3, 4 and 5.
Column 7	Total General Fund Budget for Current Year	Enter the total year General Fund Budget amount approved by the district's.
Column 8	Three Percent Amount for Current Year	Enter three percent of General Fund Budgeted amount required to be earmarked for Ongoing and Major Maintenance purposes as required by Education Code 17070.75 and 17070.77.
Column 9	Amount Budgeted for Current Year	Enter the Current Year Amount budgeted/earmarked for Ongoing and Major Maintenance purposes supported by a publicly approved Ongoing and Major Maintenance Plan as required by Education Code 17070.75(b)(2) and 17070.77.
Column 10	Actual Amount Expended During Prior Fiscal Year	Enter actual amount expended in prior Fiscal Year for Ongoing and Major Maintenance purposes.

Submit completed form to: Office of Public School Construction
Attn.: Accounting
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

CERTIFICATION OF DEPOSITS

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

SAB 40-21 (REV 12/10)

Certification by the County Superintendent of Schools to the State Allocation Board regarding deposits of district funds under the State School Deferred Maintenance Law Education Code Sections 17582 through 17592 and Title 2, California Code of Regulation Sections 1866.4.3 through 1866.4.6.

COUNTY	PREPARER'S NAME (TYPED)	PREPARER'S TITLE	TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL

FISCAL YEAR	REPRESENTATIVE NAME (TYPED)	REPRESENTATIVE TITLE	TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5	COLUMN 6	COLUMN 7	COLUMN 8	COLUMN 9	COLUMN 10
District Code Number	School District	Unmatched Carryover (EC Section 17583)	Ongoing Major Maintenance Account (EC Section 17070.75)	Transfers In	Total Amount of Deposit For Current Year	Total General Fund Budget Amount	Three percent Amount For Current Year	Amount Budgeted For Current Year	Actual Amount Expended During Prior Fiscal Year
40/									

Certifications:

I certify, as the County Superintendent of Schools or authorized representative designated by the governing board of the above-named county, that:

- The school districts herein named and/or the Treasurer of said county has, as required by Law, and pursuant to Education Code Section 17582 through 17592, and Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 1866 through 1866.14, placed on deposit in the District Deferred Maintenance Fund or as appropriate set aside funds pursuant to Education Code Section 17070.75 and 17070.77 the amounts listed above for expenditure only as specified by said Education Code Sections and the SAB Regulations and/or such amendments thereto, and that said funds are not derived from funds apportioned under any program by the SAB; and,
- Pursuant to Education Code Section 17584.3, the district has made a priority of the deferred maintenance basic grant, appropriated pursuant to Education Code Section 17584, to ensure that facilities are functional and meet local hygiene standards; and,
- This Form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the OPSC. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail; and,
- I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statements in this application and supporting documents are true and correct.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE DATE

GENERAL INFORMATION

This Form is used by a district to request Deferred Maintenance Program Extreme Hardship Grant funding for a critical project listed on the Five Year Plan, Form SAB 40-20 (Rev 01/05) that meets the criteria prescribed in Regulation Section 1866.5. The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) will accept complete applications on a continuous basis; those received prior to the last working day in June are ensured consideration for funding by the State Allocation Board (SAB) in that fiscal year's funding cycle.

The OPSC processes complete applications based on the date received. The following documents must be submitted with this Form (refer to Regulation Section 1866.5.1):

- A report from either a licensed architect or structural engineer detailing how this project qualifies for an extreme hardship grant as defined in Education Code Section 17587 and Regulation Section 1866.5, a recommended solution to correct the problem, and a detailed description of the work being performed to mitigate the problem.
- A detailed cost estimate prepared by a licensed architect or contractor showing quantity and cost breakdowns supporting the construction costs listed on this form. 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 Division of the State Architect (DSA). Items in the cost estimate shall be limited to only the minimum work necessary to mitigate the problem.
- Plot plan identifying the location of the work and 1A diagrams if available.
- A revised *Five Year Plan*, Form SAB 40-20 (Rev. 01/05) including the critical project on the plan and identifying the project in Column 9 of the Form.

The amount of the extreme hardship grant and district contribution for the project shall be determined by the criteria outlined in Regulation Section 1866.5.2. Critical projects that meet the criteria for an extreme hardship grant will be presented to the SAB on a continuous basis throughout the fiscal year. If funding is not available projects will be placed on an unfunded list based on priority order and on the date the complete application was received by the OPSC (refer to Regulation Section 1866.5.3).

Districts are advised that the OPSC must determine the critical project meets the criteria set in Education Code 17587 and Regulation Sections 1866.5 through 1866.5.3 to receive an extreme hardship grant, prior to construction costs being incurred on the project. Reimbursement of eligible architect or engineering expenditures will be allowed up to five months prior to the date that the hardship project is accepted for processing by the OPSC (refer to Regulation Section 1866.5.4).

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

1. **Type of Application** - Check the appropriate box that indicates the type of application the district is filing. A district with only one school may include other essential work in the application without being subject to the contribution requirements set forth in Regulation Section 1866.5.2. If the district checks the new project with other essential work box, the district will need to submit this form for each project category marked in Section 2 and a Form SAB 40-22 combining all the project information onto one form.

2. **Type of Project -** Check the appropriate box for the type of work the district is applying.

3. **Project Priority -** Indicate if the district is requesting Priority One Status for the project pursuant to Regulation Section 1866.5.3(c).

4. **Project Funding Order -** If the district has other critical project(s) awaiting funding on the Deferred Maintenance Extreme Hardship Unfunded List, prioritize the order of this application in relation to those project(s) for purposes of funding and district contribution requirements. (Refer to Regulation Section 1866.5.2 and 1866.5.3.)

5. **Project Duplication -** Refer to Regulation Section 1866.13.

   Enter the School Facility Program (SFP) modernization or Charter School Facilities Program (CSFP) Rehabilitation application number(s) if any, if work included in those application(s) is also included in the total project cost of the critical project amount requested in Section 3 and the district cannot certify the SFP or CSFP Rehabilitation project(s) still meets the 60 percent commensurate test requirement in the SFP or CSFP Rehabilitation after deducting the duplicative work included in this application.

6. **Project Costs - Enter:**

   I. Planning

   a. Up to 12 percent of the construction costs reported in IIc are allowable.
   b. If the critical project contains work that requires DSA approval, the fee charged by the DSA to review the plans is allowable.
   c. Other planning costs associated with the project that may be allowable, provided an explanation of the costs is given.
   d. The total of a through c.

   II. Construction

   a. The repair or replacement costs associated with the project. Eligible construction costs shall be limited to the minimum work necessary to mitigate the problem within the scope of the work identified in Section 2.
   b. Any other costs directly related to the project (i.e., asbestos removal). A detailed explanation of why the costs are necessary is required.
   c. The total of a and b.

   III. Testing

   Costs associated with testing required during construction for the project. A detailed explanation of each test and the reason the test is required is needed. If multiple tests are being done indicate the quantity.

   IV. Inspection

   If the project requires a certified DSA inspector the fee charged by the inspector during the legal duration of the construction contract is allowable. Back-up information supporting the cost is required.

   V. Contingencies

   An allowance for unanticipated costs directly related to the critical project is provided as part of the budget for the project. This amount cannot exceed five percent of I through IV. The OPSC shall review all expenditures from this allowance to ensure the eligibility.

Total Project Cost

The total of I through V.

EXTREME HARDSHIP FUNDING APPLICATION

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

SAB 40-22 (Rev. 10/07)

The school district named below applies to the State Allocation Board via the Office of Public School Construction for an Extreme Hardship Grant under the provisions of the Deferred Maintenance Program as provided by Education Code Section 17587 and Title 2, California Code of Regulation Sections 1866.5 through 1866.5.8.

