

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CALIFORNIA STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
PUBLIC MEETING

STATE CAPITOL  
ROOM 4203  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2013  
TIME: 9:13 A.M.

Reported By: Mary Clark Transcribing  
4919 H Parkway  
Sacramento, CA 95823-3413  
(916) 428-6439  
marycclark13@comcast.net

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE PRESENT:

ESTEBAN ALMANZA, Chief Deputy Director, Department of General Services, designated representative for Fred Klass, Director, Department of General Services

CESAR DIAZ, Appointee of Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor of the State of California

KATHLEEN MOORE, Director, School Facilities Planning Division, California Department of Education, designated representative for Tom Torlakson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JOAN BUCHANAN

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CURT HAGMAN

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD PRESENT:

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer  
BILL SAVIDGE, Assistant Executive Officer

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION (OPSC) PRESENT:

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer  
JUAN MIRELES, Deputy Executive Officer

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

3

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Tina, go ahead.

4

MS. CURRY: I'll go ahead and start.

5

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yes.

6

7

MS. CURRY: Thank you very much for the opportunity to present before the Subcommittee today.

8

9

Again I'm Tina Curry and I represent the California Emergency Management Agency, and I oversee disaster

10

preparedness there.

11

12

So I thought I'd start off -- and I don't have slides, but we did provide like a one page that sort of goes through what I'm going to discuss, but it should feed nicely into what Department of Ed, one of our partner agencies, will be talking about.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I'll cover a little bit about what we do and sort of how things work and crisis management when something happens here in California and then we'll focus in more on specifics of school preparedness and school safety, which I really think is what you're interested in hearing about today.

22

23

24

25

Our office is a state agency and we're responsible for bringing together our state agency family to respond to a disaster in California. We're an all hazard state as you know, so we're worried about earthquakes, fires, floods, and

1 all the different entities that can be affected by those and  
2 of course our schools and the children of California that  
3 spend time there is a huge area of concern for us for all  
4 those factors.

5           So we're responsible for taking this charge of  
6 making sure that we're ready in particular in the area that  
7 I oversee.

8           A big part of that is to understand ahead of time  
9 and to plan how that system of support works. So disasters  
10 happen locally. First responders deal with those every day  
11 here in the state.

12           When they escalate to something larger, then  
13 there's a system that we've been working with for a long  
14 time in California of how you kind of escalate your  
15 assistance to support incidents that are larger than what  
16 could be handled locally and we use this for fires, floods,  
17 and incidents like active shooter than we'll get into a  
18 little bit later.

19           But that is first sort line of defense is up to  
20 the county level. So we work with our 58 counties in  
21 California to make sure that they're prepared to be sort of  
22 the surge support for local incidents.

23           Beyond the county, then the state comes in to help  
24 and Cal EMA has a unique authority to task any state agency  
25 to do something within or outside of their authority to help

1 out, whether that's law enforcement, fire, public health,  
2 anything that's needed to deal with the effects of an  
3 emergency.

4 We have that pretty dialed in in California. So  
5 it works really well as a surge capacity. And we practice  
6 that all the time.

7 We're also the link to the Federal Government. So  
8 when something is beyond what California can deal with, then  
9 we're the ones that are calling FEMA, the other federal  
10 agencies.

11 We have a great relationship with the private  
12 sector and businesses that work here in California and  
13 outside to bring in, you know, needed supplies and other  
14 assistance, so that has been a huge area for us to build  
15 on -- tribal governments, et cetera. So we really kind of  
16 are the link to that family of disaster response.

17 And the way we do that is through a structure  
18 called the Standardized Emergency Management System.

19 So everyone falls into what I like to refer to as  
20 a common organization chart that's trained from the very  
21 first responder level all the way up now to the federal  
22 national government.

23 They know what this means. They know what the  
24 different functions are and these are really what we've  
25 identified are key areas that have to be addressed to

1 respond to emergency; so what we call operations; planning  
2 and intelligence, which is your situation and information  
3 and intel as we call it; logistics which is things that are  
4 needed to respond whether it's equipment or people or  
5 information technology; and finance.

6           And that's all governed by a management structure.  
7 And again you'll see that organization chart at the first  
8 responder level at a police department all the way to, if we  
9 have a large catastrophic earthquake, fire/flood response  
10 that involves the Federal Government.

11           So that works nicely for us because it's commonly  
12 understood and it's easy because we've trained to that for  
13 other entities that don't work in that jurisdiction to fall  
14 into that organization.

15           So between our system of supporting counties up to  
16 the federal level and outside agencies and state agencies,  
17 using this common organization structure, that's really our  
18 system to deal with most things in California and it's  
19 worked really well for us and for all the disasters we've  
20 had historically.

21           So that sort of frames that and I want to kind of  
22 talk -- then tie that back to how that works for school  
23 preparedness.

24           We've worked with the Department of Ed as the lead  
25 agency for planning for schools for disaster planning, but,

1 you know, we have an all hazards approach to support our  
2 state partners as well as other jurisdictions in California.  
3 So we really work on this together.

4 Cal EMA working with CDE has published things like  
5 nonstructural earthquake guidance for some of the earthquake  
6 disasters we've had and historically there is -- you know,  
7 there is a program for the structural type of things needed  
8 for schools, but there's a lot of things like pendant  
9 lighting and computer equipment and what we call  
10 nonstructural that need to be attended to as well.

11 There are small things that can make a big  
12 difference in safety when an earthquake hazard happens. So  
13 we publish together a guidance that schools can -- you know,  
14 can look at. It's easy to follow instructions and they  
15 could make those relatively minor improvements based on this  
16 guidance that we've prepared and to make their schools  
17 safer.

18 We've also developed guidance on how to use the  
19 SEMS structure that I describe. What does that mean in a  
20 school environment. How do they organize themselves to  
21 respond to an incident, you know, thinking about their  
22 school personnel so that they can use SEMS, you know, that  
23 works well for first responders and public safety agencies  
24 at a school site.

25 So those are the types of things where Cal EMA has

1 I think a nice connection with Department of Ed to take what  
2 our expertise is and make that something that's available  
3 for schools.

4 We have a lot of things on our website. Our  
5 websites are linked to each other. So, you know, we try to  
6 make the information easily accessible.

7 So keeping that in mind, you know, we're always  
8 preparing for different kinds of disasters.

9 Many of us when the incidents happened in Newtown  
10 wanted to know, you know, what was the role of our agencies,  
11 what can we do, what can we -- you know, how can we take  
12 this lesson and apply that to California.

13 So right away after that happened in December,  
14 we -- our secretary worked with the Department of Ed and,  
15 you know, talked about -- started to think about how we can  
16 support school districts in California with what they needed  
17 to do different, what they needed to think to attend to, you  
18 know, even better school safety in light of this -- you  
19 know, this threat that I think all of us are concerned  
20 about.

21 So we, through our training and exercises  
22 program -- and again using this foundation of emergency  
23 management that we have -- designed an active shooter  
24 seminar. So it's really not new information. It's, you  
25 know, taking the expertise we have with our partner agencies

1 and operating this.

2           A lot of schools are doing this on their own which  
3 is fantastic. We're seeing a lot of other best practices  
4 from other states, but we wanted to make something available  
5 for them.

6           So we designed these seminars. They're locally  
7 based meaning the participation in the panel are local  
8 people that those school districts already know and already  
9 work with, but we wanted to give them a framework to come  
10 together, talk about the things they needed to talk about,  
11 and make their plans better.

12           And these have been very popular. We've had --  
13 we've got about 20 that have either taken place or are in  
14 the process. So they've kind of gained in popularity and  
15 they've been very successful.

16           We've got law enforcement, school representatives,  
17 emergency medical representatives sitting in a panel  
18 presentation, talking a little bit about the active shooter  
19 threat, but then really just spending some time to dialogue  
20 about what they would go through if an incident happened,  
21 what other steps, what kind of things are missing from their  
22 plans so they can work even better together.

23           We've had, you know, up to a couple hundred people  
24 attend from a wide array of organizations within that kind  
25 of school region area and, you know, again it's been an

1 opportunity for them to interact with the panel to, you  
2 know, again talk about what to do, what are the best  
3 practices, and how they better engage and then walk away  
4 from it able to enhance to their plans.

5           So that's really dealing with the kind of  
6 structure of response to an incident, which is different  
7 than the -- you know, the physical security part that I know  
8 we're discussing today, but I just wanted to kind of provide  
9 that background about what we do at Cal EMA, how we sort of  
10 take that response structure and sort of planning  
11 enhancement.

12           We're always, you know, trying to improve on that  
13 for the various hazards we have in California.

14           We have been able to I think provide something  
15 very useful for schools that's going to continue. We have  
16 things kind of booked out all the way till May and I hope to  
17 see more of that and more schools that will take advantage  
18 of this opportunity to hold these half-day seminars. It's  
19 not a huge time commitment.

20           So we really just want to learn from those, see  
21 how we can be more helpful, and continue to work with our  
22 partners at Department of Ed who I know -- and their  
23 presentation will go into a lot more detail about school  
24 disaster planning.

25           But I hope that provides just kind of an idea of

1 our system and how we've been able to flex it to help  
2 address this particular need right now for California  
3 schools.

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you. And, Diane, if  
5 you'd like to go ahead and -- you know, we're really trying  
6 to focus on the -- you know, as a result of the Newtown  
7 incident and what people are asking, we wanted a real --  
8 trying to focus on the -- what you call the active shooter.

9 MS. WATERS: Well, following the incident at Sandy  
10 Hook, as you can imagine, the California Department of  
11 Education received many, many, many phone calls and of  
12 course the media went crazy.

13 There were all kinds of ideas that were put out  
14 there, everything from armed guards on every school site and  
15 National Guardsmen and so on to arming teachers and  
16 administrators and using bulletproof glass everywhere,  
17 locking everything down, all kinds of things.

18 But most of these things are probably pretty  
19 unlikely to actually all by themselves to solve a problem  
20 like that.

21 Many of them are too expensive or impractical, you  
22 know, and so on.

23 We could build schools like prisons, but it's not  
24 really an environment that's conducive to educating kids.  
25 Is that really what we want to see.

1 I don't know if you've got my slides here, but --

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I do. Thank you.

3 MS. WATERS: Okay. So moving onto page 2, the  
4 Council for Educational Facilities Planners International  
5 held a security summit in February and Kathleen Moore  
6 attended on behalf of the California Department of Education  
7 and they focused on four different areas: infrastructure,  
8 staffing, operational procedures, and crisis communication  
9 because they recognize that this is an interdisciplinary --  
10 you know, it takes an interdisciplinary approach to solve of  
11 the security issues.

12 Well, so naturally Kathleen was involved with the  
13 infrastructure piece. They talked about first risk  
14 assessment, you know, to find potential vulnerabilities;  
15 creating a secure perimeter; controlled access, and that so  
16 the administration knows who's coming and going on the  
17 campus, making, you know, people sign it and that sort of  
18 thing; creating safe rooms and that's, you know, being able  
19 to lock the classrooms and that sort of thing; and then of  
20 course communication systems.

21 So CEFPI will provide a report on the findings of  
22 their school summit eventually, so that'll be available on  
23 their webpage.

24 Page 3: infrastructure and safe rooms was an area  
25 that we thought should be focused on. There's currently in

1 law: After July 1st, 2011, all classroom locks in new  
2 construction must be able to lock from within the classroom,  
3 but that was only for new construction not for existing  
4 classrooms.

5           There is currently SB316 which would amend this  
6 section of the Ed Code to require that these locks be  
7 installed for modernization as well.

8           The thing about these security classroom function  
9 locksets is that they cost about \$300 each. That's not  
10 including installation so about \$500 installed. And if you  
11 have to replace the door as well, that's another thousand  
12 dollars installed.

13           So, you know, if you consider the number of doors  
14 in a school, that could be quite costly.

15           Infrastructure and communication: Now the Ed Code  
16 requires that all classrooms that were built or modernized  
17 after 1999 be provided with phones and they can be wireless  
18 or hard-wired phone systems, but not all classrooms have  
19 been modernized since that date and so there are school --  
20 there are classrooms that don't necessarily have phones in  
21 them.

22           And even with the phone systems, there are  
23 potential drawbacks. Okay, so what kinds of notification --  
24 community systems are in schools. They have fire alarms,  
25 which are required, but that works great for fires. The

1 alarm is set, people exit the building. You don't  
2 necessarily want to use that for an active shooter kind of  
3 scenario because you need to lockdown.

4           There's a PA system. Now in older schools, they  
5 may have speakers and the microphone in the office and that  
6 kind of thing, but if the incident happens in the office,  
7 you know, can that information get out to the rest of the  
8 campus.

9           And in newer schools, oftentimes the phone system  
10 acts as their PA system which may not be out on the  
11 playground. So there may not be any way of communicating  
12 with the people who are out on the playground at any given  
13 time other than sending somebody out there unless they have  
14 walkie-talkies or wireless phones or that sort of thing.

15           Some schools use mass notification system for  
16 parents and students and at a recent presentation that I did  
17 on this topic, one of the school district people said that  
18 they had used that, but, for instance, the mass emails that  
19 were sent out were viewed as spam and people didn't get  
20 them.

21           So the voice -- yeah -- the voice mass  
22 notification worked pretty effectively, but the emails did  
23 not.

24           And of course with these communication systems,  
25 it's a local decision. So the systems are all very, very

1 different, you know, because of the differences in the  
2 school size and local community needs and that sort of  
3 thing.

4           So issues to consider with the communication  
5 system is will the phones work if there's a power failure or  
6 if the office phone is busy. So if it all goes through the  
7 office and the person in the office is on the phone, can  
8 other people call out.

9           And can a teacher call outside of the network or  
10 is it limited to the people in the office.

11           What if the office is where the emergency is  
12 taking place and will the system be overloaded with panicked  
13 parents calling in. So mass notification systems can kind  
14 of help alleviate some of that.

15           You know, you can say, okay, we've got this under  
16 control, please don't come. Otherwise the -- you know, the  
17 reaction is automatically that everybody swarms to the  
18 school and that happened at Sandy Hook in fact.

19           They blocked the fire department's ability to get  
20 there and that sort of thing.

21           So, you know, mass notification systems are pretty  
22 good for that.

23           And if there's a need for a lockdown and there's  
24 no speaker out on the playground where the kids are at  
25 recess, you know, is there an alternate system. Do you have

1 battery backups. Do you have walkie-talkies, you know,  
2 different kinds of communication systems or maybe even the  
3 old fashioned speaker, you know, like they had in the old  
4 days with the old PA systems.

5           Okay. Moving on to page 4. So this is - CPTED  
6 stands for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design and  
7 you can't prevent any crime entirely and an active shooter  
8 may not be, you know, stopped by this kind of thing, but the  
9 idea is that by the way that you design your campus, you can  
10 encourage certain kinds of behavior and discourage other  
11 kinds of behavior and generally by creating clear lines of  
12 sight and things of that sort, people aren't going to want  
13 to commit crimes where they think they're going to get  
14 caught, generally speaking.

15           So the four principles of CPTED are natural  
16 surveillance, natural access control, territorial  
17 reinforcement, and maintenance.

18           And so let me -- on page 5, I'll talk about  
19 natural surveillance a little.

20           The key to natural surveillance is really keeping  
21 clear lines of sight so that administrators, teachers,  
22 security personnel, even neighbors can see what's occurring.  
23 It works very well with cameras as well because then the  
24 cameras can hone in on, you know, actual areas of trouble,  
25 making -- they're not blocked by trees or other things, for

1 instance.

2           And there are no little hidden alcoves where a  
3 person can hide, you know, to commit crimes or to grab  
4 somebody.

5           The next principle of CPTED is natural access  
6 control and the idea behind that is that you funnel all the  
7 people coming onto the site after school is in session  
8 through the office and that kind of thing, make them check  
9 in and so on.

10           And even at Sandy Hook, they did do that. The  
11 problem was that he shot out the window. So I mean -- but  
12 they did have a lot of these systems already in place.  
13 That's why I say even with some of these principles, you're  
14 not going to entirely eliminate those kinds of problems.

15           The third is territorial reinforcement and that's  
16 not just putting up big high walls and fences and barbed  
17 wire and, you know, that kind of thing. It's also about  
18 creating a space that feels like a community asset that the  
19 neighbors watch out for it because it is a source of  
20 community pride too.

21           You create boundaries everybody knows and they  
22 feel ownership in that area.

23           And also it's about creating public areas that are  
24 clearly public areas. People know that they're allowed be  
25 there or not and then private spaces that have maybe more

1 secure areas.

2           Now moving on to maintenance, the broken window  
3 theory means that if a nuisance is allowed to continue that  
4 more will likely result.

5           You see that all the time, a wall that's covered  
6 in graffiti, you know, one graffiti is there and then pretty  
7 soon it's just covered if they don't paint over it right  
8 away.

9           So that's kind of the idea is that keeping these  
10 places well maintained is very critical to keep more of this  
11 kind of criminal behavior from happening.

12           Now that's not necessarily active shooter in  
13 particular, but you know that maintenance can affect a sense  
14 of pride in ownership and then the students and teachers  
15 don't feel valued and people become apathetic and that sort  
16 of thing.

17           So I mean it really does help. Also there is a  
18 14 percent reduced suspension rate -- this was a study out  
19 of New York -- in well-maintained buildings which I thought  
20 was rather interesting.

21           Beyond regulations -- so on page 7, we have some  
22 resources here. So we have a best practice kind of  
23 document. Actually it's a research document that's  
24 available on our webpage and it talks about some of these  
25 things -- some of these things that school districts can do

1 to help create a safer school environment and after that,  
2 I'm going to turn this over to Stephanie who's talking about  
3 the safety plan.

4 MS. PAPAS: Good morning. My name is Stephanie  
5 Papas. I work at the California Department of Education of  
6 course and I'm assigned to work on school safety and one of  
7 my primary assignments is in the area of school safety  
8 plans.

9 And in the prevention world or in the world of  
10 school safety, there's a continuum of prevention,  
11 intervention, suppression, and then recovery, and we give  
12 over the task of suppression to law enforcement but  
13 certainly are actively involved in the prevention,  
14 intervention, and recovery parts of the health of a school.

15 And school safety plans, as Diane has on her  
16 slide, are required by Education Code section. The contents  
17 of those school safety plans are listed and embedded in  
18 those Ed Code sections.

19 Required contents include crisis response plans  
20 and as our colleague from Cal EMA mentioned, we use the SEMS  
21 system so that every responder speaks the same language and  
22 knows that the term is used. It's not just a term of art,  
23 that everyone knows what that term means.

24 Child abuse prevention procedures, drills -- so  
25 for earthquake and fire, those protocols need to be included

1 in the plans. Procedures for safe ingress and egress and  
2 California is portal to portal schools.

3 So plans have to be in place for how those kids  
4 get from the door of their home until the door of the school  
5 and then back at the end of the day safely.

6 And the plans also include evacuation plans.  
7 Portions of the plans need to be shared at a public meeting  
8 and the community needs to be informed that this public  
9 meeting is happening, but certain portions of the plan are  
10 kept quiet.

11 You wouldn't want everyone to know that this is  
12 the evacuation plan in the event of this kind of emergency.

13 Plans are site specific. They created by a  
14 committee so it's not just one person holed up in their  
15 office creating what they think is a good idea. A committee  
16 plan -- creates these plans and those committees need to  
17 include law enforcement and first responders and then the  
18 plan has to be approved by site council and then by their  
19 governing -- the district's governing board.

20 There is training that the Department provides on  
21 how to create these plans and so that they're compliant with  
22 law and that they're using effective best practices.

23 But the monitoring and oversight responsibility is  
24 given to districts and County Offices of Education.

25 There is a clause in Education Code that requires

1 districts and counties to report to the Department of  
2 Education if any of the site plans are noncompliant, but  
3 I've been in this position for eight years and I've never  
4 received a report. Just so you know.

5           And then we provide technical assistance in best  
6 practices. Currently lockdown drills are not required in  
7 Education Code, but it's certainly a strong recommendation  
8 and a best practice and we've posted templates on our  
9 website that show the procedure that should be followed say  
10 for a lockdown drill.

11           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. So one of the -- the  
12 main reason I asked that we add this item is because after  
13 Sandy Hook people are all asking what we're doing and since  
14 this Board really deals with facilities, it made sense that  
15 this was an appropriate area.

16           So drilling down a little bit more because while I  
17 appreciate, you know, replacing windows that are broken and  
18 going in and painting over graffiti right away and designing  
19 schools in such a way that, you know, you have clear lines  
20 and all of that, some of that deals with the day-to-day  
21 maintenance and operations with which this Board does not  
22 fund.

23           So I'm going to just sort of make a statement and  
24 see where we area because when I looked at Sandy Hook, you  
25 know, and as the eyes of a former school board member, I

1 looked at it in terms of a school that seemed to do  
2 everything right.

3 I mean they actually had put up a fence and locks  
4 so they had controlled access going in. As you said, this  
5 shooter shot his way in through the window.

6 They had the PA system which they flipped on.  
7 They had interior locks on the doors and as much of a  
8 tragedy as that was, if they hadn't had all that in place  
9 along with the drills, it could have been, you know, much,  
10 much worse.

11 So when we sort of drill down to that, it's having  
12 a safety plan in place which all of our schools are required  
13 to have. I'm surprised we don't require drills because I  
14 mean in my kids' school, we always -- they always had  
15 drills.

16 It's having a community system which I know when  
17 my kids were on the playground, if there were three bells,  
18 you had -- I mean there were -- you know, it could be a very  
19 sophisticated or not so sophisticated and the interior  
20 locks.

21 Is there more than that specifically that can or  
22 should be done in terms of the basic requirements that  
23 every -- that we'd like to see in every school?

24 MS. WATERS: One thing I didn't address was -- and  
25 it was evident after Sandy Hook -- is the mental health

1 component that's missing from --

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

3 MS. WATERS: And we can plan from now until, you  
4 know --

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

6 MS. WATERS: -- our K through 12 public education,  
7 but if we're letting kids fall by the wayside because we  
8 don't train our staff members in how to recognize certain  
9 characteristics of students who are really struggling --

10 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

11 MS. WATERS: -- and if we don't have that in  
12 place, have those counselors in place, or have that mental  
13 health first aid training available which is an important  
14 part --

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

16 MS. WATERS: -- of the whole training piece, I  
17 think we're --

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So getting back to  
19 facilities because we're not an education policy committee  
20 or a budget committee, I'm just thinking as we move forward  
21 and start to plan, I mean the thing that really comes to my  
22 mind is the fact that if a school's 10 years old and doesn't  
23 have -- or 15 years old and doesn't have interior locks,  
24 does it wait ten years or, you know, is it something we  
25 should consider on making an accommodation.

1           So I kind of would like to drill down.

2           MS. WATERS: To talk about the locks? Well, in  
3 Sandy Hook, just so you know, one of the presenters at CASH  
4 with me was a piece officer from Santa Ana who went there  
5 with a group of peace officers to kind of find out what  
6 happened and lessons learned and one of those classrooms was  
7 a substitute teacher.

8           And so substitute teachers did not get keys to the  
9 locks.

10          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

11          MS. WATERS: So she could not lockdown her --

12          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So that's a procedural  
13 issue.

14          MS. WATERS: That was a procedural issue. As far  
15 as the locks go on schools here in California, some -- well,  
16 a lot of schools already believe that with that passage of  
17 that previous law that they are required to change --

18          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

19          MS. WATERS: -- change out their locks even  
20 though --

21          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

22          MS. WATERS: -- they're mistaken. So some of them  
23 have already begun doing that.

24            You know, I think that that would be important to  
25 maybe fund that because as you know, that is quite expensive

1 especially when you consider hundreds of locks and possibly  
2 doors on any given school.

3           So I mean if you're looking for things that come  
4 out of the facility funding --

5           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

6           MS. WATERS: -- kind of area, that --

7           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. I mean we're not  
8 looking. We just want to --

9           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Madam Chairperson. You  
10 know, for just changing locks, you change out the pins in  
11 the locks. You don't change out --

12          MS. WATERS: No.

13          ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: -- the hardware. You  
14 don't necessarily --

15          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But not all schools are you  
16 able to lock the doors from the interior of the classroom.

17          MS. WATERS: So a standard -- if this isn't  
18 getting too technical, a standard classroom function lockset  
19 is -- you lock it and unlock it from outside only. Okay.

20          They do have now a security classroom function  
21 which has a double core. So you would actually have to  
22 change out the whole lock.

23          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. Or you'd have to  
24 provide some sort of --

25          MS. WATERS: There are after-market things that

1 you can do, but part of the is with any of these things --  
2 and some schools have just changed out locks. We talked to  
3 the fire marshal's office, for instance, and they said they  
4 go out there, you know, annually and inspect and they're  
5 finding all kinds of things.

6           So they're locking on the inside so that it does  
7 not allow free exiting.

8           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

9           MS. WATERS: And these classroom security function  
10 locksets allow free exiting so they don't inhibit the  
11 fire/life/safety function while allowing for the security  
12 within the classroom.

13           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: It sounds like we could --  
14 I mean almost like one of those hotel locks or a bolt that  
15 even a kid could small across without a key from the inside  
16 or something. We have --

17           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But one of the issues comes  
18 up, if you have free exit even though you can't get in from  
19 the outside, you know, making sure that you don't have a kid  
20 that just walks out the door in these situations.

21           MS. WATERS: Yes.

22           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So there's -- you know, I  
23 remember we were discussing it. I mean in our district  
24 there's -- there are considerations there, but -- so --

25           MS. MOORE: I think the -- coming from the -- what

1 we did in Washington, D.C., around infrastructure, the five  
2 different areas risk assessment which is really --

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

4 MS. MOORE: -- an operational issue --

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

6 MS. MOORE: -- there was secure perimeter, control  
7 access, safe rooms, and clear communications.

8 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Um-hmm.

9 MS. MOORE: And those all are infrastructure  
10 areas. We've spent some time on safe rooms which I think is  
11 one of the more important pieces.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

13 MS. MOORE: So as we consider as a Board the  
14 possibility of -- or what the responsibility might be in  
15 this program around safe schools, probably locksets is an  
16 important component and there's already a piece of  
17 legislation --

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

19 MS. MOORE: -- that will be considered in the  
20 Legislature.

21 The other piece is one that we don't have a  
22 requirement that all schools have secure perimeters. We --  
23 you know, that's a local decision. Fencing is a local  
24 decision.

25 However, if we are to look at modernization and

1 those components, do we need to increase funding it all in  
2 one of our -- you know, our site categories or a general  
3 site category that allows for that kind of fencing to go in  
4 should a district wish to do that.

5 I think that's an -- that probably is a more area  
6 to drill down into as well and then clear communication  
7 ensuring that the communication systems are in place for  
8 these types of emergencies.

9 You know, there's a public address system in most  
10 schools and -- you know, the fire system has to work. I  
11 think it's the part of the public address system ensuring  
12 that it is functional and in some cases up to industry  
13 standard and that might be another area that we would want  
14 to drill down into.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

16 MS. WATERS: Another issue when you were  
17 mentioning the PA system and the three bells or that sort of  
18 thing, as long as they practice and everybody knows that  
19 three bells means that, but if you have a substitute teacher  
20 or you've --

21 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

22 MS. WATERS: -- got new students, then --

23 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. Obviously, you know,  
24 you mentioned that we need -- whatever we do needs to be  
25 practiced so everyone understands it. I mean I think that's

1 really very clear.

2           Is there any public comment on this before I move  
3 on?

4           MR. DIXON: Thank you. I'm Joe Dixon, Assistant  
5 Superintendent of Facilities, Santa Ana Unified, and as of  
6 last week, CASH chair.

7           We had a workshop last week at CASH with the Santa  
8 Ana Unified police officer who was back for the debriefing  
9 in Sandy Hook. We've also met with all our principals. I  
10 mean it's a big issue for all the school districts and, you  
11 know, in some cases, locks -- we call them Columbine  
12 locks -- are just not practical on the outside.

13           So here's what we came up with. We think first of  
14 all the PA system all call should be accessible in various  
15 locations of the school site. I think that'd be very  
16 helpful instead of just the office. And we can do that.

17           Most often with the newer ones, it's already  
18 there, but even on older PA systems, I believe they can all  
19 be coded that way.

20           Secondly, the principals ask for a panic button  
21 which is kind of impractical, but on their phones, we can  
22 have speed dial to 911 on all kinds of phones and that would  
23 be on a speaker. So that would fix that as well.

24           And then cell phones, most of us have cell phones,  
25 principals included, and just make sure the 911 is on your

1 cell phone to call that way.

2           So those are the things we came up, but I think  
3 that fencing is a big issue. You need to -- that's the  
4 stranger on campus thing that we've been working with for  
5 years.

6           Make sure everybody goes through the office first,  
7 but keeping gates locked and things like that are real  
8 important.

9           Now FEMA also -- you know, we were talking about  
10 FEMA. FEMA has come up with a new standard as well and  
11 it's -- I believe it's run -- run if you can, you know, if  
12 it's safe to run; hide if you have to; and if you're in a  
13 situation with a person like that, fight. So they have  
14 three new protocols that they came up with which would be  
15 important to probably train everybody in the state if you  
16 could in school.

17           So I just wanted to share that with you.

18           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you.

19           MR. DIXON: You're welcome.

20           MS. ALLEN: Good morning, Cathy Allen, San Juan  
21 Unified School District and past CASH chair a week ago.

22           Just a couple of comments. You know, I wish there  
23 were answers for this. I think it's very important to  
24 realize how mind boggling this truly is.

25           Right after Sandy Hook, you know, the word came

1 out about I can't close my blinds, I have missing slats. So  
2 now I'm in the middle of conducting a blind survey on over  
3 80 sites.

4 Do you have blinds, are they horizontal or are  
5 they vertical. Do you have curtains, are they fire rated,  
6 are they missing slats, all that kind of stuff.

7 I don't know what we're going to do with it. I  
8 know we're talking hundreds and hundreds of thousands of  
9 dollars if I were to just go and cover my windows.

10 I think another aspect to look at -- well, windows  
11 is a huge thing. I've always been a proponent of windows  
12 and don't put windows down and people can see into the  
13 classroom, mostly because I think the kids don't need to be  
14 distracted by what's going on outside.

15 But kind of a two-prong thing here: It does  
16 provide some level of safety.

17 The other thing I just wanted to share and those  
18 of you who are from the area and listened to the news a  
19 couple days ago, one of my high schools on Sunday night,  
20 there was a young student who had made threats on a Facebook  
21 page that he was going to tear up El Camino, whatever the  
22 word was.

23 So the only way we were able to kind of work  
24 through that and it certainly had nothing to do with  
25 facilities, it was all about social networking.

1           It was on a Facebook page. You know, some parent  
2 saw it, called our dispatch center. We happen to have a  
3 dispatch center. We're one of the few school districts that  
4 do, probably because we're large enough. So that's staffed  
5 24-7.

6           We were able to do a snapshot of that Facebook  
7 page, find out who the kid was through our Zangle software  
8 program, and it all ended happily.

9           But again just goes to show that no matter how  
10 many safeguards we put in, social media is something that we  
11 have absolutely no control over.

12           So again I wish I could solve it. I think we all  
13 do. If there was just a nice little simple one or two fix  
14 things, but, you know, curtains and blinds and locks and  
15 what do you do for kids who just went to the restroom can't  
16 get back in and what happens if the shooter decides to wait  
17 for recess. All the fencing in the world isn't going to  
18 stop a bullet unfortunately.