SCHOOL DISTRICT	APPLICATION NUMBER 40/
SCHOOL (SITE) NAME	COUNTY

1. Type of Application (Check only one)
   - ☐ New Project ☐ Increase to Prior Project
   - ☐ New project with other essential work (Refer to Regulation Section 1866.5.2[c])
2. Type of Project (Check only one) (Refer to Regulation Section 1866.5)
   - ☐ Asbestos ☐ Paving
   - ☐ Electrical ☐ Plumbing
   - ☐ Flooring Systems ☐ Roofing
   - ☐ HVAC ☐ Underground Toxic Tank
   - ☐ Painting ☐ Wall Systems
3. Project Priority

   Is the district requesting Priority One status pursuant to Regulation Section 1866.5.3(c)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Project Funding Order

   If the district has other critical project(s) awaiting funding on the unfunded list, prioritize the order of this application in relation to those project(s). # _____
5. Project Duplication (Regulation Section 1866.13)

   SFP Modernization Project(s) 57/ _____

   CSFP Rehabilitation Project(s) 54/ _____
6. Project Costs

I. Planning	
a. Architect/Engineering Fee	$ _____
b. DSA Plan Check Fee	$ _____
c. Other	$ _____
d. Total Planning Costs	$ _____
II. Construction	
a. Repair/Replacement Cost	$ _____
b. Other	$ _____
c. Total Construction Costs	$ _____
III. Tests	$ _____
IV. Inspection	$ _____
V. Contingencies	$ _____
TOTAL PROJECT COST	$ _____

Certifications:

I certify, as the District Representative, that:

- The district will comply with the Public Contract Code; Education Code; Government Code; California Code of Regulations (Title 24); and any other legal requirements; and;
- The district will execute a contract prior to any work being performed on the project and will obtain its legal counsel approval on each contract; and;
- If required, the district will obtain DSAs approval of the project and plan(s); and;
- If the critical project includes work currently included in a SFP modernization project that is currently on the SFP Modernization Unfunded List or the OPSC Modernization Workload List, or in a CSFP Rehabilitation project, the district certifies that after eliminating the work to be funded with the extreme hardship grant from the SFP modernization or CSFP Rehabilitation project, the cost estimate for the remaining work in the SFP or CSFP Rehabilitation project meets the 60 percent commensurate requirement in the SFP. If the district cannot make this certification, the district will withdraw the SFP modernization or CSFP Rehabilitation project prior to the release of any extreme hardship grants to the district (Refer to Regulation Section 1866.13); and;
- The district understands that some or all of the extreme hardship grant for the project may be returned to the SAB as a result of an audit pursuant to Regulation Section 1866.9.1; and;
- The district shall submit the expenditure report for the extreme hardship grant no later than two years from the date any funds were released pursuant to Regulation Section 1866.9; and;
- The district did not receive funding from any other State funded program for the work requested in this application; and;
- If within six months of SAB apportionment of the project the district has not submitted to the OPSC a request for a release of funds, the district will be required to submit a progress report in the form of a narrative to the OPSC pursuant to Regulation Section 1866.5.8, and;
- This Form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the OPSC. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail; and;
- I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statements in this application and supporting documents are true and correct.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

FUND RELEASE AUTHORIZATION

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

SAB 40-23 (New 04/02)

SCHOOL DISTRICT	APPLICATION NUMBER 40/
SCHOOL (SITE) NAME	COUNTY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS - (refer to Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Section 1866.5.7)

After the State Allocation Board (SAB) has apportioned the Deferred Maintenance Extreme Hardship Grant, the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) will release the amount apportioned as designated below to the appropriate county treasury after the district has complied with the requirements of this Form and submitted it to the OPSC.

Check the appropriate box and supply the requested documentation.

Part I - Release of Funds Based on Bids Only

☐ The district requests a release of funds for the above project based on the submittal of this Form and the following documents to the OPSC:

- A copy of the complete bid package including any addendas.
- A copy of the proposed contract.
- Plans and specifications for the project(s). Approved Division of the State Architect (DSA) plans are needed for those projects that contain work that must be approved by the DSA.

☐ The district certifies that its matching share has been deposited in the District Deferred Maintenance Fund.

Part II - Release of Funds Based on Awarded and Signed Contracts

☐ The district requests a release of funds for the above project based on the submittal of this Form and the following documents to the OPSC:

- A copy of the complete bid package including any addendas.
- A copy of the signed and awarded contract.
- A summary listing of all the bidders and amount of the bids the district received for the project upon which the contract was awarded.
- Plans and specifications for the project(s). Approved DSA plans are needed for those projects that contain work that must be approved by the DSA.
- All fully executed change orders.

☐ The district certifies that its matching share has been deposited in the District Deferred Maintenance Fund.

Part III - Partial Release of Funding

Does the documentation submitted represent a request of funds for the entire scope of the project approved by the SAB? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no provide the percentage of work under contract or bid and the dollar value for the documents submitted.

Percentage of work under contract or bid: _____ %

Value of request for release of funds: $ _____

Certifications:

I certify, as the District Representative, that:

- The district will or has complied with the Public Contact Code regarding the expenditure of funds; and,
- The district will maintain all appropriate records to support all district certifications and expenditures for all costs associated with the project(s) for a period of not less than four years; and,
- If the work funded with Deferred Maintenance Program Grants is also included in an unfunded School Facility Program (SFP) modernization project, the district has withdrawn the SFP modernization project unless it can certify the remaining work in the SFP modernization project meets the 60 percent commensurate requirement specified in Regulation Section 1866.13; and,
- This form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the OPSC. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail; and,
- I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statements in this application and supporting documents are true and correct.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE DATE

GENERAL INFORMATION

The district shall submit this Form no later than two years from the date any funds were released for the project. A separate report is needed for each application. Amounts entered in the Total Project Report column must represent the final costs of the project.

INSTRUCTIONS - (refer to Title 2, California Code of Regulations, Sections 1866.9 and 1866.9.1)

Part I - Summary of Receipts and Disbursements

Item 1. District Funds Deposited - The amount of district funds that have been deposited into and expended from the deferred maintenance fund. This amount should be at least the ½ percent amount required at the time the Hardship was approved.

Item 2. State Funds Deposited - The amount of State warrant(s) received for the State's ½ percent amount and placed on deposit in the district's deferred maintenance fund.

Item 3. Hardship Funds Deposited - This is the amount of State warrant(s) received for the hardship project(s).

Item 4. Interest Earned - Interest earned on the investment of State Hardship funds reported in Item number 3.

Item 5. Total Available Funds - Show the sum of Item numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Item 6. Expenditures - The total amount expended from district and State funds. The amount should agree with total expenditures listed on the detail.

Item 7. Balance Available - The amount of district and State funds available for project expenses. The balance should be equal to Item number 5 less Item number 6.

Item 8. Amounts Returned to the State - The amount of funds returned to the State.

Item 9. Funds Required - The amount needed to meet the remaining cost of the project. It is the result of subtracting Item number 8 from Item number 7.

Part II - Final Construction Report

Item 1. Enter the date construction began or as shown on the Notice to Proceed.

Item 2. Enter the date construction was completed as stated in the Notice of Completion on the last working contract.

Item 3. Show the date the Notice of Completion was filed on the last effective contract. Attach a copy of the Notice of Completion for each contract with this report, if it has not been submitted to this office.

Provide a detailed listing of each expenditure by warrant, the date of the warrant, payee, warrant number, and description/purpose of the expenditure. The use of a transaction record, in lieu of warrant numbers, is acceptable for force account expenditures.

Visit the Office of Public School Construction Web site at www.dgs.ca.gov/opsc for an EXCEL worksheet, which may be used to assist the District in reporting these expenditures.

Submit to: Department of General Services
Office of Public School Construction
Attn.: DMP Audit
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

SCHOOL DISTRICT	SCHOOL SITE NAME	APPLICATION NUMBER 40 /	
BUSINESS ADDRESS	COUNTY	FISCAL YEAR	TYPE OF HARDSHIP
PREPARER'S NAME (TYPED)	PREPARER'S TITLE (TYPED)	TELEPHONE NUMBER/E-MAIL ADDRESS	
DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE NAME (TYPED)	DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE TITLE (TYPED)	TELEPHONE NUMBER/E-MAIL ADDRESS	

Part I - Summary of Receipts and Disbursements

ITEM	TOTAL PROJECT REPORT	THIS COLUMN FOR STATE USE ONLY
1. ½ percent of District Funds Deposited		
2. ½ percent of State Funds Deposited		
3. Hardship Funds Deposited		
4. Interest Earned on Hardship Funds		
5. Total Available Funds		
6. Expenditures		
7. Balance Available		
8. Amount Returned to State		
9. Funds Required (7-8)		

Part II - Report on Progress of Project

ITEM	ENTRY
1. Date construction began per inspector's report or Notice to Proceed (attach copy for each contract)	
2. Date construction actually completed per Notice of Completion	
3. Date Notice of Completion was filed (attach copy for each contract)	

Certifications:

I certify, as the District Representative, that:

- I am designated as an authorized representative by the governing board of the District; and,
- The Public Contract Code was adhered to in the construction of the project included in the application; and,
- This Form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the Form provided by the OPSC. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail; and,
- I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the statements in this form are true and correct.

X

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE DATE

Emergency Repair Program

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM FUNDING

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present Emergency Repair Program (ERP) funding applications for apportionment.

DESCRIPTION

As of August 26, 2015, the State Allocation Board (Board) had apportioned $796.7 million for funded projects. The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) has received $9.8 million in savings from previously funded projects. This item recommends the Board to approve apportionments for the next applications in line, pursuant to ERP Regulations.

AUTHORITY

ERP Regulation Section 1859.322. Emergency Repair Program Project Funding Order.

The Board shall make apportionments on a monthly basis for Grants in the order of receipt of an Accepted
Application and for Grant Adjustments in the order of receipt of a complete Form SAB 61-04, as follows:
(a) If sufficient funding is available to provide funding to all applications presented that month, all applications will receive an Apportionment of the eligible costs.
(b) If funding is insufficient in any given month:
(1) Grants will be provided to each application on a prorated basis with the balance placed on the Unfunded List, unless the proration will result in funding less than 25 percent of the eligible project costs. The proration shall be determined by dividing the total funds available by the total eligible costs of all applications Ready for Apportionment. All Grant Adjustments will be placed on the Unfunded List.
(2) If the proration, as determined in (1) above, will be less than 25 percent of the eligible project costs, the Board shall provide Grant funding at 100 percent of the eligible project costs of the Grants based on date order received until funds are no longer available and the remaining Grant applications shall be placed on the Unfunded List. All Grant Adjustments will be placed on the Unfunded List.
(3) The Board will continue to accept and process applications for the purpose of developing an Unfunded List based on the order of receipt of the Accepted Applications.

When funds become available, projects on the Unfunded List will be apportioned in the order of date received. From available funds, Grants will be funded first and Grant Adjustments will be funded second. After an Apportionment has been made by the Board, funds will be released automatically by the OPSC. If local funds have been expended, the Apportionment must be used by the LEA [Local Educational Agency] to reimburse the special reserve fund and the original source of funds used to make the LEA expenditures for the ERP project.

Once all ERP funds have been depleted, any applications that have received a prorated Apportionment, a Grant, or a Grant Adjustment will be deemed a full and final Apportionment, any applications remaining fully unfunded on the Unfunded List will be returned to the LEA, and the Unfunded List shall be dissolved.

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF ANALYSIS / ATTACHMENTS

ERP Regulation Section 1859.322 requires the Board to make apportionments on a monthly basis and provides for an unfunded list to be generated when there is insufficient funding in any given month. ERP Regulation Section 1859.322(b) further requires that if funding is insufficient in any given month Grants will be provided to each application on a prorated basis, with the balance placed in an Unfunded List unless the proration will result in funding less than 25 percent of the eligible project costs. ERP Regulations further stipulate that when funds become available, projects on the Unfunded List, which includes applications that have been funded with prorated amounts, will be apportioned funds in the order of date received.

Pursuant to ERP regulations, the following describes how the returned savings will be processed to fund applications, in the order date received:

- Attachment contains 32 applications for which OPSC has sufficient funds to make full apportionments for a total of *$5,750,059*. These applications are the next applications in line to be fully funded.

RECOMMENDATION

Apportion $5,750,059 in ERP funds for all projects listed on the Attachments from Fund 3082-000.

ATTACHMENT
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	Types of Projects	Apport. Type*	LEA Total State Apportionment	Admin Filing Fees (Included in total)
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	Marsh Elementary	61/61648-00-0025	Paving($24,282);	g	$24,282.00	
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	Prospects High (Alternative)	61/61648-00-0026	Paving($4,801); Flooring Systems($48,267); Restroom Partitions($4,976);	g	$58,044.00	
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	Fremont Elementary	61/61648-00-0027	Structural Damage($375,578); Paving($70,013); HVAC($28,534);	g	$474,125.00	
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	Antioch High	61/61648-00-0028	Swimming Pool($159,530); Hazardous Materials($250,000); Flooring Systems($255,202); Paving($115,777); HVAC($78,976);	g	$859,485.00	
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	Antioch Middle	61/61648-00-0029	Paving($25,674); Restroom Partitions($8,723); Paving($192,562); HVAC($47,818); Hazardous Materials($33,175);	g	$307,952.00	
				Antioch Unified Total State Apportionments		**$1,723,888.00**	
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	McKinley Elementary	61/73437-00-0210	Windows/Doors/Gates($4,620); Flooring Systems($4,611);	g	$9,231.00	
				Compton Unified Total State Apportionments		**$9,231.00**	
Monterey	Soledad Unified	Gabilan Elementary	61/75440-00-0002	Paving($181,340); Paving($34,302); Roofing($143,248);	g	$358,890.00	$ 5,000
Monterey	Soledad Unified	Main Street Middle	61/75440-00-0003	Paving($644,639);	g	$644,639.00	$ 5,000
Monterey	Soledad Unified	San Vicente Elementary	61/75440-00-0004	Paving($306,656); Paving($23,830); Roofing($146,502);	g	$476,988.00	$ 5,000
Monterey	Soledad Unified	Soledad High	61/75440-00-0005	Paving($160,008);	g	$160,008.00	$ 3,137
Monterey	Soledad Unified	Ledesma (Frank) Elementary	61/75440-00-0006	Paving($621,057);	g	$621,057.00	$ 5,000
				Soledad Unified Total State Apportionments		**$2,261,582.00**	
Orange	Orange Unified	Handy Elementary	61/66621-00-0070	Flooring Systems($198,966);	g	$198,966.00	
				Orange Unified Total State Apportionments		**$198,966.00**	
Riverside	Coachella Valley Joint Unified	Mecca Elementary	61/73676-00-0097	Structural Damage($119,234);	e-r	$119,234.00	

*Application type 'g' identifies requests for grant funding for projects that have not been completed
Application type 'e-r' identifies requests for reimbursement funding for projects that have been completed