19           So I look forward to maybe some creative ideas as  
20 we move forward and figure out what to do. Thanks.

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And I would just reiterate  
22 again we sort of have to decide what's operational and  
23 what's facilities and those things that we can do outside of  
24 building prisons that our kids attend, you know, if there  
25 are things we can do like ensure we have interior locking

1 doors, I think, you know, we have to seriously consider  
2 that.

3           There are others that you never can anticipate  
4 everything and you can't live your life in fear and we don't  
5 want our children to live their lives in fear. But, you  
6 know, we did want to at least take a look at --

7           MS. WATERS: Yeah.

8           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- what the current  
9 thinking is on that.

10           Okay. We're going to move on to the next item  
11 which is the U.C. Berkeley report and I think, Ms. Moore,  
12 you were going to do an introduction for us.

13           MS. MOORE: Thank you for the opportunity to  
14 introduce Dr. Jeff Vincent from the Center for Cities and  
15 Schools at Berkeley.

16           The Center is a policy research and best practices  
17 center housed in Berkeley's Institute of Urban and Regional  
18 Development.

19           Dr. Vincent is well known nationally for his work  
20 in school infrastructure policy together with city and  
21 regional planning.

22           I'd like to provide context for the report and  
23 information that he will be sharing with the Subcommittee  
24 today.

25           The Superintendent of Public Instruction assembled

1 a transition advisory team in 2011, the members of which  
2 provided a report, A Blueprint for Great Schools, which  
3 include recommendations from nine policy areas including  
4 facilities and construction reform.

5           There were five recommendations from that work in  
6 facilities and they were to collaborate with the Governor to  
7 consolidate or better coordinate agencies, to inventory  
8 school facilities, to enable districts to engage in more  
9 efficient and facilities construction and redesign, to  
10 establish a superintendents council of business and labor,  
11 and to foster joint use.

12           Following this work, the Superintendent created  
13 the Schools of the Future Initiative that brought experts  
14 together including Mr. Diaz who co-chaired the effort.

15           Recommendations addressed two key areas: school  
16 facility reform, including the educational impact of design,  
17 site selection, and high performance schools including high  
18 energy efficiency schools and energy project financing.

19           One of the key recommendations of the Schools of  
20 the Future report was to determine a needs analysis and  
21 corresponding policy recommendations for the future  
22 facilities bond program.

23           The Superintendent and the Department of Education  
24 commissioned Dr. Vincent and his team to address this  
25 recommendation with a methodology that looked at other

1 states, gathered the best research and practices in the  
2 field, and surveyed the stakeholder community.

3 The results of the report are before us today.  
4 The Superintendent released this report in July of last year  
5 and directed the Department of Education to review the  
6 recommendations and determine an implementation plan.

7 The report provides an outside perspective on  
8 where we've been and makes eight policy recommendations for  
9 the future of this program that will have a positive impact  
10 for all California students, staff, and communities.

11 Dr. Vincent.

12 DR. VINCENT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Moore. Thank  
13 you for having me here. As has been said, I'm Jeff Vincent,  
14 Deputy Director of the Center for Cities and Schools at U.C.  
15 Berkeley.

16 And so I've been asked to run through the findings  
17 and recommendations of the research that we did to guide  
18 this very discussion and so I promise to be brief. I will  
19 elaborate where we would like more discussion.

20 And certainly, you know, we've compiled a lot of  
21 information on the various issues that have come up in the  
22 previous hearings of the Committee and those are all  
23 available to you and I'm happy to pull that information  
24 together.

25 So my colleagues at U.C. Berkeley and I basically

1 spent the better part of a year looking comprehensively at  
2 the state of K-12 school facilities in California and really  
3 thinking about what does the state need to do -- lowercase  
4 s -- what do we need the state to go over the next decade,  
5 how do we prioritize funding.

6           There probably will not be enough funding to meet  
7 all of the needs on the ground. How do we think about  
8 prioritizing these.

9           So for the research, we asked three main  
10 questions. Just to give you a sense, how does the state of  
11 California promote efficient and sound planning for K-12  
12 school facilities across the state; how should the next  
13 generation of California State level K-12 funding be  
14 prioritized; and then given that, what are the policy and/or  
15 regulatory changes or reforms that would be needed to  
16 support the sound planning and a prioritization of state  
17 funds.

18           To answer these questions, we did a handful of  
19 things -- four main tasks really. First was we conducted  
20 more than 60 interviews of stakeholders across the state  
21 that work in school facilities at the local level with  
22 districts, with other local governments, in the private  
23 sector, as well as state agencies, getting their perspective  
24 on what they've seen over the last decade, what challenges  
25 remain, and what they see as solutions.

1           Secondly, we reviewed all the past research that's  
2 been done on this both in California by the LAO and others  
3 as well as looking nationally what's been done on this issue  
4 because we spent a lot of money on it.

5           We conducted a detailed review of all the  
6 California code related to school facilities and as you well  
7 know, it's kind of in different parts of the code from the  
8 Public Resources Code to the Ed Code to the General Code,  
9 et cetera, try to understand how does the SFP, the School  
10 Facilities Program, work, what are the various codes related  
11 to it.

12           And then we also said, okay, we're one of many  
13 states. How do all other states in the country fund school  
14 facilities. How do they do it. Has anyone figured out a  
15 better way and how do we use that information to inform what  
16 we're thinking about here in California.

17           And what I can tell you is that, you know, these  
18 past hearings of this Committee have shown this is an  
19 enormously challenging issue and as I have talked to many of  
20 the directors of programs and legislatures in other states,  
21 they continually grapple with this challenge and it's always  
22 a tension between what's the role of the state and what's  
23 the role of locals and where is that autonomy and where are  
24 the standards, et cetera, and where is the accountability.

25           What we do in this report is really lay out a

1 framework for action and how does the state think about  
2 prioritizing its funds going forward based on the evidence  
3 from the field across the country and best practices.

4           We haven't solved every challenge. I can tell you  
5 that. But we're hoping that this sets forth framework to  
6 guide this discussion and I think as Ms. Buchanan said -- I  
7 think it was the last hearing you said yes, we want to hear  
8 your challenges, but we really want to see some solutions  
9 and I hope that what we present here really contributes  
10 greatly to that.

11           So the key finding, if you remember nothing of  
12 what I say today, I would suggest you remember this. Our  
13 key finding in the research -- and I'll go into more detail  
14 on the findings -- is that today's context in California has  
15 different demands than it did in 1998.

16           In 1998 when SB50 passed, what we know as the  
17 School Facilities Program today was created.

18           And what's needed going forward -- and I'll  
19 describe this in more detail as I go through this is that a  
20 strategic shift is needed to increase value for money.

21           And our main recommendation is that from an asset  
22 management perspective, which is what we're talking about  
23 here, is that plans and needs should guide state investment.

24           We should be spending money where it's needed and  
25 we should be spending money where we get the most bang for

1 the buck for and I'll explain how we can think about doing  
2 that.

3           Because really we can't afford not to be  
4 strategic. I think there's a broad consensus that there  
5 will never be enough money to meet the demands across the  
6 state and I'll talk a little bit about how we quantify those  
7 demands.

8           Today's context has different demands. What we  
9 found is that there were really three key pieces to that,  
10 from -- the difference from 1998 and I think I forgot is  
11 that in the study we really looked at from 1998 to the  
12 present, so through 2012 what has happened. And in 1998 as  
13 you know is the beginning of SB50 and the -- the passage of  
14 SB50 and the School Facilities Program creation.

15           First is that we're in a new economic era. I  
16 think that's clear, but how that translates for school  
17 facilities is that the Department of Finance's latest  
18 numbers of enrollment growth projections over the next  
19 decade are at about 2 percent.

20           So we're still having growth. We're still going  
21 to have new students that we need to house, but that  
22 2 percent is very different from the roughly 20 percent  
23 enrollment growth that we have had as a state since the  
24 early 1990s.

25           So that's just a very different time of growth and

1 needing to house students.

2 Secondly is that --

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: 2 percent over what period?

4 I'm sorry.

5 DR. VINCENT: Over the next decade. I believe

6 the --

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: For the entire decade.

8 DR. VINCENT: Yeah. I believe the latest numbers  
9 are 2013 to 2023 I think if I'm correct on that. I think  
10 it's 1.8 percent to be precise, but it's roughly at  
11 2 percent.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: For the next ten years,  
13 we're going to grown --

14 DR. VINCENT: For the next ten years from now.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So our population over the  
16 next decade is going to grow -- from 38 million now, we're  
17 expecting our population to grown by less than 400,000  
18 people in the next decade?

19 DR. VINCENT: I don't have the numbers of total  
20 population in my head. 2 percent is K-12 enrollment growth.

21 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

22 MR. ALMANZA: That's annual -- annual growth.

23 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: No. He said for the entire  
24 decade.

25 DR. VINCENT: Over the decade. It's about 300,000

1 new students. I think Bill Savage is much --

2 MR. SAVIDGE: The most recent Department of  
3 Finance projections were from 2012 to 2021 is my  
4 recollection and that the total increase is actually only  
5 around 80,000 students, but if you -- that's because there's  
6 declining enrollment in several urban areas.

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Some areas; right.

8 MR. SAVIDGE: If you look at every county in  
9 California -- there's about 36 or 37 that has increased  
10 enrollment, the increase in enrollment is about 282,000  
11 using Finance's projections over that nine-year period.

12 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. I won't keep  
13 interrupting. I'll save these questions for after. I  
14 apologize.

15 DR. VINCENT: I think Bill makes a good point is  
16 that there's one thing, you know, to have total enrollment  
17 change, but then there's also a difference between net and  
18 unfortunately I think where we have excess capacity in some  
19 of our facilities is not where we're necessarily seeing some  
20 of the enrollment growth.

21 So anyway, the number is --

22 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, I was just trying  
23 translate that into total growth in population because for  
24 those numbers to be correct, you'd have to have virtually  
25 other growth in population virtually zero students and that

1 just doesn't logically make -- I'm not questioning the  
2 report or the numbers. It just doesn't logically make sense  
3 to me.

4 DR. VINCENT: Yeah. And this pulled exactly from  
5 the Department of Finance which --

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah.

7 DR. VINCENT: -- we can certainly look back and  
8 see what the specifics are.

9 But secondly is that where we find ourselves in  
10 2013 is that we have new educational priorities that have  
11 emerged both locally in districts but also things that the  
12 Department -- State Department of Ed is actively working on  
13 and these have facilities implications for them.

14 Namely I'm talking about the career technical  
15 education which the program has funded, movement towards  
16 promoting STEM or science, technology, engineering, and  
17 math; much more interest in project-based learning and  
18 linked learning and other efforts that the Superintendent  
19 has been involved in, for example; a movement towards common  
20 core nationally; as well as upgrades in using -- having  
21 students and staff and teachers use modern day technologies.

22 All of these things have facilities implications  
23 in them and that is facilities and components of facilities  
24 are required to really facilitate a lot of that work.

25 So we're kind of in a new era of emerging

1 educational priorities.

2           And then fourth, I would say looking at state  
3 level is that there's new state infrastructure and  
4 investment goals and namely I'm talking about the passage of  
5 AB857 a handful of years ago which codified in the  
6 Government Code the planning priorities that would in theory  
7 guide state infrastructure and mainly these have kind of  
8 three goals or pillars.

9           One is strengthen existing infrastructure. Two is  
10 conserve open space and farmland and three is encourage  
11 location efficient development wherever it may occur and I  
12 think that that while still being defined by the Legislature  
13 and then implemented in various ways sets a broad framework  
14 of goals for infrastructure investment in the state.

15           And as you know one of the largest infrastructure  
16 investments that we make as a state, bricks and mortar  
17 infrastructure investments is K-12 facilities.

18           And for now it's really been left entirely out of  
19 kind of that broad-based thinking and one of the pieces that  
20 we've pulled together in this report is how do we think  
21 about that so that it's aligning with these broad goals  
22 while first and foremost certainly promoting high quality  
23 education.

24           So let me start with a truism that I think is  
25 something that we can't ignore which is that these assets --

1 these buildings require an ongoing investment, however  
2 minimal it may be, just to keep them safe and healthy. I  
3 think we know that.

4           If you look to the building industry, the industry  
5 standard for investing in a building is that an owner should  
6 invest 2 to 4 percent of its replacement value per year and  
7 this is a practice that's commonly referred to as capital  
8 renewals.

9           And the definition of capital renewals is that you  
10 are -- this is the planned repair or replacement of  
11 component systems finishes of a building. Essentially what  
12 this does is you know when something's going to need to be  
13 replaced. You're tracking that. You're replacing it or  
14 repairing it and essentially what you're doing is keeping  
15 that building -- that asset -- on par and quality.

16           This is not about making major room additions.  
17 This is not about significantly putting in major new  
18 components as they emerge technology wise or whatnot. This  
19 is keeping a building on par, so 2 to 4 percent and I  
20 introduce that now because I'll come back to it in a few  
21 slides when I talk about quantifying the needs.

22           And you can see clearly we as a state have a huge  
23 inventory. So this is a really big challenge. And if --  
24 you know, we've got about 10,000 schools across the state  
25 and they sit in every type of community with every type of

1 climate that you could imagine. So this is an enormous  
2 challenge.

3           And the question is what is a fair state program  
4 to assist on this assuming the state is going forward with a  
5 funding contribution.

6           Okay. Let me just briefly lay out the framework  
7 of the recommendations and then before I go into them, I  
8 want to touch on a handful of key findings and then I will  
9 go into the recommendations and as I said, I'll do my best  
10 to be brief and to the point.

11           The recommendations are really about leveraging  
12 the state role in this because as we know the thing that  
13 we're talking about, school facilities planning and  
14 management, is a local activity. It's done by local school  
15 districts.

16           Any my opinion is it's probably not something that  
17 the state wants to come in and micromanage any more than it  
18 might need to. I think that -- that right there is  
19 obviously an ongoing intention with any of this discussion  
20 as you can see in the conversations in the previous  
21 hearings.

22           But anyway eight recommendations. The first is we  
23 need a state vision and plan and I will talk about these in  
24 more detail as I go through it.

25           Two is the state has a role in promoting sound and

1 wife local planning for school facilities. Three is that --  
2 and I do believe that we handed copies of this PowerPoint to  
3 everyone and I have executive summaries as well of the  
4 report.

5           Three is we have to as a state know our assets.  
6 If we're going to be strategic with these funds, we have to  
7 know our assets. There's no way to be strategic without  
8 knowing.

9           Four is that we need to review and update the  
10 standards for these school facilities. Most of those are in  
11 the Code of Regulations known as Title 5. I think that's  
12 come up certainly in the discussions of this community.

13           Five -- and this is the real big one -- is we need  
14 to set priorities and I think that this Committee as well as  
15 the State Allocation Board certainly should play a role in  
16 saying, you know, these are the broad priorities that the  
17 state has for how we should prioritize these funds and I'll  
18 talk about it in a second.

19           Six is that if we want to follow best practices in  
20 the building industry in the K-12 infrastructure, the state  
21 should really consider funding this concept of capital  
22 renewals.

23           Seven is diversifying the revenue. We're mostly  
24 bond driven in terms of our funds.

25           And then number 8 is how -- we need to strengthen

1 program accountability and that's accountability within the  
2 School Facilities Program.

3 And for sake of time, I'm mostly going to focus on  
4 the ones that I've put in red here. I know that's a lot. I  
5 apologize, but they're connected and I will try to move  
6 through them swiftly.

7 But before I do that, let me touch on some of the  
8 key findings because I think they play into this and I've  
9 tried to exclude things that I think -- that I've seen  
10 discussed here or presented here by OPSC or others at these  
11 hearings.

12 But as you know, looking from 1998, we  
13 collectively as a state -- the state funds and local funds  
14 spent a lot of money on K-12 school facilities and we got  
15 huge, huge benefits from these.

16 So we estimated all the funds that went into K-12  
17 school facilities from 1998 through 2011 -- our estimate was  
18 118 billion and you see how I have that divided up. State  
19 bonds made up about 35 billion of that. This was the four  
20 last state bonds.

21 Local bonds, about 66 billion and then you can see  
22 also developer fees and then the Deferred Maintenance  
23 Program.

24 As I said, roughly 20 percent enrollment growth.  
25 So a lot of those funds went in to housing new children,

1 overcrowded school -- lots of overcrowded schools were  
2 relieved as we know. We upgraded thousands of schools and  
3 based on our calculations, if you look at total capital  
4 dollars spent, I think it's -- this is for the last handful  
5 of years, 2005 through 2008, what we find is a 70/30 percent  
6 local/state share. So locals are contributing about  
7 70 percent of their total capital expenditures and the state  
8 is doing about 30 percent of that.

9           You all have talked about the different buckets of  
10 funds in the four state bonds that the program has been  
11 designed around, but if you -- those bonds -- the monies in  
12 those bonds could be grouped into three categories and I've  
13 put them here in this pie graph: new construction,  
14 modernization, and then other that has 12 or 15 or so  
15 smaller programs.

16           You can see that roughly 45 percent of these  
17 35 billion funds went towards new construction, 30 percent  
18 went towards modernization.

19           And why have we done this? We've done this  
20 because school facilities matter and I just want to make the  
21 point that the research and science nationally and  
22 internationally is getting much better on understanding  
23 conditions of buildings and how they affect teachers and  
24 teacher performance as well as student and student  
25 performance and we point to some of the latest research on

1 that.

2           And most studies show correlations between those  
3 things, between conditions and performance. But the  
4 research is also getting better on understanding how the  
5 locations, the conditions, the qualities of this  
6 infrastructure, this community infrastructure of K-12  
7 schools affects communities.

8           It affects travel patterns. It affects community  
9 desirability. It also affects growth in regions.

10           And what we see taking a broad look at  
11 infrastructure and the K-12 facilities in California is that  
12 there's really an increasing policy interest in three main  
13 areas; so (indiscernible) planning, healthy communities, and  
14 health equity particularly around combatting childhood  
15 obesity and then also high quality schools and learning  
16 environments and there's various activities, new  
17 legislation, funding pots, et cetera, on these things, but  
18 if you look at these K-12 school facilities, our  
19 infrastructure investment, really straddles these various  
20 issues.

21           And I think even if you look at some of the policy  
22 efforts here in Sacramento going on in these various broad  
23 camps, schools and school facilities quite often get  
24 mentioned and I think we spend some time focusing more what  
25 does that mean, how does the state leverage multiple

1 benefits across these avenues.

2           Okay. So for the research -- I have to pull a  
3 Marco Rubio here. For the research, what we did was take a  
4 look at what's been done on this across the country and from  
5 that we created a kind of framework for a well-managed K-12  
6 capital investment program.

7           And what we did was -- first of all, surprisingly  
8 as much as states like California and others spend on school  
9 facilities, there's actually very little written and done  
10 research on what are true best practices, what are outcome  
11 and performance measures particular at the state level which  
12 is kind of mind boggling when you think about the state of  
13 California's 35 billion and we're actually not spending the  
14 most.

15           We found guidance from the USGAO. The General  
16 Accounting Office has done work on best practices in capital  
17 decision making. The World Bank has done work on K-12  
18 infrastructure which is very informative and then from U.C.  
19 Berkeley, Professor David Dowall is an infrastructure  
20 specialist who's done a lot of work with the California  
21 infrastructure best practices.

22           From all of that, we created a four-point  
23 framework for best practices, sound planning, effective  
24 management, adequate and equitable funding, and appropriate  
25 accountability.

1           I think these are fairly logical. They're not  
2 rocket science. They're in fact harder than rocket science  
3 to implement.

4           So what we did for the research was take each one  
5 of these lenses and look at the state of K-12 school  
6 facilities in California and how the School Facilities  
7 Program runs in relation to each of these and that's what  
8 our findings are structured around.

9           And I'm not going to go into enormous detail on  
10 these, but I think what I'll do is gloss over the take-away  
11 point for each one and then I want to get into the  
12 recommendations.

13           So from a planning perspective, as I mentioned  
14 there are new demands. We're just in a different era than  
15 we were in 1998. There certainly still will be growth, but  
16 there's a lot less growth projected than before.

17           But we also found that local school districts  
18 really varied in their capacity to both do school facilities  
19 planning and their capacity to access school facilities  
20 funds at the state level. I think we all know that.

21           But I think there was also a feeling among a lot  
22 of the folks that we interviewed and certainly our analysis  
23 of the codes that if you look at the state codes and the  
24 guidelines and the regulations that they send mixed signals  
25 and there's a lot of disconnects in them.

1           And there are unclear funding priorities at the  
2 state level. There is some language in the code about  
3 funding new construction over modernization. There's also  
4 some language in there about funding modernization over new  
5 construction.

6           And I think that the signal is what really are the  
7 state's priorities and I think those are unclear.

8           From management perspective, how -- you know, how  
9 does the state manage a School Facilities Program. We  
10 really have no info to guide strategic investment as I said.  
11 So poor info, but also very interestingly that came up a lot  
12 was surprising to me in some regard was how often people  
13 talked about sort of decay and trust in the program,  
14 especially since 1998, and I think that there was decay and  
15 trust from the locals to the state level but also a  
16 perceived decay in trust across the state agencies that  
17 participate or have a role in the School Facilities Program.

18           And as you know, in the construction industry,  
19 lack of trust has been shown to contribute to increased  
20 school construction costs for a variety of reasons, but also  
21 that -- you know, so that's a built-in inefficiency  
22 potentially. But also that the grants in the School  
23 Facilities Program do lack a certain flexibility for local  
24 creativity because, you know, on one hand they serve -- or  
25 they fund classrooms and some of the educational work that's

1 going on right now isn't necessarily occurring in  
2 traditional four-walled classrooms.

3 I mean we certainly -- probably still have  
4 traditional four-wall classrooms and use them.

5 That the model funds classrooms and districts  
6 don't always want to build classrooms, but then also that  
7 they're really in practice, it doesn't -- the state approach  
8 really doesn't have a category for funding full building  
9 replacements.

10 And we heard a lot of stories about districts  
11 saying, you know, it's a waste of even a nickel to spend  
12 anything on this building because it's really beyond its  
13 useful life.

14 But the way eligibility is calculated and the way  
15 the funds come down is that it's really difficult to make  
16 them useful for building replacement type of approach.

17 Funding -- we document what's been shown and do  
18 some new analysis on the levels of what we found to be  
19 patterns of inadequate and inequitable funding. And I want  
20 to go into that in a little more detail after this slide.

21 But then on the accountability side is that  
22 because we don't have information about our inventory, about  
23 the condition of all of those schools, and there's no clear  
24 minimum standards for school facilities that the  
25 accountability is then understandably weak in terms of

1 really understanding what value did we get for spending that  
2 35 billion that we have just expended since 1998.

3           We actually don't know the real answers to that  
4 question. And there's -- I have been delighted to see in  
5 these hearings that this is some of the most detailed  
6 description of the School Facilities Program I've ever seen  
7 and I commend OPSC on pulling that information together, but  
8 there's also been almost no open assessment done and I think  
9 that even though we started to talk about that in some of  
10 these hearings, there's a lot more that we could do and I'll  
11 illustrate the example of that right now.

12           One of our key findings from a funding perspective  
13 is that I think many of us know this anecdotally is that our  
14 modernization approach fell show and this has likely  
15 compromised education.

16           And just to give you a window into that, if you go  
17 back to that capital renewal standard that I talked about,  
18 the building industry recommends spending 2 to 4 percent of  
19 replacement value.

20           We went through a methodology of estimating what  
21 is the replacement value for all of California's schools.  
22 And the capital renewal standard on that is that about 7 to  
23 \$15 a square foot per year should be spent on school  
24 facilities in the state just to do capital renewals.

25           If you look at, since 1998, how many state dollars

1 have been spent on existing school facilities in the  
2 Modernization Program and in the Deferred Maintenance  
3 Program mostly, that comes to about \$3 a square foot per  
4 year.

5           This is not to say that the state should be  
6 funding all -- a hundred percent of everything, but what  
7 this is saying is that the -- you know, the definition of  
8 modernization is the School Facilities Program is far beyond  
9 their definition of capital renewal. It's about significant  
10 upgrades and et cetera.

11           So that's one window inadequacy. I also want to  
12 show a set of maps here. These are not in the report, but  
13 this is something that I've done more recently.

14           These are preliminary. We're trying to fine tune  
15 the analysis here on this.

16           But what I still want to understand better is  
17 particularly the spending on existing school facilities;  
18 right? I think we had the growth; we spent new construction  
19 money on that. I think that's very straightforward.

20           But what did we do for existing school facilities  
21 and how did those funds break down along income lines of  
22 students.

23           So what I've done here is do a series of maps  
24 laying the modernization funds across at the county level by  
25 student wealth.

1           So this first map is at the county level because  
2 that's only the data I had at the time. So this is all the  
3 school districts within a county.

4           This is the percentage of students qualifying for  
5 free and reduced lunch in all the school districts in that  
6 county. So the darker the county, the more students qualify  
7 for free and reduced lunch.

8           The next map I'm going to show you is --

9           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: As a percent or as a  
10 number?

11          DR. VINCENT: As a percent. So you can see the  
12 dark tends to congregate in the middle. Sort of.

13          So the next map I'm going to show you is per  
14 student modernization funds -- state modernization funds by  
15 this. So you can see that it's somewhat opposite. This is  
16 modernization funds per student at the county level.

17          And what this is starting to paint a picture of is  
18 that districts serving lower income students likely receive  
19 less money per student in modernization funds. So going  
20 back -- forward.

21          This analysis, we're working on making this  
22 analysis more sophisticated for one thing. This is at the  
23 county level.

24          There would be enormous variation at the school  
25 district level let alone the individual school level. I

1 have received some better data on that from OPSC in the last  
2 couple of weeks and we're going to try to run through some  
3 more of that.

4           What I also tried to do on the next slide is say,  
5 well, okay, the Modernization Program only funds classrooms  
6 if they're 25 years old. This is making the assumption that  
7 every classroom qualifies.

8           So in the next map, I tried to do an adjustment  
9 for an assumption of the classrooms or schools that are over  
10 25 years old and so here's the same analysis. You can  
11 see --

12           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: What was the assumption  
13 there?

14           DR. VINCENT: Well, the -- so we looked at --

15           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I mean like most of your  
16 growth with the housing bubble is out in the Central Valley,  
17 so how are you adjusting for all --

18           DR. VINCENT: So what we did was aggregating all  
19 the districts in those counties, looking at schools that  
20 existed in '87 or '88, basically 25 years ago, and saying  
21 okay, anything that was added beyond that probably, you  
22 know, doesn't qualify, so basically taking numbers from like  
23 the late '80s of the numbers of schools and students and  
24 assuming those students are sitting in -- it's --

25           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Where did you get the

1 numbers?

2 DR. VINCENT: I got the numbers from Department of  
3 Ed, CVS codes of schools from the late '80s -- schools that  
4 existed in the late '80s assuming they were --

5 Again some of my colleagues at Berkeley would  
6 probably say this is still a crude analysis. I will  
7 acknowledge it is a crude analysis, but we're starting to  
8 paint a picture of how these funds were spent and what we're  
9 going to spend the next handful of months hopefully doing if  
10 we can get the support for it is to zero in and fine tune  
11 the specific measures and zero in at the school district  
12 level to know how these funds are spent.

13 Okay. Part of what we were asked to do was figure  
14 out what are the needs, how do we quantify the needs in  
15 California for school facilities.

16 It hadn't been done. It was a recommendation of  
17 the Schools of the Future report. And so what we did was  
18 work with stakeholders across the state in trying to  
19 understand what are construction costs, what are they seeing  
20 in terms of needs, and we looked at needs in three  
21 categories: new construction, modernization, and this idea  
22 of capital renewals.

23 And in new construction, we looked at both growth  
24 and crowding but also this idea of building replacement  
25 which some people talk about this in modernization, but

1 you're really building an entirely new school.

2           The most important that we did here on  
3 modernization was really look at modernization from two  
4 perspectives. One was modernization for health, life,  
5 safety, and ADA but also modernization for education program  
6 delivery.

7           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Can I just interrupt?

8           DR. VINCENT: Yeah.

9           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: When we started looking at  
10 these numbers -- and I really appreciate your putting  
11 together some kind of numbers and having some kind of study  
12 on this.

13           I'm wondering are you using -- what standards are  
14 you using for cost per square foot? Is it what we've been  
15 paying for it? Is it what other people pay for it? Is it  
16 the standard in industry for commercial? Where are the  
17 benchmarks here for this action?

18           And if I can't get a database of all my buildings  
19 in the state, how'd you get it? Because I've been asking  
20 for that for like two months.

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And when we were looking at  
22 seismic, I read that one article. I forget which  
23 publication it was in. It had schools in my district that  
24 had completely been torn down and replaced as needing  
25 seismic repair and it had been done five or six years

1 earlier.

2           So I am kind of curious as to the validity of all  
3 the data that we're using.

4           DR. VINCENT: Given the fact that all of you make  
5 great points that none of this data exists, doing this  
6 exercise is difficult.

7           We went through a long process of estimating what  
8 we knew about what had been spent, looking at what we know  
9 about the ages of buildings and trying to -- and looking at  
10 what we're seeing in the industry in construction costs to  
11 multiply that out.

12           So I can show you the methodology of that. It's  
13 on --

14           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: No, no. I'm good. I'm  
15 just wondering if -- because I know we used to pay a lot  
16 more per square foot for a school --

17           DR. VINCENT: Right.

18           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: -- than the real world  
19 does -- follow different rules and we debated when that --  
20 all those rules are needed to build the facilities.

21           But are you basing it on what we pay or -- I  
22 guess --

23           DR. VINCENT: I'm basing it on -- let me get to  
24 the next slide and I'll --

25           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Okay.

1 DR. VINCENT: -- answer your question.

2 So what we found is adding that up is 117 billion.  
3 Divided into those categories, you can see where it is.

4 The way we did this is in this chart. The cost  
5 per square foot that we estimated -- well, I would say  
6 before this is that I think this is pretty darn conservative  
7 both from a cost side and potentially on estimating the  
8 amount of square footage across the state that needs a  
9 certain treatment.

10 That was the feedback I got from many, many people  
11 on this. I decided to keep it conservative.

12 The DSA has reported there are 471 million square  
13 feet of school space. That was our total inventory that we  
14 used. That was the only number that we could come up with,  
15 471 million square feet.

16 We used a new construction cost for hard and soft  
17 costs of \$375 a square foot. That will vary.

18 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Coming from a family of  
19 commercial construction, I could build you the best hotels,  
20 five star all around, for about, you know, 250. So  
21 that's -- I keep coming back to that in our meetings because  
22 why does it cost us 375 per square foot.

23 DR. VINCENT: That is both hard and soft costs.  
24 Your point's absolutely well taken. I would love for  
25 someone to fine tune these or add nuance to this number.

1           What we have set out to do was try to do this  
2 because no one had done it.

3           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Yeah.

4           DR. VINCENT: So what we did was translate -- for  
5 new construction, we translated the amount of new students  
6 the Department of Finance projects, how many square feet  
7 does the Department of Ed recommend roughly for those  
8 students, multiply that out by cost per square foot, you get  
9 a total number statewide.