ATTACHMENT
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	Types of Projects	Apport. Type*	LEA Total State Apportionment	Admin Filing Fees (Included in total)
Riverside	Coachella Valley Joint Unified	Coachella Valley High	61/73676-00-0098	Paving($21,709);	e-r	$21,709.00	
				Coachella Valley Joint Unified Total State Apportionments		**$140,943.00**	
Riverside	Desert Sands Unified	Madison (James) Elementary	61/67058-00-0011	HVAC($552,306);	g	$552,306.00	
				Desert Sands Unified Total State Apportionments		**$552,306.00**	
Riverside	San Jacinto Unified	San Jacinto High	61/67249-00-0023	Windows/Doors/Gates($7,797); Windows/Doors/Gates($1,234); Paving($23,000);	e-r	$32,031.00	
Riverside	San Jacinto Unified	Estudillo (Jose Antonio) Elementary	61/67249-00-0024	Plumbing($3,750); Windows/Doors/Gates($1,300);	e-r	$5,050.00	
Riverside	San Jacinto Unified	Park Hill Elementary	61/67249-00-0025	Paving($31,950);	e-r	$31,950.00	
				San Jacinto Unified Total State Apportionments		**$69,031.00**	
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Bonnheim (Joseph) Elementary	61/67439-00-0267	Flooring Systems($33,538);	g	$33,538.00	$ 515
				Sacramento City Unified Total State Apportionments		**$33,538.00**	
San Diego	San Diego Unified	Logan Elementary	61/68338-00-0289	Kitchen Equipment($4,550); Plumbing($2,788); HVAC($1,043); Fire Detection/Alarm and/or Sprinkler System($992); Graffiti Removal($725); Windows/Doors/Gates($368); Electrical($298); Roofing($94);	e-r	$10,858.00	
San Diego	San Diego Unified	Clairemont Senior High	61/68338-00-0290	Windows/Doors/Gates($8,949); Paving($5,950); Graffiti Removal($5,374); HVAC($4,255); Plumbing($3,919); Electrical($3,030); Flooring Systems($1,885); Kitchen Equipment($700); Roofing($684); Siding/Fences($630); Cafeteria Tables($414); Ceiling System($155);	e-r	$35,945.00	

*Application type 'g' identifies requests for grant funding for projects that have not been completed
Application type 'e-r' identifies requests for reimbursement funding for projects that have been completed

ATTACHMENT
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	Types of Projects	Apport. Type*	LEA Total State Apportionment	Admin Filing Fees (Included in total)
San Diego	San Diego Unified	School of Multimedia & Visual Arts at Crawford	61/68338-00-0291	Kitchen Equipment($1,795); Siding/Fences($1,146); Ceiling System($965); Paving($952); Restroom Partitions($755); Refrigerator/Freezer($681); Hazardous Materials($569); Flooring Systems($66);	e-r	$6,929.00	
San Diego	San Diego Unified	School of Law & Business	61/68338-00-0292	Roofing($16,190); Graffiti Removal($11,929); Windows/Doors/Gates($11,386); Bleachers($9,192); Restroom Partitions($755); Refrigerator/Freezer($681); Hazardous Materials($569); Flooring Systems($66);	e-r	$50,768.00	
				San Diego Unified Total State Apportionments		**$104,500.00**	
Santa Clara	Alum Rock Union Elementary	Goss (Mildred) Elementary	61/69369-00-0023	Electrical($4,025); Fire Detection/Alarm and/or Sprinkler System($7,732); Flooring Systems($399); HVAC($856); Plumbing($3,706); Roofing($192); Structural Damage($371); Wall Systems($216); Windows/Doors/Gates($821); Graffiti Removal($550);	e-r	$18,868.00	
Santa Clara	Alum Rock Union Elementary	Hubbard (O. S.) Elementary	61/69369-00-0024	Electrical($7,060); Fire Detection/Alarm and/or Sprinkler System($3,191); HVAC($1,586); Plumbing($2,550); Roofing($370); Structural Damage($295); Wall Systems($133); Windows/Doors/Gates($864); Graffiti Removal($508);	e-r	$16,557.00	
				Alum Rock Union Elementary Total State Apportionments		**$35,425.00**	
Sonoma	Santa Rosa Elementary	Monroe (James) Elementary	61/70912-00-0028	Roofing($166,075);	g	$166,075.00	$ 3,256
Sonoma	Santa Rosa Elementary	Monroe (James) Elementary	61/70912-00-0029	HVAC($210,708);	g	$210,708.00	$ 4,132
				Santa Rosa Elementary Total State Apportionments		**$376,783.00**	

*Application type 'g' identifies requests for grant funding for projects that have not been completed
Application type 'e-r' identifies requests for reimbursement funding for projects that have been completed

ATTACHMENT
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	Types of Projects	Apport. Type*	LEA Total State Apportionment	Admin Filing Fees (Included in total)
Tulare	Cutler-orosi Joint Unified	Orosi High	61/71860-00-0141	Gym/Hall Lockers($91,606);	e-r	$91,606.00	
				Cutler-orosi Joint Unified Total State Apportionments		**$91,606.00**	
Tulare	Lindsay Unified	Jefferson Elementary	61/71993-00-0073	Flooring Systems($48,007);	g	$48,007.00	
				Lindsay Unified Total State Apportionments		**$48,007.00**	
Tulare	Richgrove Elementary	Richgrove Elementary	61/72082-00-0006	Roofing($16,320);	g	$16,320.00	$ 320
Tulare	Richgrove Elementary	Richgrove Elementary	61/72082-00-0007	Plumbing($81,600);	g	$81,600.00	$ 1,600
Tulare	Richgrove Elementary	Richgrove Elementary	61/72082-00-0008	Accessibility($6,333);	g	$6,333.00	$ 124
				Richgrove Elementary Total State Apportionments		**$104,253.00**	
				GRAND TOTAL		**$ 5,750,059**	

*Application type 'g' identifies requests for grant funding for projects that have not been completed
Application type 'e-r' identifies requests for reimbursement funding for projects that have been completed

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM GRANT ADJUSTMENTS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To correct grant apportionments for the attached listing of Emergency Repair Program (ERP) projects.

DESCRIPTION

The Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) listed on the Attachment have submitted the required *Expenditure Reports* (Form SAB 61-04) upon completion of their projects. The State Allocation Board (Board) previously approved adjustments to the project apportionments in recognition of reported project savings and/or the accrual of interest. The Attachment includes 5 ERP applications that require minor adjustments to the apportionment, savings, and/or interest amounts previously recognized and approved by the Board. The adjustments will not result in any amounts due by school districts.

The purpose of this item is to request the Board make adjustments, as listed on the Attachment, to the apportionment, savings, and interest amounts previously recognized and approved by the Board.

AUTHORITY

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 2, Section 1859.330, states in part, that when expenditures have been determined to be less than the ERP funded grant, the apportionment for ERP funding should be reduced (adjusted) by the amount of the savings and any interest earned.

CCR Title 2, Section 1859.324.1(a), states in part, that when adjustments to apportionments are established, collection procedures must be initiated.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the adjustments for the ERP applications listed on the Attachment.

ATTACHMENT

EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM GRANT ADJUSTMENTS
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

County	School District	Site	Application Number	Current LEA Total State Apportionment	Current Application Savings	Current Application Interest	Adjustment to LEA Total State Apportionment	Adjustment to Application Savings	Adjustment to Application Interest	Final LEA Total State Apportionment	Final Application Savings	Final Application Interest
Kings	Hanford Elementary	Monroe Elementary	61/63917-00-0014	$ 11,519.00	$ 7,161.88	$ 426.00	$ 0.12	$ -	$ -	$ 11,519.12	$ 7,161.88	$ 426.00
Tulare	Woodlake Union Elementary	White (francis J.) Learning Center	61/72272-00-0008	$ 531,248.65	$ 1,322.00	$ 8,347.00	$ 0.35	$ -	$ -	$ 531,249.00	$ 1,322.00	$ 8,347.00
San Bernardino	Fontana Unified	Redwood Elementary	61/67710-00-0005	$ 15,097.50	$ -	$ 187.00	$ 0.50	$ -	$ -	$ 15,098.00	$ -	$ 187.00
Humboldt	Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified	Hoopa Valley High	61/62901-00-0028	$ 1,169,020.00	$ 54,863.07	$ 47,820.09	$ (0.07)	$ -	$ -	$ 1,169,019.93	$ 54,863.07	$ 47,820.09
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	Garfield (james A.) Senior High	61/64733-00-3763	$ 63,815.00	$ 4,234.00	$ 233.00	$ -	$ -	$ (0.35)	$ 63,815.00	$ 4,234.00	$ 232.65

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 25, 2016

EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM GRANT ADJUSTMENTS - SAVINGS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To reduce grant apportionments for the attached listing of Emergency Repair Program (ERP) projects.

DESCRIPTION

The Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) listed on the Attachment A and Attachment B have submitted the required *Expenditure Reports* (Form SAB 61-04) that indicate expenditures are less than the ERP funded grant (savings). In addition, any interest earned on the reported savings has been verified.

The Attachment A includes 95 ERP applications that require adjustments, for which the districts have submitted a check with the total amount to be returned.
The Attachment B includes 10 ERP applications that require adjustments, for which the districts have not yet submitted a check with the total amount to be returned.

AUTHORITY

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 2, Section 1859.330, states in part, that when expenditures have been determined to be less than the ERP funded grant, the apportionment for ERP funding should be reduced (adjusted) by the amount of the savings and any interest earned.

CCR Title 2, Section 1859.324.1(a), states in part, that when adjustments to apportionments are established, collection procedures must be initiated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reduce the grant apportionments by the savings and interest earned for the ERP applications listed on both Attachment A and Attachment B.

2. Require the LEAs to return State Funds as indicated on the Attachment B.

ATTACHMENT A
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM - Grant Fund Adjustments - Accepting Payments of Savings
State Allocation Board Meeting - May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	State Apportionment	Expenditures	Savings	Interest	Total funds returned to the state	Adjusted Apportionment
Fresno	Parlier Unified	Chavez (Cesar E.) Elementary	61/62364-00-0009	$ 893,226.00	$ 576,190.43	$ 317,035.57	$ 6,295.86	$ 323,331.43	$ 576,190.43
Fresno	Parlier Unified	Parlier High	61/62364-00-0010	$ 56,044.00	$ 43,677.04	$ 12,366.96	$ 289.16	$ 12,656.12	$ 43,677.04
Fresno	Parlier Unified	Martinez Elementary	61/62364-00-0011	$ 490,394.00	$ 293,296.10	$ 197,097.90	$ 3,841.81	$ 200,939.71	$ 293,296.10
Fresno	West Park Elementary	West Park Elementary	61/62539-00-0004	$ 56,705.00	$ 55,594.00	$ 1,111.00	$ -	$ 1,111.00	$ 55,594.00
Glenn	Hamilton Union Elementary	Hamilton Elementary	61/62570-00-0002	$ 277,941.00	$ 270,732.56	$ 7,208.44	$ 618.90	$ 7,827.34	$ 270,732.56
Kings	Hanford Elementary	King (Martin Luther, Jr.) Elementary	61/63917-00-0016	$ 840,825.00	$ 839,541.46	$ 1,283.54	$ 3,679.55	$ 4,963.09	$ 839,541.46
Monterey	Salinas City Elementary	Sherwood Elementary	61/66142-00-0014	$ 477,830.00	$ 441,003.00	$ 36,827.00	$ 3,584.00	$ 40,411.00	$ 441,003.00
Monterey	Salinas City Elementary	Roosevelt Elementary	61/66142-00-0019	$ 1,102,740.00	$ 917,088.00	$ 185,652.00	$ 8,271.00	$ 193,923.00	$ 917,088.00
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Valley High	61/66670-00-0018	$ 106,811.00	$ 104,184.11	$ 2,626.89	$ 52.61	$ 2,679.50	$ 104,184.11
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Valley High	61/66670-00-0019	$ 46,137.00	$ 40,840.42	$ 5,296.58	$ 27.24	$ 5,323.82	$ 40,840.42
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Valley High	61/66670-00-0020	$ 89,467.00	$ 83,162.15	$ 6,304.85	$ 38.75	$ 6,343.60	$ 83,162.15
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Saddleback High	61/66670-00-0022	$ 3,282,007.00	$ 3,281,030.97	$ 976.03	$ -	$ 976.03	$ 3,281,030.97
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Adams Elementary	61/66670-00-0026	$ 169,527.00	$ 166,428.84	$ 3,098.16	$ 309.49	$ 3,407.65	$ 166,428.84
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Fremont Elementary	61/66670-00-0030	$ 3,126,553.00	$ 2,601,591.55	$ 524,961.45	$ 4,106.78	$ 529,068.23	$ 2,601,591.55
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Saddleback High	61/66670-00-0031	$ 175,886.00	$ 175,717.34	$ 168.66	$ 370.97	$ 539.63	$ 175,717.34
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Willard Intermediate	61/66670-00-0034	$ 44,771.00	$ 44,768.06	$ 2.94	$ 0.01	$ 2.95	$ 44,768.06
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Hoover Elementary	61/66670-00-0036	$ 1,975,349.00	$ 1,566,788.81	$ 408,560.19	$ 2,186.06	$ 410,746.25	$ 1,566,788.81
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Lathrop (Julia C.) Intermediate	61/66670-00-0049	$ 1,412,536.00	$ 1,211,547.91	$ 200,988.09	$ 4,845.01	$ 205,833.10	$ 1,211,547.91
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Adams Elementary	61/66670-00-0061	$ 210,007.00	$ 207,757.05	$ 2,249.95	$ 864.31	$ 3,114.26	$ 207,757.05
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Martin Elementary	61/66670-00-0064	$ 1,930,724.00	$ 941,175.09	$ 989,548.91	$ 8,353.19	$ 997,902.10	$ 941,175.09
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Remington (Frederick) Elementary	61/66670-00-0065	$ 1,366,904.00	$ 583,966.44	$ 782,937.56	$ 6,037.97	$ 788,975.53	$ 583,966.44
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	Roosevelt (Theodore) Elementary	61/66670-00-0066	$ 685,738.00	$ 370,523.24	$ 315,214.76	$ 2,911.75	$ 318,126.51	$ 370,523.24
Riverside	Alvord Unified	Norte Vista High	61/66977-00-0240	$ 14,685.00	$ -	$ 14,685.00	$ 231.81	$ 14,916.81	$ -
Riverside	Coachella Valley Joint Unified	Cahuilla Desert Academy (Jr. High)	61/73676-00-0085	$ 6,311.00	$ -	$ 6,311.00	$ -	$ 6,311.00	$ -
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Moreno Valley High	61/67124-00-0011	$ 202,941.00	$ 193,741.00	$ 9,200.00	$ 53.63	$ 9,253.63	$ 193,741.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Butterfield Elementary	61/67124-00-0013	$ 308,895.00	$ 303,367.39	$ 5,527.61	$ 30.65	$ 5,558.26	$ 303,367.39
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Badger Springs Middle	61/67124-00-0023	$ 557,623.00	$ 547,452.43	$ 10,170.57	$ 181.71	$ 10,352.28	$ 547,452.43
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Armada Elementary	61/67124-00-0024	$ 501,668.00	$ 488,370.01	$ 13,297.99	$ 184.20	$ 13,482.19	$ 488,370.01
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Butterfield Elementary	61/67124-00-0025	$ 476,486.00	$ 450,959.91	$ 25,526.09	$ 235.71	$ 25,761.80	$ 450,959.91
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Creekside Elementary	61/67124-00-0026	$ 415,378.00	$ 405,962.00	$ 9,416.00	$ 144.90	$ 9,560.90	$ 405,962.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Sunnymead Middle	61/67124-00-0027	$ 569,377.00	$ 528,007.70	$ 41,369.30	$ 567.74	$ 41,937.04	$ 528,007.70
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Serrano Elementary	61/67124-00-0032	$ 81,485.00	$ 79,117.73	$ 2,367.27	$ 271.25	$ 2,638.52	$ 79,117.73
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Sunnymead Elementary	61/67124-00-0033	$ 321,380.00	$ 298,681.00	$ 22,699.00	$ 316.18	$ 23,015.18	$ 298,681.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Honey Hollow Elementary	61/67124-00-0034	$ 366,333.00	$ 348,125.00	$ 18,208.00	$ 322.52	$ 18,530.52	$ 348,125.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Edgemont Elementary	61/67124-00-0035	$ 419,913.00	$ 380,899.00	$ 39,014.00	$ 412.23	$ 39,426.23	$ 380,899.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Vista del Lago High	61/67124-00-0059	$ 9,416.00	$ 9,416.90	$ (0.90)	$ 4.34	$ 3.44	$ 9,416.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Sunnymead Middle	61/67124-00-0060	$ 15,484.00	$ 15,483.87	$ 0.13	$ 2.23	$ 2.36	$ 15,483.87
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Moreno Valley High	61/67124-00-0063	$ 14,382.00	$ 14,381.28	$ 0.72	$ 6.63	$ 7.35	$ 14,381.28
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Honey Hollow Elementary	61/67124-00-0066	$ 5,200.00	$ 5,200.22	$ (0.22)	$ 2.40	$ 2.18	$ 5,200.00