10           Did the same thing for building replacements. We  
11 estimated that 10 percent of existing square footage across  
12 the state probably needs full renovation -- full  
13 replacement.

14           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Based on what? Just --

15           DR. VINCENT: Based on interviews, based on the  
16 fact that --

17           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So you said you  
18 interviewed --

19           DR. VINCENT: -- 30 percent of schools across the  
20 state are more than 50 years old, based on what we know  
21 about estimates of deferred maintenance.

22           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. But you said you  
23 interviewed 60 people, which included school folks and  
24 local --

25           DR. VINCENT: Yes.

1           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- elected, so we've got a  
2 thousand school districts.

3           DR. VINCENT: Right.

4           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: How many of that 60 -- then  
5 how many different districts or school people did you talk  
6 to?

7           DR. VINCENT: How many people from school  
8 districts did I talk to?

9           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. Yeah.

10          DR. VINCENT: You know, I --

11          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I mean because the focus on  
12 this is the schools and the condition of the schools. I  
13 mean that's --

14          DR. VINCENT: Right.

15          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- and we -- but we -- I  
16 mean you're pointing out here I think rightly so that that  
17 varies dramatically throughout the state.

18          DR. VINCENT: Absolutely.

19          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So in terms --

20          DR. VINCENT: Absolutely.

21          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- of the actual --

22          DR. VINCENT: You know, I'd have to go back and --

23          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- and direct data that we  
24 got from individual school districts, do we know what  
25 percent that is?

1 DR. VINCENT: Do we know what percent what is?

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, that you -- what  
3 percentage of the schools or districts, you know, did you  
4 talk to --

5 DR. VINCENT: Oh.

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- I mean how much data did  
7 we get from actual school districts in terms of --

8 DR. VINCENT: I would say I talked to a very small  
9 percent.

10 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. Yeah.

11 DR. VINCENT: Right. These are -- these numbers  
12 here are based on what we could glean from the program that  
13 had been spent, an estimation looking at age, you know,  
14 hearing about what facility managers and -- are talking  
15 about across the state.

16 It's an estimate and it's that -- with a capital  
17 E. It's an informed estimate.

18 MS. MOORE: If I may on the replacement.

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Uh-huh.

20 MS. MOORE: We do have an estimate that 10 percent  
21 of our facilities in California are over 70 years old.

22 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

23 MS. MOORE: So that is what drove I believe the  
24 10 percent value that was attributed here.

25 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. And I would guess

1 that some of those 70-year-old schools might be better than  
2 the schools might be better than the schools that were built  
3 30 years ago, so I don't -- you know, it may well be  
4 70 percent -- or 10 percent, but we don't -- just based on  
5 age, I think is probably --

6 DR. VINCENT: Absolutely. Age is a terrible proxy  
7 for quality because as you say some of these old buildings  
8 actually are some of our better buildings, assuming they've  
9 been --

10 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Properly maintenance.

11 DR. VINCENT: -- properly invested in. Yes, I  
12 absolutely agree and I would tell you anecdotally that a lot  
13 of what I heard individuals say was that, you know,  
14 buildings in certain eras are the ones that need to be  
15 replaced. '60s, '70s perhaps.

16 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Those are the ones that  
17 opened classrooms, the ones that we replaced.

18 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Is that when the Governor  
19 was governing the first time?

20 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, it was when you  
21 had -- a lot of them in the '60s and '70s you had these --  
22 no walls -- open classrooms and they just didn't work.  
23 So -- yeah.

24 MR. SAVIDGE: Terrible.

25 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. Those -- he had the

1 same issues in his district as we did in ours, so -- yeah.

2 DR. VINCENT: On the modernization side of things,  
3 as I mentioned, two categories. So we heard lots of stories  
4 and there's been testimony by Ms. Moore and others that  
5 modernization funds really went mainly towards health, life,  
6 safety, and ADA issues and really weren't stretched far  
7 enough to do the real definition of upgrades in  
8 modernization-related program delivery.

9 So we tried to estimate that. What we estimated  
10 was 30 percent of the total square footage across the state  
11 probably still needs health, life, safety, and ADA upgrades.  
12 30 percent of it also needs modernization for educational  
13 program delivery, and we price those out \$50 a square foot  
14 and \$150 a square foot. Again fairly conservative.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And again the 30 percent  
16 are just --

17 DR. VINCENT: Based on age, based on --

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- guesstimates. Yeah.

19 DR. VINCENT: Yeah. They're informed estimates  
20 and unfortunately, that's the best we can do to California  
21 right now.

22 If there was one outcome from all the effort that  
23 we put into this, it would be us moving beyond informed  
24 estimates or guesstimates as you say.

25 If we were actually data driven -- information

1 driven and prioritized funds, that would be an enormous win  
2 and I would love to retire.

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, I think we're going  
4 to be talking about some of that later.

5 DR. VINCENT: On the capital renew side, we  
6 calculated across the 471 million square feet. What that  
7 means at 3 percent, that's roughly \$5 billion annually.

8 Just to get a sense, if we had all the money in  
9 the world, how might we spend it based on best practice.

10 So if there are no further questions on that, I  
11 will jump into the recommendations and try to move through  
12 briefly.

13 Establishing a state vision and master plan,  
14 promoting sound local planning, assemble the needed  
15 information, review and update Title 5 standards, set the  
16 funding priorities, establish state funding of capital  
17 renewals, identify multiple revenue sources, and improve  
18 program accountability and as I said, I'm going to touch  
19 mainly on the ones in red which is kind of hard to see  
20 actually.

21 In the report -- and I have even more information  
22 on it -- we provided information on how other states do  
23 this.

24 What I can tell you is that every state does it  
25 dramatically differently. At least two-thirds of states

1 fund school facilities at the state level, but this can vary  
2 from a 2 percent contribution to a nearly hundred percent  
3 contribution.

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And if we make a comparison  
5 of California to a large state like some of your large  
6 industrial states like New York and others --

7 DR. VINCENT: Um-hmm.

8 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- does the comparison  
9 change at all because -- and if you've got a state where  
10 you've got a million or two million people total, you're  
11 smaller than the city of Los Angeles.

12 So I mean what you can do in a state that's that  
13 small versus a state of, you know, 38 million people with  
14 six and a half million student is dramatically different.

15 DR. VINCENT: Sure. And I have much more detailed  
16 information on that, but let me just give you a sense of I  
17 told you that our analysis shows that the state of  
18 California contributes about 30 percent --

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

20 DR. VINCENT: -- of total capital.

21 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

22 DR. VINCENT: Let me give you a couple  
23 comparisons. New York, 52 percent; Ohio, 50 percent;  
24 Florida, 21 percent; Arizona, 32 percent; Illinois,  
25 8 percent, although I think that's jumped up; Massachusetts,

1 30 to 80 percent. They have a real sliding scale. But that  
2 gives you a sense and we have more information which I'm  
3 happy to pull together for you.

4 But what we found is that --

5 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Without a context, I mean  
6 how do you know because you don't know what the tax  
7 structure is, how much the state takes in and how much  
8 local --

9 DR. VINCENT: There's 10,000 variations.

10 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: -- just you don't know.  
11 Yeah.

12 DR. VINCENT: Exactly. Because the flip side of  
13 that coin is what's the state rules on enabling legislation  
14 around the ability for locals to raise money. You know,  
15 that's the flip side of these and they all vary on that too.

16 You know, so that's the other piece of --  
17 understanding each one of those is an enormously huge  
18 endeavor.

19 Other states moving in the direction of things  
20 that we've outlined in the recommendations, 11 states have  
21 state level K-12 infrastructure plans. I'll talk about that  
22 in a second. 23 states require that local school districts  
23 have district-wide facility master plans, not unlike the  
24 state of California that requires of cities, for example,  
25 and those are general plans.

1           22 states have state level school facilities  
2 inventories that measure different issues around conditions,  
3 et cetera, of that inventory.

4           23 states factor local wealth into their funding  
5 formulas and 15 states factor building condition -- some  
6 measure of building condition into their funding formulas,  
7 just to give you a sense. And we have a lot more data  
8 points on those pieces going through.

9           So the first one is the state should really  
10 adopt -- create and adopt a vision and master plan for  
11 school facilities and this would really be potentially a  
12 role of the Legislature and -- the State Allocation Board it  
13 seems really to clarify the state's intent.

14           What we have seen in the others is this identifies  
15 high level priorities. This is not picking individual  
16 projects. It identifies high level priorities. It's really  
17 where the state links its educational goals and its school  
18 facilities priorities.

19           It then guides future discussions around bonds or  
20 any other legislation that creates additional funding at the  
21 state level and it should also have some broad compatibility  
22 with statewide infrastructure goals and here you can see  
23 these are the states that have those plans.

24           And one of the things that we laid out in the  
25 report was a suggested set of kind of principles around

1 accountability, around streamline and efficiency, around  
2 equity that could be -- are suggested for inclusion in that  
3 kind of thing.

4 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Madam Chair, may I digress  
5 a little bit off the report just because we're on that fact.

6 DR. VINCENT: Sure.

7 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: I mean we've been talking  
8 about a long time to have some kind of database where we  
9 know what facilities we have and what condition they're in,  
10 that sort of thing.

11 And I thank the staff for working with me, trying  
12 to come up with some ideas. Didn't realize that we need  
13 probably a statute to actually establish this and require  
14 funding for that. So that's something we have to work in  
15 the Legislature which I have introduced a bill for.

16 My concern is -- and we're going to talk about the  
17 second part of the thing is if we can't get our school  
18 district to accurately fill out the little whiz forms or  
19 whatever we call them, how are we going to have them fill  
20 out the database saying what kind of -- you know, what -- so  
21 maybe as you're addressing your comments and you bring up  
22 the other state examples, you need the carrot and the stick  
23 so to speak to make sure you have accurate data.

24 DR. VINCENT: Right.

25 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Because like -- we're

1 doing a lot of assumptions here on age of buildings and size  
2 and things like that, but if we don't have the local  
3 districts participating in it truthfully and fully and be  
4 able to utilize their, you know, capital monies in the right  
5 way, we can't track that, which I'm frankly surprised that  
6 we have all these state agencies and we spend a lot of money  
7 up here, but we're not doing that to begin with, but since  
8 we're not, you know, what kind of systems do you think that  
9 does work out there.

10 DR. VINCENT: Yeah. That's a very good question  
11 and this is basically the next piece that I'm going to talk  
12 about.

13 What we have seen is that sometimes it's in  
14 statute. It's an absolute requirement and/or it's a  
15 requirement to access any state funds. You have to provide  
16 this information, no questions.

17 Recommendation three is assemble the information  
18 and know the assets to be strategic and priority driven.  
19 Our recommendation here is really to develop an inventory  
20 and assessment tool and I think that this has been  
21 interpreted many ways in the -- what we've written in the  
22 report, but I also think there's many, many ways to do this.

23 On one hand, what we've seen in states like  
24 Colorado or others is that they hire a firm. They go out  
25 and do a snapshot inventory and it's a snapshot in time of

1 what exists and what are the conditions of it.

2           What I would recommend and what it appears that a  
3 handful of states are doing is more of a living and ongoing  
4 tool for both local planning and state planning and  
5 prioritization where locals are collecting the data and  
6 there are some standards around what is collected.

7           It's simple. It's clear and they're reporting  
8 that digitally in a system or whatnot and they're  
9 responsible for updating it.

10           New York and Florida, for example, they do it.  
11 Florida does it almost annually I think. New York does it  
12 every five years, but there's usually a technology component  
13 involved in that.

14           But that it's really locally validated. That is  
15 it's up to the locals to have approved it by their board or  
16 whatever the requirement is and the state says okay, we  
17 accept that.

18           And I think that also it's a locally validated  
19 element of a local school district facility master plan and  
20 that's actually one of the pieces in recommendation two  
21 which I wasn't going to talk a lot about, but I think that,  
22 you know, what's interesting in the Governor's budget  
23 proposal particularly around education and facilities is  
24 that with the local control funding formula that they  
25 suggested that local school districts put together an

1 education plan.

2           And there's some language in there about the  
3 facilities would be a component of that. And I think this  
4 presents a window of opportunity to put some guidelines  
5 around what should districts be looking at and collecting  
6 and laying out in facilities plan and really that facilities  
7 plan, when I get to the state prioritization of funds, would  
8 really be a locally driven thing and the state would say  
9 okay, you've put together a sound plan based on the way --  
10 the best practices we've laid out and we're going to help  
11 you fund that plan with a certain share.

12           But I think where the other states that we have  
13 talked to, the New Mexicos, the others are moving towards is  
14 how can this be a partnership tool and a planning tool for  
15 both locals and state and there's a technology component to  
16 that and we have some examples in the report.

17           But as you say, Mr. Hagman, it's not an easy  
18 thing. It's not been an easy thing in California and it  
19 actually gets back to the distrust piece.

20           A lot of school district representatives just told  
21 me that they were very cautious at providing data because  
22 they didn't know how it was going to be used. They have  
23 concerns about it and I think implementing something like  
24 this, we have to be clear about this is how it's going to be  
25 used, this is what's required of it, these are the

1 incentives that you get for filling out this information.

2 MR. ALMANZA: Did you get any examples of data  
3 that would be dangerous to disclose?

4 DR. VINCENT: Dangerous to disclose? In terms  
5 of -- related to the safety issue or --

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Our school districts are  
7 part of -- they're in the public. So we're saying that we  
8 can't disclose information that is in the public domain  
9 because if I disclose it, maybe I don't qualify for one  
10 program or another or whatever.

11 I mean is it because of the way the program's set  
12 up or what is the --

13 DR. VINCENT: That's a really good question  
14 because I think that -- I think, you know, there's a  
15 legitimate concern -- I don't know what the analogy is --  
16 airing your dirty laundry.

17 You don't necessarily want to put these things out  
18 there in a way that, you know, is going to cause, you know,  
19 uproar either locally or at the state level, but you also --  
20 you know, the -- I think from a state approach it's okay if  
21 we do an inventory. Does that mean we own a hundred billion  
22 dollar problem that we document?

23 MR. ALMANZA: So --

24 DR. VINCENT: You know, I think that's --

25 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So you're saying that

1 they --

2 DR. VINCENT: That's a legitimate concern.

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But you -- your comment you  
4 made earlier was that they don't want to give the  
5 information to the state because there's great distrust of  
6 the state and that this program has created more distrust.

7 Having been on a school board before and after the  
8 program, I look at this program as a night and day compared  
9 to the programs we had prior.

10 So I'm trying to figure out did it work previously  
11 and it doesn't work now because clearly when you -- if you  
12 take a look at the investment that's been made over the last  
13 14 years, it far exceeds what we were able to do in the  
14 previous, you know, couple of decades.

15 So I'm just trying to -- those are very broad sort  
16 of statements that you're saying and I'm just trying to  
17 drill down to this saying what is the distrust.

18 I mean right now school districts have to certify  
19 their enrollments, the number of classrooms they have.  
20 There are some criteria and I'm just amazed that -- I know  
21 Bill and I have talked because he's from West Contra Costa,  
22 I'm from San Ramon Valley. We certainly have master plans  
23 before we even go forward to make -- to apply for funds.

24 So I'm just trying to figure out are we unique and  
25 other districts don't do that kind of planning or is there

1 something that's different that's happening everywhere else.

2 DR. VINCENT: Yes. I would say you are somewhat  
3 unique. I can't --

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. And that's based --  
5 again how many -- out of your 60 interviews, how many school  
6 districts do you know are doing master planning and aren't  
7 doing master planning?

8 DR. VINCENT: That I don't know. I could try to  
9 figure something like that -- (indiscernible) I could  
10 actually figure that.

11 What I have heard repeatedly from many folks is  
12 that capacities for planning both the staff, knowledge, and  
13 just staff varies greatly.

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

15 DR. VINCENT: Districts that have accessed the  
16 program usually have their shop together for the most part  
17 and are able to do planning, but not everyone has that  
18 luxury to do and I think that --

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And I'm just trying to  
20 drill down and say that's what you've heard. How do I  
21 validate that there's -- are we -- you know, is it --

22 DR. VINCENT: Um-hmm.

23 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I mean in terms of the  
24 sample size you have which is obviously very small versus  
25 what is actually happening and having something that's more

1 reliable so we know what's happening throughout the state  
2 because I find it hard to believe that any district that's  
3 going to go to the voters for a bond or for that matter even  
4 apply to the state for financial hardship is not taking some  
5 kind of an assessment of its inventory and where its  
6 greatest need is.

7           If not, I would think you'd have school boards  
8 being voted out of office all over the state. So I just --  
9 it just seems intuitive to me that that should be happening  
10 and if it's not, I just -- I would really like to know.

11           DR. VINCENT: It seems to me the Department of Ed  
12 would probably have the best --

13           MS. MOORE: Yeah. I would say it's -- as Jeff  
14 indicates, we see a range in those types of plans. What I  
15 would say is that we have never funded planning.

16           So oftentimes, you know, you hear what is funded  
17 or measured gets done. So I think one of the outcomes that  
18 we were seeking as we moved forward in this discussion was  
19 the importance of planning and if that is to set the tone  
20 and the breadth of a school district's projects that we  
21 ought to have a clear understanding of what that should be  
22 and, you know, are we willing as a state to contribute  
23 towards that funding to ensure that projects are done in  
24 priority order. I think --

25           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Maybe you can help me

1 because we did our -- we set our district standards, we  
2 created our master plans. We did master planning at each  
3 site level.

4 To my knowledge, we never sent that to the  
5 Department of Ed or got approvals. Is that --

6 MS. MOORE: You don't have to get approvals, but  
7 there are certain components of our Title 5 that you have to  
8 justify through your --

9 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: That's exactly right.

10 MS. MOORE: -- through your master plan.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But in terms of a district  
12 master plan and everything else --

13 MS. MOORE: But you have to justify it, but it  
14 doesn't necessarily come to the Department of Education and  
15 we bless that.

16 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But that's what I'm trying  
17 to figure out --

18 MS. MOORE: Yeah. So --

19 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- I mean how we really  
20 drill down into whether or not it's -- districts are  
21 doing --

22 MS. MOORE: I think that your district -- and we  
23 can certainly hear from districts. I think that your  
24 district and your experience is one end of the continuum and  
25 then I think there is a capacity issue with a lot of

1 districts at other ends of continuums.

2           You know, when districts staff -- when the  
3 facilities, it's a superintendent. You know, that's going  
4 to produce a different set of capacity than --

5           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

6           MS. MOORE: -- a district that has a director of  
7 facilities or an assistant superintendent of facilities and  
8 a 30-member staff. So that --

9           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Absolute --

10          MS. MOORE: -- that range in capacity produces a  
11 range in results so that I think that you're seeing a bit of  
12 represented here today.

13          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So -- but half your school  
14 districts have what, less than a thousand or 2,000 students.  
15 Your ability to, you know, hire help or have them take a  
16 look at the -- assess your facility if you're a one school  
17 or two school district, that need in terms of staffing to do  
18 that also varies dramatically.

19          MS. MOORE: I mean we had an example in this state  
20 of how we funded deferred maintenance and we funded deferred  
21 maintenance based on a five-year plan.

22                 It was a very successful program. Districts  
23 produced their five-year plans. They operated off of them.  
24 The state funded its share of deferred maintenance. I mean  
25 it was a planned based operation and it was very successful.

1           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Although I would argue that  
2 it was not truly successful. I mean it required districts  
3 to do a five-year plan and you could adjust it during those  
4 five years. It never came close to meeting the goals of --  
5 and we called it deferred maintenance, but it never came  
6 close to meeting the actual requirements of what you're  
7 talking about in your report in terms of your 2 to 4 percent  
8 that you should be putting into schools so that if you go 25  
9 years from, you know, your construction or modernization to  
10 the next 25 years and you know you have to replace your  
11 HVAC, your paint two times or whatever, I mean it never --  
12 it was a good program, but it never came close to funding  
13 the real need.

14           MS. MOORE: I would agree with that and I think  
15 its strength, however, was that it was a plan based program.

16           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: And I was just going to  
17 comment. I think we always have the pressures of day-to-day  
18 operation costs and the political pressures that ensue from  
19 there for operational staff versus the capacity of the  
20 buildings and the most flexibility that the locals have of  
21 that, the more influenced they are by those political  
22 pressures to spend their dollars one way or the other.

23           And I think, you know, for our purposes on --  
24 since we're dealing with 30-year capital improvements for  
25 the most part is we got to see what recommendations we could

1 have beyond that. Not so much getting all the rest of the  
2 operations. Ms. Buchanan has to deal with that in her own  
3 committee.

4 But we do -- you know, we talked about a little  
5 bit of security earlier. I was concerned that, well, you  
6 know, we got to spend new locks and stuff.

7 We're talking 30-year bond money. So my turn is  
8 that if I'm paying on something for 30 years, I want this  
9 thing to last longer than 30 years and it's not for  
10 something the quick fix and this is that -- you know, we  
11 just got a grant.

12 It's not a grant of money for operations or fix-it  
13 projects or anything like that. This is something that has  
14 to be long lasting because we'll be paying on it for a very  
15 long time.

16 I do think something that should be discussed on  
17 the regular education operational funding is how much -- you  
18 know, we -- and we always talk about flexibility and  
19 categoricals and such all the time, but how much needs to be  
20 put aside so that local pressure to spend every cent they  
21 have possibly on keeping everyone else happy today doesn't  
22 cost us more tomorrow.

23 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. And I agree,  
24 although I would also say that local control without  
25 adequate funding is -- doesn't have much meaning.

1           So I want to try and wrap this up in the next 30  
2 minutes if possible. I don't know -- I'm sure we're going  
3 to have comments -- we're going to have comments even though  
4 we're down a few members here, but we also want to try and  
5 get to the PIW before --

6           DR. VINCENT: Should I take another six minutes or  
7 what would you suggest?

8           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Maybe you could take five  
9 to ten and then --

10          DR. VINCENT: Great.

11          CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: We then have time for  
12 additional questions or comments.

13          DR. VINCENT: So in concluding I think that  
14 discussion which is a good one I think that my understanding  
15 and look at what's is -- in California, there are few  
16 requirements, guidelines, direction on the planning side for  
17 local school districts for worse and I think that districts  
18 vary greatly in their capacity, their know-how, their  
19 ability to staff and do those kinds of things.

20          As I heard from one school facility director, we  
21 get the money and then we plan. A little tongue in cheek  
22 but not entirely.

23          Four is really we should do a review and update of  
24 the standards -- the Title 5 in California Code of  
25 Regulations. This has come up at each of the hearings of

1 this Committee that I have watched online or attended.

2           How do we define a complete school? If the  
3 state's funding a school, what does that minimally have to  
4 have. This is a tough question. Other states really  
5 wrestle with this.

6           One approach to doing that is the first bullet  
7 there, is to say, okay, let's do a statewide comparison of  
8 schools built in the last number of years -- new schools and  
9 look at ones across different types of communities,  
10 particularly across different community wealth, and really  
11 see what are the basic component -- what seem to be the  
12 basic components, what seem to be more extraordinary  
13 components, and try to put some definition around that.

14           We had the complete school discussion here a  
15 handful of years ago. It never quite got resolved and this  
16 is in our minds kind of looming out there.

17           So what -- updating the -- doing a review of  
18 Title 5 -- it was last updated in the year 2000. It would  
19 define minimum standards particularly to guide modernization  
20 because if you read Title 5, it's mostly about new  
21 construction and it was written at a time of growth and it  
22 says very little about upgrading schools and where are the  
23 standards. So that would guide modernization.

24           Obviously it should promote modern quality  
25 educational facilities and promote wise community

1 investment.

2           Looking across the states, we find that 23  
3 states -- usually if they fund facilities, they have  
4 comprehensive standards.

5           Comprehensive standards is a subjective term.  
6 These vary greatly. We're one of them that I would say have  
7 comprehensive standards, but those vary greatly from any one  
8 of those states up there.

9           Part of the work that we are doing right now as a  
10 follow-up to this for California Department of Ed is taking  
11 a closer look at what are the types of things that are  
12 addressed in these standards.

13           Not that necessarily California should copy  
14 exactly anything from any other state, but how do we inform  
15 how we even think about that. Because I can tell you that,  
16 you know, a state like Ohio had a very large lawsuit a  
17 number of years ago. Then they had I believe tobacco  
18 settlement money -- use and inventory to literally rank  
19 individual schools and fund down this equity list mandated  
20 by the courts.

21           But one of the things that came out of that was a  
22 standards design guide manual that's in two parts and it's  
23 this thick and it's largely seen as way over prescriptive,  
24 and I think we -- my impression is we don't necessarily want  
25 to go down the road with that.

1           But how do we think with this balance of what  
2 state minimums are in ensuring equity and accountability but  
3 also giving local flexibility.

4           So we're working on that piece to inform that  
5 discussion. But that is a key piece of this.

6           All right. Clearly the most controversial: set  
7 priorities to support new construction, maintain/improve  
8 assets, and remember inadequate facilities. The things that  
9 I talked about before, having a broad state plan that lays  
10 out priorities, having locals do plans, and having these  
11 standards would really define what the priorities are and  
12 where are the schools that fall below some defined minimum.

13           And I think a key piece of our recommendations is  
14 really going forward from an asset management approach and a  
15 wise investment approach with scarce funds at the state  
16 level is really do some targeted investment particularly  
17 around schools that are below a minimum level.

18           We should also, you know, assist with funding new  
19 construction and growth because we certainly will be back,  
20 but we really need to spend some time looking at the other  
21 side of this, the 80-so percent of our inventory, which is  
22 all the existing schools out there, you know, that are more  
23 than 25 years old.

24           Identify state level need with the inventory,  
25 et cetera, local plans can prioritize those needs, getting

1 back to our conversation.

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Can I ask one quick  
3 question? On your 87 percent that are more than 25 years  
4 old --

5 DR. VINCENT: Well --

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- are you including in  
7 that the parts of the 87 percent that have been modernized  
8 in the last --

9 DR. VINCENT: No, and I think that's why what we  
10 need to do is map OPSC apportionment data - -

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. I just want to be  
12 sure when we make a statement like that people don't assume  
13 that that 87 percent haven't been touched in 25 years --

14 DR. VINCENT: Absolutely.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- because they may well  
16 have been completely modernized in that time.

17 DR. VINCENT: Right. One of the things I would  
18 love to see is the apportionment data, the allocation data  
19 since 1998 mapped onto schools and onto districts and do  
20 that by geography and wealth and who got nothing or next to  
21 nothing and why is that.

22 Is it they didn't want to do anything and that's  
23 fine. Is it that they lack the technical capacity to get in  
24 line in our program or is it that they lack (interruption)  
25 may be some or all of those.

1           But really the idea here is that a targeted  
2 investment at least with some of our next funding, assuming  
3 there is another round of funding from some source, really  
4 it's our -- investments bringing schools up to a minimum  
5 level and at some times that will be full school  
6 replacements, but of course that -- we need to have some  
7 guidelines on life cycle costing to make that determination.

8           What we have seen across the country is that 14  
9 states have had facilities adequacy lawsuits that have  
10 involved facilities and they have mandated this kind of  
11 approach.

12           We had Williams. We had Godinez as well.  
13 Remedies in my opinion a trickle in the bucket relative to  
14 what we were spending and relative to what we need.

15           On the funding formula side, it's interesting  
16 since we did this research now that the local control  
17 funding formula is out there. It's being discussed with a  
18 base rate and then a few additions for certain disadvantages  
19 and it may be something that we want to think about in  
20 streamlining what we have now in terms of our facility side  
21 with a project-by-project approach and then the  
22 categoricals.

23           What we have found is that many of the states that  
24 fund school facilities do this sort of weighted approach so  
25 there's kind of a sliding scale for any individual project.

1           Some of them actually do plan based funding for  
2 construction and renovation as Kathleen was mentioning, but  
3 some of them do a project-by-project.

4           They either weigh local wealth into the funding  
5 formula or they weight building condition. And some of them  
6 also we a measure of educational suitability of that  
7 building.

8           I won't go through this, but we have many examples  
9 of specific states in the report. I'm happy to pull more of  
10 this information for you together.

11           Establish capital renewals funding to safeguard  
12 these assets. That's what we've seen in the Deferred  
13 Maintenance Program here which now has been able to be  
14 flexed.

15           This seems like a problem going forward in terms  
16 of our investment. But a key piece to that the state may  
17 want to consider is adjusting that capital renewal funding  
18 for wealth, condition, and local effort because I think one  
19 of the concerns people often have is okay, should a district  
20 just ignore its facilities and it'll get more state money.

21           And what we've seen other states try to do is  
22 measure effort. Do they have a plan. Have they  
23 prioritized. You know, do they have an inventory. Have  
24 they at least tried to put forth bonds.

25           There are measures at that local effort and we can

1 talk more about that. What we found is that nine states  
2 have moved towards an annual appropriation for facilities  
3 even if it's a minimal amount.

4 Let me wrap up by saying that improving program  
5 accountability, we need program assessment as I said. Map  
6 these monies, where they went to who got them and who didn't  
7 get them.

8 We talk also in the report about issues around  
9 streamlining the process. I won't go into it because I  
10 think it's something you all are interested, but the key  
11 piece of it really is the technology to do that, you know,  
12 an interagency management system that's also linked to an  
13 inventory system and I can show you other states that are  
14 trying to develop that.

15 So let me end by saying that the take-away again  
16 is that plans and needs should guide the state investment  
17 particularly as we are in an era of less funds. We still  
18 have high needs. They're different than they were 13 years  
19 ago in terms of the productions and we should really be  
20 targeting them.

21 Maintain local control flexibility and  
22 prioritization but have clear state standards about where  
23 facilities need to be.

24 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you. So does anyone  
25 have -- any comments from anyone? I think we might as well

1 hear all the comments before we actually begin.

2 DR. VINCENT: Should I stay up here?

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah.

4 MR. LYON: Good morning, Madam Chair, members.  
5 Richard Lyon on behalf of the California Building Industry  
6 Association.

7 Acknowledge Mr. Vincent for taking on the heroic  
8 task of producing this report and also want to thank the  
9 Superintendent of Public Instruction for his strong support  
10 of a 2014 school bond, his strong support of the SB50  
11 program. We think there are real opportunities going  
12 forward for the home building community to work with all of  
13 you and to expand the SB50 program in areas of -- we talked  
14 about school safety, higher technology, energy efficiency.

15 We think those are real lucrative areas where we  
16 can work and make some real headway as we go forward and  
17 you'll find the home building industry to be a strong  
18 partner in those.

19 I'd like to offer a couple comments with respect  
20 to the Berkeley report and I'd like to focus on two specific  
21 areas. One are the conclusions that the report reaches  
22 regarding housing demand and the long-term market trends and  
23 the impact this would have on K-12 infrastructure and  
24 secondly, on recommendations that were made in the report  
25 that would load some new state planning and infrastructure

1 criteria onto the SB50 program which we fear could take the  
2 program into another direction.

3           It could attempt to solve problems that other laws  
4 have been established to solve. And in doing so, we fear  
5 that it could compromise some of the basic tenets of the  
6 program which is to provide classroom space and to educate  
7 students where they and their families choose to live.

8           First to the housing issue. The report  
9 appropriately I think relies on the Department of Finance  
10 data to project overall population growth and net enrollment  
11 increases.