ATTACHMENT A
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM - Grant Fund Adjustments - Accepting Payments of Savings
State Allocation Board Meeting - May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	State Apportionment	Expenditures	Savings	Interest	Total funds returned to the state	Adjusted Apportionment
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Butterfield Elementary	61/67124-00-0069	$ 6,011.00	$ 6,011.09	$ (0.09)	$ 2.77	$ 2.68	$ 6,011.00
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	Badger Springs Middle	61/67124-00-0070	$ 47,901.00	$ 47,900.78	$ 0.22	$ 26.07	$ 26.29	$ 47,900.78
Sacramento	River Delta Joint Unified	Isleton Elementary	61/67413-00-0006	$ 54,425.00	$ 51,239.72	$ 3,185.28	$ 14.72	$ 3,200.00	$ 51,239.72
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento Charter High	61/67439-00-0096	$ 5,556.00	$ 5,176.44	$ 379.56	$ -	$ 379.56	$ 5,176.44
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Wood (Will C.) Middle	61/67439-00-0100	$ 141,327.00	$ 47,205.87	$ 94,121.13	$ 155.72	$ 94,276.85	$ 47,205.87
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Burbank (Luther) High	61/67439-00-0101	$ 537,231.00	$ 530,963.85	$ 6,267.15	$ 11.25	$ 6,278.40	$ 530,963.85
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Bacon (Fern) Middle	61/67439-00-0113	$ 287,335.00	$ 256,146.22	$ 31,188.78	$ 239.87	$ 31,428.65	$ 256,146.22
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Twain (Mark) Elementary	61/67439-00-0114	$ 38,499.00	$ 33,315.55	$ 5,183.45	$ 35.56	$ 5,219.01	$ 33,315.55
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Bacon (Fern) Middle	61/67439-00-0115	$ 94,578.00	$ 82,211.95	$ 12,366.05	$ 43.78	$ 12,409.83	$ 82,211.95
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Goethe (Charles M.) Middle	61/67439-00-0116	$ 34,196.00	$ 22,466.92	$ 11,729.08	$ 32.99	$ 11,762.07	$ 22,466.92
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Johnson (Hiram W.) High	61/67439-00-0117	$ 3,021,961.00	$ 2,832,197.03	$ 189,763.97	$ 1,018.79	$ 190,782.76	$ 2,832,197.03
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Johnson (Hiram W.) High	61/67439-00-0118	$ 809,586.00	$ 785,376.19	$ 24,209.81	$ 264.02	$ 24,473.83	$ 785,376.19
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Tahoe Elementary	61/67439-00-0119	$ 264,366.00	$ 247,044.51	$ 17,321.49	$ 93.00	$ 17,414.49	$ 247,044.51
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Alice Birney Waldorf-Inspired K-8 (for	61/67439-00-0120	$ 45,729.00	$ 31,257.79	$ 14,471.21	$ 45.58	$ 14,516.79	$ 31,257.79
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Morse (John F.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0121	$ 27,767.00	$ 18,399.28	$ 9,367.72	$ 13.62	$ 9,381.34	$ 18,399.28
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Morse (John F.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0122	$ 47,963.00	$ 33,085.42	$ 14,877.58	$ 21.04	$ 14,898.62	$ 33,085.42
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Harkness (H.W.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0123	$ 85,728.00	$ 59,941.97	$ 25,786.03	$ 81.79	$ 25,867.82	$ 59,941.97
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Tahoe Elementary	61/67439-00-0124	$ 71,437.00	$ 46,401.15	$ 25,035.85	$ 74.78	$ 25,110.63	$ 46,401.15
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Wire (Clayton B.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0125	$ 2,503,717.00	$ 825,935.36	$ 1,677,781.64	$ 2,253.44	$ 1,680,035.08	$ 825,935.36
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Wire (Clayton B.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0126	$ 206,100.00	$ 110,339.80	$ 95,760.20	$ 165.03	$ 95,925.23	$ 110,339.80
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Wire (Clayton B.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0127	$ 432,989.00	$ 230,606.32	$ 202,382.68	$ 347.98	$ 202,730.66	$ 230,606.32
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento Charter High	61/67439-00-0128	$ 695,266.00	$ 594,585.37	$ 100,680.63	$ 309.36	$ 100,989.99	$ 594,585.37
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento Charter High	61/67439-00-0129	$ 1,202,404.00	$ 1,030,025.65	$ 172,378.35	$ 404.36	$ 172,782.71	$ 1,030,025.65
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Wire (Clayton B.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0131	$ 47,705.00	$ 39,966.16	$ 7,738.84	$ 23.94	$ 7,762.78	$ 39,966.16
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Carson (Kit) Middle	61/67439-00-0132	$ 39,663.00	$ 35,032.35	$ 4,630.65	$ 18.42	$ 4,649.07	$ 35,032.35
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Capital City (Independent Study)	61/67439-00-0133	$ 951,022.00	$ 607,342.02	$ 343,679.98	$ 431.94	$ 344,111.92	$ 607,342.02
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento Charter High	61/67439-00-0136	$ 73,756.00	$ 60,184.50	$ 13,571.50	$ 14.25	$ 13,585.75	$ 60,184.50
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Rosa Parks Middle (Formerly Goethe	61/67439-00-0137	$ 9,694.00	$ 9,361.33	$ 332.67	$ -	$ 332.67	$ 9,361.33
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento Charter High	61/67439-00-0140	$ 2,249,560.00	$ 1,819,487.40	$ 430,072.60	$ 1,246.52	$ 431,319.12	$ 1,819,487.40
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Rosa Parks Middle (formerly C.M.Go	61/67439-00-0141	$ 1,400,328.00	$ 1,213,526.28	$ 186,801.72	$ 634.79	$ 187,436.51	$ 1,213,526.28
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Sloat (John D.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0142	$ 105,513.00	$ 87,817.31	$ 17,695.69	$ 19.34	$ 17,715.03	$ 87,817.31
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Morse (John F.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0146	$ 39,640.00	$ 9,226.19	$ 30,413.81	$ 41.85	$ 30,455.66	$ 9,226.19
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Bacon (Fern) Middle	61/67439-00-0148	$ 61,669.00	$ 58,511.12	$ 3,157.88	$ 17.54	$ 3,175.42	$ 58,511.12
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Tahoe Elementary	61/67439-00-0150	$ 406,285.00	$ 381,339.68	$ 24,945.32	$ 138.65	$ 25,083.97	$ 381,339.68
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0152	$ 502,689.00	$ 435,714.11	$ 66,974.89	$ 258.82	$ 67,233.71	$ 435,714.11
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0153	$ 237,796.00	$ 217,945.03	$ 19,850.97	$ 151.45	$ 20,002.42	$ 217,945.03
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0154	$ 89,946.00	$ 76,096.26	$ 13,849.74	$ 49.36	$ 13,899.10	$ 76,096.26
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Capital City (Independent Study)	61/67439-00-0157	$ 49,261.00	$ 46,610.83	$ 2,650.17	$ 13.84	$ 2,664.01	$ 46,610.83
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0160	$ 104,781.00	$ 89,820.77	$ 14,960.23	$ 59.73	$ 15,019.96	$ 89,820.77

ATTACHMENT A
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM - Grant Fund Adjustments - Accepting Payments of Savings
State Allocation Board Meeting - May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	State Apportionment	Expenditures	Savings	Interest	Total funds returned to the state	Adjusted Apportionment
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0161	$ 101,760.00	$ 92,139.65	$ 9,620.35	$ 52.58	$ 9,672.93	$ 92,139.65
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0162	$ 64,327.00	$ 56,414.87	$ 7,912.13	$ 12.98	$ 7,925.11	$ 56,414.87
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0163	$ 48,780.00	$ 14,909.28	$ 33,870.72	$ 39.76	$ 33,910.48	$ 14,909.28
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Parkway Elementary	61/67439-00-0164	$ 163,952.00	$ 130,215.19	$ 33,736.81	$ 87.25	$ 33,824.06	$ 130,215.19
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Birney (Alice) Elementary	61/67439-00-0165	$ 104,348.00	$ 33,437.04	$ 70,910.96	$ 109.68	$ 71,020.64	$ 33,437.04
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Harkness (H.W.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0166	$ 12,257.00	$ 9,279.57	$ 2,977.43	$ 6.90	$ 2,984.33	$ 9,279.57
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Still (John H.) Elementary	61/67439-00-0167	$ 730,121.00	$ 703,357.48	$ 26,763.52	$ 281.44	$ 27,044.96	$ 703,357.48
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Smith (Jedediah) Elementary	61/67439-00-0168	$ 190,872.00	$ 170,979.49	$ 19,892.51	$ 118.30	$ 20,010.81	$ 170,979.49
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Smith (Jedediah) Elementary	61/67439-00-0169	$ 235,804.00	$ 62,945.20	$ 172,858.80	$ 282.92	$ 173,141.72	$ 62,945.20
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Carson (Kit) Middle	61/67439-00-0227	$ 5,462.00	$ -	$ 5,462.00	$ 9.19	$ 5,471.19	$ -
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	Carson (Kit) Middle	61/67439-00-0271	$ 198,225.00	$ 158,283.82	$ 39,941.18	$ 123.90	$ 40,065.08	$ 158,283.82
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair Elementary	Vineyard Elementary	61/67819-00-0102	$ 22,413.00	$ 21,413.00	$ 1,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000.00	$ 21,413.00
San Joaquin	New Hope Elementary	New Hope Elementary	61/68619-00-0001	$ 229,065.00	$ 88,431.33	$ 140,633.67	$ 682.43	$ 141,316.10	$ 88,431.33
Santa Clara	East Side Union High	Overfelt (William C.) High	61/69427-00-0003	$ 1,280,576.00	$ 1,191,198.75	$ 89,377.25	$ -	$ 89,377.25	$ 1,191,198.75
Santa Clara	East Side Union High	Yerba Buena High	61/69427-00-0005	$ 1,287,683.00	$ 1,111,565.66	$ 176,117.34	$ -	$ 176,117.34	$ 1,111,565.66
Sonoma	Santa Rosa Elementary	Monroe (James) Elementary	61/70912-00-0023	$ 127,011.00	$ -	$ 127,011.00	$ -	$ 127,011.00	$ -
Sonoma	Santa Rosa Elementary	Santa Rosa Charter School for the Ar	61/70912-00-0025	$ 292,119.00	$ -	$ 292,119.00	$ -	$ 292,119.00	$ -
Tulare	Porterville Unified	Vandalia Elementary	61/75523-00-0002	$ 439,210.00	$ 356,314.40	$ 82,895.60	$ 5,469.49	$ 88,365.09	$ 356,314.40
				Totals	**$ 36,202,470**	**$ 9,467,974.90**	**$ 75,704.12**	**$ 9,543,679.02**	

ATTACHMENT B
EMERGENCY REPAIR PROGRAM - Grant Fund Adjustments - Require the Districts to Return Savings
State Allocation Board Meeting - May 25, 2016

County	Local Educational Agency (LEA)	Site	Application Number	State Apportionment	Expenditures	Savings	Interest	Total funds to be returned to the state	Adjusted Apportionment
Fresno	Fresno Unified	Del Mar Elementary	61/62166-00-0701	$ 124,823.00	$ 19,544.54	$ 105,278.46	$ -	$ 105,278.46	$ 19,544.54
San Bernardin	Ontario-Montclair Elementary	Vineyard Elementary	61/67819-00-0102	$ 22,413.00	$ 21,413.00	$ 1,000.00	$ -	$ 1,000.00	$ 21,413.00
Fresno	Golden Plains Unified	Tranquillity Elementary	61/75234-00-0025	$ 485,520.00	$ 485,520.00	$ -	$ 3,675.49	$ 3,675.49	$ 485,520.00
Los Angeles	Lennox Elementary	Felton Elementary	61/64709-00-0014	$ 743,271.00	$ 631,534.95	$ 111,736.05	$ -	$ 111,736.05	$ 631,534.95
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Bunche Middle	61/73437-00-0098	$ 212,855.00	$ 132,601.02	$ 80,253.98	$ -	$ 80,253.98	$ 132,601.02
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Bunche Middle	61/73437-00-0099	$ 1,003,224.00	$ 980,626.52	$ 22,597.48	$ -	$ 22,597.48	$ 980,626.52
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Bunche Middle	61/73437-00-0105	$ 396,289.00	$ 391,645.13	$ 4,643.87	$ -	$ 4,643.87	$ 391,645.13
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Davis Middle	61/73437-00-0114	$ 113,771.00	$ 83,548.61	$ 30,222.39	$ -	$ 30,222.39	$ 83,548.61
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	Anderson Elementary	61/73437-00-0218	$ 118,323.00	$ 102,999.21	$ 15,323.79	$ -	$ 15,323.79	$ 102,999.21
Los Angeles	Pasadena Unified	Washington Middle	61/64881-00-0039	$ 59,993.00	$ 33,405.44	$ 26,587.56	$ -	$ 26,587.56	$ 33,405.44
				Totals	**$ 2,882,838.42**	**$ 397,643.58**	**$ 3,675.49**	**$ 401,319.07**	

Facility Hardship / Rehabilitation Program

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

School District: …….....BRAWLEY UNION HIGH
County:……..…..IMPERIAL
Application Number:…….…….58/63081-00-002
School Name:…….....BRAWLEY HIGH
Total District Enrollment:…….…….…….1,878
Project Grade Level:……...……..……..…..…..9-12
Financial Hardship:……..……..……..……..……..……..……NO

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Type of Request	State Allocation Board (Board) approval for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) for a School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship Seismic Mitigation Program (SMP) rehabilitation project.
Total Project Cost	$ 1,718,362
Cost to the State	$ 859,181

DESCRIPTION

Description of Health and Safety Threat	The Palmer Auditorium at Brawley High School located in Brawley, California is categorized as the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Building Type. The building was originally constructed between 1947 and 1948. In early Spring 2013, a licensed structural engineer prepared a structural evaluation for this building which identified critical deficiencies in the building's wall, floor, and roof systems. The Division of the State Architect (DSA) concurred with the presence of the threat of a local or global collapse of the facilities in the event of seismic activity, as outlined in the structural engineer's report.
Scope of Project	The scope of the project included structural repairs to the wall, floor and roof systems.
Status of School Site	The project has been completed and the building is occupied.