12           Where we think it falls short and we think it  
13 falls very short are on the conclusions that it draws about  
14 future housing demand. And again this is important because  
15 making sure that we have accurate assumptions about housing  
16 demand both in terms of type and location will have  
17 significant implications for K-12 infrastructure investment  
18 policies in the future.

19           A theme that -- or a conclusion that runs through  
20 the report is that the demands both in terms of housing and  
21 school facility needs going forward will be significantly  
22 different than they've been historically -- been  
23 historically has been case.

24           And to an extent, that's correct. You know,  
25 things change. Nothing remains the same.

1           We think though we do need to be careful about is  
2 forecasting or expecting big transformational changes.  
3 Market fundamentals and family and consumer attitudes tend  
4 over time to remain pretty constant in terms of what people  
5 value. They value opportunities for personal betterment.  
6 They value safe communities and safe schools and they  
7 certainly value choice in how and where to live.

8           And those are constants that we think will remain  
9 and they are absolute fundamentals.

10           The report relies on the Urban Land Institute  
11 survey of a couple years ago that made some headline  
12 grabbing news that California has a support of single family  
13 homes that are sufficient to last through 2035. The report  
14 came out in 2011.

15           So it was basically concluding that we have a  
16 single family supply of homes to last for about 25 years.

17           It was a bit of an eccentric statement when it was  
18 made and a couple years later, it really couldn't be further  
19 from the realities out there in the marketplace today.

20           A significant issue that we're facing in  
21 California today is a higher housing demand in the face of  
22 lower inventory. We're beginning to edge back to the more  
23 historical patterns of rising prices brought on by  
24 increasing demand and a constrained supply.

25           For example, in the Bay Area or portions of the

1 Bay Area, we have a solid job base. We have an active  
2 housing market.

3           There's a lot of new demand. The problem we're  
4 seeing in parts of the Bay Area is a quickly dwindling  
5 supply of buildable and entitled land and that's a  
6 constraining supply and it's contributing to higher prices.

7           In other parts of the state, in the Sacramento  
8 region, for example, we're beginning to see a somewhat  
9 better economy.

10           There's land for growth, but we still have a  
11 hangover from higher unemployment and from distressed  
12 properties on the market.

13           Here in this region what we see are a low  
14 inventory of units coupled with increasing demand and that  
15 is pushing prices upward.

16           The top of the market was '04 or '05. The bottom  
17 was in '09. And one of the interesting occurrences that we  
18 have seen since the bottom of the market is the rise in  
19 multi-family rental permits that have been pulled.

20           Last year we actually saw multi-family permits  
21 slightly exceed single family permits and as we talk to our  
22 members, we're beginning to see that dynamic begin to change  
23 somewhat and I think understandably so.

24           There's a strong consumer demand for homeownership  
25 and because new residential construction numbers had fallen

1 so low and because homeownership rates had fallen so low,  
2 there's room -- a lot of room for growth and opportunity in  
3 the new homeownership market

4           And this is where particularly we see a strong  
5 rebound poised to occur.

6           There's going to be definitely economic  
7 revitalization challenge in areas of the state, areas with  
8 higher unemployment, higher crime rates, lower economic  
9 wealth, and we're all going to need to work together to  
10 fashion tools for those localities and that includes  
11 bettering the schools in those areas and the Modernization  
12 Program we think is uniquely suited to those challenges and  
13 to the extent that we need to strengthen the Modernization  
14 Program to respond to those underserved communities, we look  
15 forward to working on that.

16           Another conclusion or recommendation that the  
17 report makes is that the next round of funding should  
18 prioritize at least in part by sustainable community  
19 objectives. And to its credit, the report acknowledges that  
20 first and foremost that our facility investment program  
21 should support educational needs, but beyond that caveat, it  
22 spends pages upon pages suggesting that new state land use  
23 criteria and new state infrastructure planning criteria  
24 should be loaded onto the SB50 program even as Mr. Vincent  
25 has acknowledged that the report does recognize the

1 importance of local control.

2           We think that it would be a mistake to do this.  
3 We think it would divert the SB50 program from its primary  
4 mission.

5           I'm going to skip a lot of the discussion about  
6 SB375. I represented the industry in the SB50 negotiations  
7 15 years ago. I represented the California Building  
8 Industry in the SB375 negotiations that created sustainable  
9 community strategies.

10           There are processes and plans out there that  
11 address those issues and we think it would be again a  
12 mistake to load those onto the SB50 program.

13           My wife is elementary level public school teacher.  
14 Keeping fourth graders on track is a challenge and she's  
15 fond of teaching them the lesson of the hound and the  
16 rabbit.

17           It's an allegorical lesson and the hound is given  
18 the responsibility to chase down the rabbit. And he starts  
19 out with very good intentions, but he finds himself quickly  
20 diverted by squirrels that keep popping up and he'll chase a  
21 squirrel here and he chases a squirrel there and in the end  
22 he loses sight of the rabbit and ends up with nothing.

23           We need to keep the SB50 program focused to its  
24 main objective and that's providing schools where families  
25 with children choose to live. We think that's the very

1 definition of a sustainable community and SB50 allocates  
2 resources to meet those real world needs and that's really  
3 the beauty of the program.

4           So with that, thank you very much for the  
5 opportunity to offer those comments, Madam Chair.

6           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: All right. Thank you.

7           MR. LARSEN: Good morning. My name is Michael  
8 Larson. I'm staff to the California Strategic Growth  
9 Council. The Council is made up of four state agencies and  
10 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and one of  
11 our charges is to consider the state's infrastructure  
12 spending in relation to the state's sustainability goals.

13           First let me say that we at the Council are truly  
14 excited and pleased that the State Allocation Board through  
15 this Subcommittee is turning an eye to the future of the  
16 School Facilities Program.

17           The review is a challenging but supremely  
18 important task and I commend you all for undertaking it.

19           I'm not going to use this opportunity to talk  
20 about the importance of sustainable development or in-fill  
21 development or energy efficiency or green building, even  
22 though those are all priorities of the Strategic Growth  
23 Council and we really do think that they're all great  
24 opportunities for the School Facilities Program.

25           But despite all of that, I still don't think that

1 those are even the most supreme opportunity for this  
2 program.

3           So I'm going to talk about that single greatest  
4 opportunity which I think is to encourage local  
5 collaborative planning.

6           There are great co-benefits to be realized through  
7 local collaborative planning and I see a potential for the  
8 School Facilities Program to incentivize this type of local  
9 activity. So that might be school facilities that are  
10 consistent with local or regional plans and in turn local  
11 and regional plans that promote the school district's  
12 objectives.

13           Think about a school district, a city, a county,  
14 and a region that are all nested or maybe overlapping  
15 jurisdiction and each of these entities is separately  
16 developing long-range plans that map out the future of their  
17 community.

18           Now of course it's entirely up to them to decide  
19 what that future's going to look like. That local authority  
20 is sacrosanct, no question.

21           But we're simply suggesting that those visions --  
22 the school district's vision, the city's vision, the  
23 county's vision, the regional agency's vision -- that those  
24 visions be consistent with one another, that it be a shared  
25 vision of a common future.

1           Through this sort of collaborative planning, all  
2 parties can benefit and they benefit across all sorts of  
3 outcomes. As just one of many examples, think about safe  
4 routes to school.

5           For safe routes to school to really work, a school  
6 district needs to work with the local government. This  
7 leads to tremendous safety benefits of course. That's the  
8 primary purpose but also great public health benefits both  
9 in terms of providing healthy active ways for students to  
10 get school and also in terms of reducing the number of cars  
11 idling in front of the school gate spewing particulate  
12 emissions that make our students more susceptible to asthma  
13 and other diseases.

14           And there's a longstanding understanding that  
15 healthier students are more able to learn, so there are also  
16 positive educational outcomes.

17           And in case that isn't enough, there's also a  
18 financial argument for collaborative planning and in this  
19 era of tight resources and prudent spending, we as the state  
20 should take a bigger picture view about how the state spends  
21 its dollars.

22           In one part of the state government, CTC and  
23 Caltrans, they're funding the planning and construction of  
24 the state's regional transportation networks.

25           Over in my shop, we're giving grants to local

1 governments to do general plan updates and the like and then  
2 of course here providing funding for school districts to  
3 build facilities here or there to serve the community.

4           And wouldn't all of our money be better spent.  
5 Don't we as the state as a funder have a vested interest in  
6 seeing that these regional, local, and school district plans  
7 and facilities are aligned with one another.

8           This is fundamentally about making our state  
9 investment go further and I would hate to limit over in our  
10 shop where funding some specific plan that makes it harder  
11 for students to safely cross the street to get to a school  
12 that's funded through this program. Then we would be  
13 funding things that are at odds and that would be a waste of  
14 our state resources.

15           So to make sure that doesn't happen, we at the  
16 Grown Council and other places, need to explicitly consider  
17 the impact on schools from the projects that we fund and  
18 analogously we ask that you explicitly consider the impacts  
19 on communities, cities, and regions from the projects that  
20 you fund through the future of the School Facilities  
21 Program.

22           And the impact is real. 10 percent of weekday  
23 vehicle trips in California are dropping off or picking up  
24 students to or from school. That's amazing statistic and it  
25 suggests that schools have a huge impact on a region's

1 transportation network.

2           And of course that transportation network affects  
3 residential growth or where people live and we all know that  
4 where people live affects school enrollment, you know, where  
5 the students are.

6           So these issues are all interconnected across all  
7 levels of government and Dr. Vincent's work makes a very  
8 compelling case for this. A school cannot thrive if a city  
9 is failing and a city is not thriving if its schools are  
10 failing.

11           They share a common future and so their planning  
12 efforts should be coordinated and consistent to shape that  
13 future.

14           The School Facilities Program is one of the few  
15 levers that we have to move local planning in this direction  
16 and so we at the Strategic Growth Council encourage you to  
17 take advantage of that. Thank you.

18           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So I have a couple  
19 questions there.

20           MR. LARSEN: Please.

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Because I'm clearly  
22 confused in terms of what you're implying.

23           Are you saying the schools lead the plan and we  
24 plan the cities around the schools?

25           MR. LARSEN: Not at all. Not at all. I'm simply

1 suggesting that we feel that all the partners, schools,  
2 local governments, and regions --

3 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. So you're not  
4 suggesting -- so let me get this straight. I don't know of  
5 any city or county who would cede that authority to schools.

6 So to my understanding, at least all the ones with  
7 whom I've worked or the communities surrounding mine, the  
8 cities or the counties, they do their general plan, they do  
9 their transportation.

10 MR. LARSEN: Right.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: We then say okay, you know,  
12 if you're going to add these homes, we're going to need an  
13 elementary school or a middle school or a high school or  
14 whatever and we respond to that and the -- when they do  
15 their transportation studies and everything else, it takes  
16 all that into consideration.

17 So how -- what are you saying is our role here at  
18 the state level in terms of directing that if that's already  
19 happening at the local level and I don't -- I mean and, you  
20 know, how do we -- what are -- I mean right now school  
21 funding follows need.

22 So if a city's general plan or whatever calls for,  
23 you know, we're going to have new development whether it's  
24 located in this area or this area or somewhere else, we --  
25 you know, the school districts respond to that by defining

1 what their needs are and the state responds to that by  
2 saying okay, if you have this need, we will -- and, you  
3 know, you're going to have the students, you're going to  
4 need the classrooms, we respond by providing funding there.

5 So what is not responsive in the program today  
6 with respect to that?

7 MR. LARSEN: Well, we do see examples of local  
8 plans that can throw off school district plans and similarly  
9 school district plans that can --

10 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Can you give me a good  
11 example? I'd appreciate that.

12 MR. LARSEN: I don't feel comfortable naming names  
13 of the --

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: All right.

15 MR. LARSEN: -- communities in California, but  
16 just a very brief answer to that.

17 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And the other comment I  
18 would say is that I do believe that schools are the most  
19 important elements of communities and you can see -- when  
20 you see population movement from one area to another,  
21 sometimes it's for the simple reason that the parents want  
22 the kids in one school district or another.

23 But building the school itself does not  
24 necessarily drive that as much as the quality of the  
25 educational program in that school. So I don't think that

1 the building itself -- I mean and I do agree that if you  
2 take -- you know, the most important issue in education is  
3 having a highly qualified -- not qualified -- highly  
4 effective teacher in every classroom.

5           If you put that teacher in a classroom that's well  
6 equipped, that has good lighting and everything, I think  
7 that helps that teacher become even more effective.

8           But certainly this Board does not deal with that  
9 operational aspect and I think that -- how the schools  
10 operate and they're managed and the quality of education and  
11 all of that is as equally or even potentially more important  
12 than the facilities themselves.

13           But I just do not see how school districts, one,  
14 don't have input now, and, two, how we drive those local  
15 general planning decisions. Certainly we respond to them  
16 and we're part of the process, but --

17           MR. LARSEN: I agree with all that. We're simply  
18 encouraging local school districts and local government to  
19 get together earlier in the process to map out a common  
20 future for the vision and --

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So I'd just be interested  
22 in examples where that's not happening right now.

23           MS. MOORE: Well, I think what Mr. Larsen is  
24 pointing out is that we have a lot Public Resource Code,  
25 Education Code, and regulatory schemes that sometimes

1 provide conflicting messages and that probably one of the  
2 aspects that the report pointed out was that we could do  
3 better at these regional planning levels.

4           And I think that feeds into what I said earlier  
5 about being able to both fund and develop capacity for  
6 school districts to locally plan and plan within their  
7 community regions.

8           It was one of the findings and I mean we hear this  
9 a lot about how difficult it is both for the school  
10 districts and cities and counties to plan together.

11           School districts have a tremendous amount of  
12 autonomy in their projects and their planning as do cities  
13 and counties and that that -- ways that we can encourage  
14 that the regions plan better together, I think is the point  
15 that I'm hearing Mr. Larsen make is that that makes for  
16 better communities.

17           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: But I'm trying to find out  
18 do they not have adequate input into the general planning  
19 process or where exactly then is the problem because  
20 ultimately we fund schools where they need to be built.

21           You know, it's sort of like we have a new  
22 development going in. It's going to generate 720 elementary  
23 school students. You know, we can't ask them to travel five  
24 miles across town to another one and so we agree with that  
25 and we provide funding for that school.

1           So I'm just trying to -- you know, I guess we'll  
2 talk about it more as we talk about the program, but exactly  
3 how our program is not responding to that because I think  
4 those types of planning issues are not controlled strictly  
5 by schools.

6           MR. LARSEN: Thank you for your time.

7           MR. DIXON: Madam Chair, Committee members, Joe  
8 Dixon, Assistant Sup. of Facilities in Santa Ana, and I want  
9 to commend Dr. Vincent for his report.

10           We think there's a lot of really important aspects  
11 to the report.

12           But I wanted to comment a little bit about the  
13 size of California and Assemblymember Hagman's question was  
14 a good one. What do you use for the square foot -- cost per  
15 square foot? It's all over the place.

16           And it just shows that the diversity of the state  
17 is so big, it's hard to have a state master plan for every  
18 school district.

19           I've seen districts in the Central Valley that  
20 simply don't have the resources either human or otherwise to  
21 be able to do the things that we can do in Orange County,  
22 for example.

23           I also wanted to perhaps answer the question about  
24 why school districts wouldn't trust sending information.  
25 And the example that popped into my head was the AB300 list.

1           In Southern California, the media got ahold of  
2 that and really beat us up and they still do on other stuff  
3 too, but that was just one example of, you know, perhaps  
4 when Dr. Vincent said he's not sure why they didn't trust,  
5 that could be part of it as well.

6           I just think it's important that local control is  
7 considered in anything we do and think about the expertise  
8 of the local school districts.

9           So we think that data-driven decisions are  
10 important too, but how we get that with 10,000 schools in a  
11 thousand districts really isn't going to be some event that  
12 happens. It's going to be a process. That's how I think  
13 it's going to happen.