QUALIFYING CRITERIA

Government/State Level Concurrence	DSA approved the Brawley High Palmer Auditorium for SMP eligibility, evaluated and approved the seismic mitigation work, and issued plan approval.
Site Visit Completed by Staff	Yes
Staff Supports the District's Request	Yes

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A.

(Continued on Page Two)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the District's request for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) for SMP rehabilitation funding for the Palmer Auditorium on the Brawley High site, pursuant to the SFP Regulation Section 1859.82, as provided on Attachment B.

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

ATTACHMENT A

AUTHORITY

Education Code (EC) 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 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.

EC Section 17075.10(b)(2) states:

> 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "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."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for Facility Hardship grant funding when, "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…seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings as verified by the DSA…."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(A) states:

> 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(B) states:

> 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.

ATTACHMENT A

AUTHORITY (CONT.)

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(C) states:

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.

SAB Meeting: **May 25, 2016** **Seismic Mitigation Program - Adjusted Grant Approval**

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No:	58/63081-00-002	**County:**	Imperial
School District:	Brawley Union High	**School Name:**	Brawley High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High 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:**	17.85
Alternative Education School:	No	**Existing Acres:**	44.8

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA		PROJECT FINANCING	
Seismic Rehabilitation	761,319	**State Share**	
Project Assistance	6,504		
Small Size Project (12%)	$ 91,358	**This Project**	$ 859,181
Total State Share (50%)	859,181	**District Share**	
District Share (50%)	859,181	**Cash Contribution**	859,181
Total Project Cost	$ **1,718,362**	**Financial Hardship**	
		Total Project Cost	$ **1,718,362**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share					
New Construction/Additional Grant	**957-505**	**1D**	$	$ 859,181.00	$ 859,181.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution				859,181.00	
Total			$	$ **1,718,362.00**	$ **859,181.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.

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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014 repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works contract awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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 any and all project savings realized from the funding of this Seismic Mitigation Program project must be returned to the State.

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
APPROVAL ❖ ❖ ❖ May 25, 2016

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: ……MARYSVILLE JOINT UNIFIED	County:…….…….....YUBA
Application Number:…….…… 58/72736-00-001	School Name:……LINDHURST HIGH
Total District Enrollment:……..……..……9,647	Project Grade Level:……...…….….....9-12
Financial Hardship:……..…….……..….....NO	

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Type of Request	State Allocation Board (Board) approval for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) for a School Facility Program (SFP) Facility Hardship rehabilitation project.
Total Project Cost	$ 1,483,215
Cost to the State	$ 889,929

DESCRIPTION

Description of Health and Safety Threat	The Lindhurst High School's air cooling system for buildings C and F experienced a complete operational failure according to the industry specialist's report. This created a health and safety threat to the students occupying those buildings as internal temperatures in the classroom buildings were reaching highs in the 80s and 90s. The central chiller was beyond repair. The industry specialist recommended full replacement of the system. The Yuba County Health and Human Services Department (YCHHSD) has concurred that a health and safety threat exists.
Scope of Project	The scope consists of removal of the Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system and replacing it with two split HVAC units, one in each building. The work includes modification to the existing electrical power system in addition to structural work for the new HVAC equipment.
Status of School Site	The work commenced in November 2015 and it is anticipated to be completed by the summer of 2016.

QUALIFYING CRITERIA

Government/State Level Concurrence	The District has obtained concurrence with the hazards reported and with the proposed minimum work for rehabilitation from the YCHHSD.
Site Visit Completed by Staff	Staff has accepted the report by the industry specialist and the YCHHSD's approval in lieu of a site visit.
Staff Supports the District's Request	Yes

(Continued on Page Two)

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the District's request for placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) for Facility Hardship rehabilitation funding for the replacement of HVAC units in Buildings C and F at the Lindhurst High site pursuant to the SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e), as provided on Attachment B.

2. 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.

ATTACHMENT A

AUTHORITY

Education Code (EC) 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 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 states, "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.."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1) provides for Facility Hardship grant funding when, "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… adverse air quality emission or other health and safety risks…."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82(a)(1)(A) states:

> 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.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.83(e) provides for:

> Excessive Cost for rehabilitation of facilities the Board has determined are a health and safety risk to the pupils pursuant to Section 1859.82(a)(1) and the cost/benefit analysis to mitigate the problem and remain in the facility is less than 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost of the facility. 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 district qualifies, the district is eligible for funding of Rehabilitation Costs as a modernization project. …. If the Approved Application is received after April 29, 2002, 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. An additional grant may be provided for 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. For any project funded in whole or in part from Proposition 47 or Proposition 55 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 1859.78.1(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 1859.78.1(b) and subject to the limitations established in Section 1859.78.1(c).

SAB Meeting: **May 25, 2016** **Rehabilitation - Adjusted Grant Approval**

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

Application No:	58/72736-00-001	**County:**	Yuba
School District:	Marysville Joint Unified	**School Name:**	Lindhurst High

PROJECT DATA

Type of Project:	High 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:**	33
Alternative Education School:	No	**Existing Acres:**	34

ADJUSTED GRANT DATA	
Rehabilitation/Mitigation	$ 889,929.00
Total State Share (60%)	889,929.00
District Share (40%)	593,286.00
Total Project Cost	$ **1,483,215.00**

PROJECT FINANCING	
State Share	
This Project	$ 889,929.00
District Share	
Cash Contribution	593,286.00
Financial Hardship	
Total Project Cost	$ **1,483,215.00**

HISTORY OF PROJECT COST AND APPORTIONMENT

	Fund Code	Proposition	Previously Authorized	Authorized This Action	Unfunded Approval This Action
State Share					
Modernization/Additional Grant	**957-570**	**1D**		$ 889,929.00	$ 889,929.00
District Share					
Cash Contribution				593,286.00	
Total			$	$ **1,483,215.00**	$ **889,929.00**

Funding Source: Proposition 1D Bonds/2006-Nov.

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.

Senate Bill 854, Chapter 28, Statutes of 2014, repealed Labor Code (LC) Section 1771.3 which required school districts to provide payment to Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) for prevailing wage monitoring. As a result, school districts awarding a construction contract on or after June 20, 2014 are not mandated to provide payment for DIR monitoring and enforcement of prevailing wage requirements. Projects with an initial public works project awarded on or after June 20, 2014 are not eligible to receive an additional grant for prevailing wage monitoring; however, school districts are still required to notify DIR within five days of initial contract award pursuant to LC Section 1773.3(a)(1).

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 any and all project savings realized from the funding of this Facility Hardship Program project must be returned to the State.