14           It's going to take time to build that database.  
15 Do we have to start? Yes. Does the state need it?  
16 Absolutely.

17           But if we think we're going to have it next year,  
18 two years, three years, I think that's going to be  
19 difficult. I think we just have to start --

20           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Can I ask you on the  
21 database part because you're the school facilities manager;  
22 right? So you know what campuses you have and your staff  
23 knows what's been put into it.

24           If we were to have a simple field, these  
25 buildings, this is, you know, the average age of

1 infrastructure, this is the last time it got fixed, you  
2 know, for the core stuff. I'm not talking operational costs  
3 I'm talking, you know, the truly core stuff.

4           You really think it's going to take two or three  
5 years for your district to upload that information into a  
6 database that we provide, the open field Internet access in  
7 a cloud type environment and because you -- I assume you  
8 already have most of that stuff at your fingertips because  
9 you're managing your facilities with the dollars that you  
10 have right now.

11           MR. DIXON: That's true. I could -- we have all  
12 that information in Santa Ana right now because we're  
13 probably a little more progressive than most. We have more  
14 expertise and we have more resources. We have a plan  
15 maintenance system in place.

16           So we have the age and condition of all of our  
17 systems and equipment.

18           But if you go to the Central Valley --

19           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Sure.

20           MR. DIXON: -- it's going to be difficult.

21           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: I'm hearing there's a  
22 consistent theme here for smaller districts that may not  
23 have the admin core that a larger district may have based on  
24 so much percentage of the ADA going to administration -- may  
25 not have all this expertise in there. That may be something

1 you want to consider for the size of the district.

2           Would you have problems -- I'm asking you to  
3 open -- hopefully, you know, speak here -- supporting a  
4 database system?

5           And from my point of view, it's not so much we  
6 could say, hey we got gotcha. I'm looking -- you know, I'm  
7 asked to support a bond that I'm already paying 30 years on  
8 that we just spent in the last ten years \$30 billion cut up  
9 in two years.

10           I'm getting these reports anywhere \$187 billion on  
11 to what spectrum do we have to go and really now the  
12 infrastructure and government agencies we have here, I  
13 cannot tell you what buildings you have, what, you know,  
14 vacant lands you have, and what your need is for your  
15 district.

16           You could tell me, but how am I supposed to get a  
17 statewide view of that and know what the exposure is and  
18 what is the long-term plan versus what's going to get us by  
19 for the next four to five years till the next bond comes  
20 out.

21           And that's what I'm trying to say can we get that  
22 established and would you, you know, speaking on behalf of  
23 your district, feel like you would feel comfortable adding  
24 that information up to a centralize core and then  
25 participating in a more larger, maybe regional discussion

1 of, okay, in the region we have these assets, we have these  
2 needs. These are our priorities.

3 It's almost like every district's out for  
4 themselves to a certain extent and that's how we --

5 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: They are.

6 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: -- that's how we set it  
7 up. But from the state level, we need to kind of also look  
8 at what's the biggest hole in the damn at this point.

9 MR. DIXON: Well, first I would be more than happy  
10 to participate. We're ready to go.

11 My concern would be making sure everything was  
12 apples to apples. You know, perhaps, Assemblymember Hagman,  
13 a good way to go would be as districts get into the School  
14 Facility Program, they're required to provide that  
15 information and that's how we build the database, you know,  
16 with some kind of a recognized document perhaps that we're  
17 already using so that we all understand what it is.

18 You know, part of the problem would be outreach as  
19 well to a lot of districts. Even within Orange County,  
20 there's huge differences. There's 28 districts. There's --  
21 you know, there's a handful that they don't get out of the  
22 house, so to speak. So they don't understand this kind of  
23 thing.

24 So I just think -- I think it's important, but  
25 again it's -- I don't believe we're going to have an event

1 where it happens. It's going to have to be a process.

2 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Thank you. Madam Chair, I  
3 have to go and Vice Chair my insurance committee real quick,  
4 but one of the things, you know, to consider maybe in this  
5 discussion of mapping out the assets is do we set up an  
6 accounting team and that way we have the same people  
7 assessing all the facilities in a county the same way? Is  
8 that third party sets up in the superintendent's office of  
9 each school district -- I don't know.

10 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, you know, we might  
11 want to put that in the issue bucket and decide what kind of  
12 mandated cost you get into and everything else that you're  
13 doing there.

14 MR. ALLEN: Good afternoon. My name is Brooks  
15 Allen. I'm the Director of Education Advocacy for the ACLU  
16 of Southern California and I'm here today largely because  
17 for the past eight plus years now, I've been working on  
18 implementation of our Williams vs. California settlement and  
19 the settlement legislation that came from that.

20 And in that capacity, we're encouraged and excited  
21 by the discussion and the themes of the discussion today and  
22 a lot of the recommendations in Dr. Vincent's report.

23 It's in some ways a little bit disheartening that  
24 we're having the same conversation we had around the  
25 settlement where we were talking about the need for the

1 state to actually have a good knowledge -- working knowledge  
2 of what the assets are, where the needs are located, setting  
3 some minimum standards, and then prioritizing funding.

4 Those are all themes within the settlement  
5 legislation, goals which still have to be accomplished.

6 I think it's worth noting that in some of these  
7 areas -- and Dr. Vincent's report does this -- there have  
8 been some previous efforts. Right. So when we talk about  
9 some of the things that -- I'm sorry Assemblymember Hagman  
10 had to leave -- where it talks about trying to take an  
11 assessment, the facilities needs assessment grant program  
12 that was set up part of the Williams settlement legislation  
13 was an effort to capture a lot of this information in one  
14 subset of schools as an idea of something to build upon.

15 The good repair standards were established.

16 Now a lot of these things when we saw the economic  
17 downturn hit is all of a sudden the discussion of how we  
18 were going to build on those baby steps. When we were  
19 moving forward, it kind of fell by the wayside and at the  
20 same time, from our perspective, in a way that is  
21 potentially damaging to students' opportunities, we saw a  
22 removal of all the state security and safety nets to ensure  
23 that minimum level of investment to protect our facilities.

24 So the elimination of deferred maintenance,  
25 elimination of the RMA (ph) percentage set-aside. So as we

1 move forward, we're really encouraged that this discussion  
2 is coming back up. Hopefully we're encountering a time of  
3 additional resources where we can start talking about how we  
4 restart these conversations that we think started to move  
5 forward, build upon pieces that we already have.

6           And we would just encourage and really support  
7 both the Subcommittee as well as the Legislature and the  
8 administrative agencies in continuing to keep equity front  
9 and center in terms of both keeping an eye in terms of  
10 figuring out what we do have and where our needs lie and  
11 then really trying to focus our funds in a data-driven way  
12 towards where those needs are so that all students can have  
13 a full equal educational opportunity to learn.

14           Recognize the state has a constitutional duty to  
15 ensure that and therefore it's appropriate that there are  
16 some state level mechanisms for gathering that data and  
17 prioritizing funding along those lines.

18           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you.

19           MR. ALLEN: Thanks.

20           MR. KITAGAWA: Good morning. My name is Brandon  
21 Kitagawa. I'm with an organization called Regional Asthma  
22 Management and Prevention. We coordinate a statewide  
23 network of asthma coalitions that focus on reducing exposure  
24 to asthma triggers, looking at outdoor air quality, housing,  
25 and obviously schools.

1           I think we know that between one in six and one in  
2 seven children in California have been diagnosed with  
3 asthma, but we know that that's not, you know, consistent  
4 around the state, that there are communities with much  
5 higher rates.

6           And we have some of our asthma -- or one of our  
7 asthma coalitions identified schools that they work with  
8 where one in three kids in the school have been diagnosed  
9 with asthma. So that's 10 students out of a class of 30.

10           They often work with schools. You know, there's a  
11 lot that they are able to do in terms of asthma education  
12 and management, but when it comes to issues related to the  
13 facility and the health of the facilities, they run into  
14 real challenges mostly because schools and districts really  
15 lack the resources or have a challenge with the resources of  
16 maintaining healthy facilities and that this has a  
17 significant health and academic impact.

18           So I think the issues around disparities -- around  
19 asthma specific that we look at, I think helps -- I think  
20 speak to Dr. Vincent's recommendation around and what a lot  
21 of the conversation today has been around sort of the need  
22 for an assessment, that there's something, you know, between  
23 nothing and, you know, recognizing the practical challenges  
24 involved with having someone with the clipboard go to every  
25 classroom.

1           You know, there needs to be something in between  
2 that that helps guide these decisions.

3           The -- you know, the one thing that we've used for  
4 state policy issues around schools was a 2004 report by the  
5 Air Resources Board and the Department of Health and Human  
6 Services that looked at portable classrooms and one of the  
7 valuable things about it is that they also looked at  
8 traditional classrooms as a comparison and what they found  
9 were significant problems in both.

10           But since that report, there's been no follow-up  
11 to see have any of the recommendations actually been used,  
12 has there been an improvement at all, and that it was a  
13 fairly limited sample.

14           So what we have is, you know, ineffective for  
15 really showing a good picture.

16           I think in addition, you know, to the demographic  
17 issues that were highlighted, I think the health perspective  
18 also suggests a need to increase the focus on existing  
19 buildings and a simple approach would be increasing the  
20 share of money that goes towards modernization in a new  
21 program.

22           And then finally sort of thinking about as we were  
23 thinking about the role of this Committee in helping to  
24 shape what a new program might look like, I think some of  
25 the important questions not just to ask but to answer and I

1 think I've heard attempts at that today are what districts  
2 actually are having challenges with their facilities and  
3 getting the funding and what specifically are their barriers  
4 and to what extent can some of those barriers be overcome  
5 through the design of a new program.

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you.

7 MR. KITAGAWA: Thanks.

8 MS. FERRERA: I'll go quickly. Anna Ferrera on  
9 behalf of the County School Facilities Consortium. We  
10 represent County Offices of Education, statewide and  
11 facilities issues.

12 CSFC supports many of the goals in the Cities and  
13 Schools Report and its broader view that incorporates  
14 sustainable planning and adequate and equitable funding.

15 We especially agree that having a regular and  
16 reliable funding source is vital for school facilities.

17 Because of our regional nature, County Offices of  
18 Ed deeply understand this broader view and with adequate  
19 resources, could be of great assistance as recommendations  
20 are considered in more detail and perhaps implementation  
21 through a new bond or other series of mechanisms.

22 COEs already provide fiscal oversight to K-12  
23 schools in their jurisdictions and these relationships have  
24 long been established. These channels may also be of some  
25 assistance as the state seeks better evaluation, management,

1 and planning.

2           Finally, we serve a unique student population that  
3 includes special ed, alternative ed, community day, and  
4 court students. So we would also look forward to working  
5 with the Board as we consider how those classrooms fit into  
6 the sustainable planning idea. Thank you.

7           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you. Are there any  
8 comments?

9           I guess I would say that I think, you know, you  
10 bring up many important items in your report. The problem  
11 we're going to have is going from the ideal where you have  
12 all the money you want to resolve all these problems to the  
13 reality.

14           And where I would disagree with you about SB50  
15 because I've been involved in school facility planning at  
16 the local -- very local level since 1985 or '6 when our  
17 school district did its first site master plan for a school  
18 and they asked me to participate on a committee, I think  
19 it's actually the best program we've ever had in actually  
20 getting money out to schools, but also providing an  
21 incentive tied with the Prop. 39 55 percent vote, the  
22 incentive for local school districts to actually take more  
23 responsibility for their schools because historically, if  
24 you go back pre-Prop. 13, local school districts funded all  
25 their needs.

1           And we're sort of in a state where we want local  
2 control and we have a history of local funding for schools,  
3 but because of Prop. 13 and a number of other things that  
4 have happened, we've become more dependent on the state.  
5 And so we've got that pull between what our needs are and  
6 what the state can provide when we're not providing enough  
7 funding for the basic educational program and the basic  
8 operations of our schools.

9           And while we've made great progress, you know, if  
10 you take a look at your numbers, it's hard to say that  
11 having a program that generates \$35 billion in state money  
12 matched with another 70 billion from local bonds and  
13 developer fees and having \$100 billion that you put into a  
14 program over, you know, a decade plus is unsuccessful, you  
15 know, but having those resources and ability to do  
16 everything is just limited.

17           And so I get reminded -- I mean I still -- if you  
18 could say area -- is I do believe that schools follow local  
19 planning in terms of where they need to be built and funding  
20 follows where the need is.

21           But what's been made clear to me over the first  
22 few meetings we've had -- and we'll get into the real heavy  
23 discussions I think in a couple months -- is that there are  
24 districts that have differing levels of bonding capacity and  
25 that may not have anything to do with the relative affluence

1 of the community.

2           Where I am, you know, it's easier to pass bonds in  
3 West Contra Costa or Oakland than it is when you move -- you  
4 know, go to the -- you know, to San Ramon Valley. We've had  
5 to work harder than some of the others.

6           So -- you know, but there are communities that  
7 don't have that capacity.

8           We've talked about charter schools. We've talked  
9 about County Offices of Education. We've talked about  
10 schools where their bonding capacity is very low and I think  
11 if you have a program that works, those are the kinds of  
12 things we're going to have to talk about because, you know,  
13 we do want to be able to do all we can to meet the needs of  
14 all students.

15           So, you know, I -- again I don't know -- I don't  
16 see the state as being the one that can solve all these  
17 problems. I would hope that school districts are doing  
18 master planning as part of their process. If they're not,  
19 we certainly can talk about whether or not we want to  
20 require that as part of an element.

21           But I also don't want to get into a situation  
22 where I'm telling a school district exactly what it needs to  
23 build or do to meet the needs of its students locally  
24 because that's why they elect local school boards. That's  
25 why they hire superintendents and others.

1           And I'm not sure the state knows what's best in  
2 all those instances. We -- the people locally elect those  
3 people to make those decisions. Yeah.

4           MR. ALMANZA: Well, you know, the -- I mean you  
5 raise a lot of good points and the testimony also describes  
6 a program that I think for the most part has worked pretty  
7 well.

8           But we continue to have need and all that's going  
9 to require funding. I don't know if it's going to be at the  
10 level that we've had over the last dozen years.

11           So that's going to be our challenge is that, you  
12 know, we've got 35 billion over the last 12, 14 years. For  
13 the next 12, 14 years, we'll be servicing that debt. I  
14 think it's costing around 2 billion a year.

15           And the likelihood that we'll get another 30-,  
16 35 million, you know, maybe not so likely, but we have great  
17 need. And so our challenge is going to be to come up with  
18 some recommendations on the next -- the future of the  
19 program, that -- make smart decisions on how we prioritize  
20 where those funds go. So it's going to be pretty  
21 challenging. Tough decisions.

22           MS. MOORE: Well, I'll just make a concluding  
23 statement.

24           First, I really want to thank you as Chairwoman of  
25 our Subcommittee for bringing this voice forward and having

1 this presentation today.

2 We understood this work and asked the U.C.  
3 Berkeley Center for Cities and Schools to help us because we  
4 felt that they could step out of our individual roles in  
5 this program and look in from an independent viewpoint and I  
6 think that Dr. Jeff Vincent and his team have done that.

7 I think that they accurately point out at this  
8 juncture when we're looking at the program here's some  
9 pieces to consider it -- to consider -- there are important  
10 components to consider and I think you, Jeff, for your  
11 leadership on that and helping us.

12 So, you know, there's many parts of this complex  
13 system that we're looking at. We've heard from people today  
14 about that I think your voice is an important voice in that  
15 and we'll move forward to really --

16 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

17 MS. MOORE: We're -- I think everyone here wants  
18 to serve students well in California and it's how we're  
19 going to get there with the limited resources that we'll  
20 have -- or more limited resources.

21 So thank you, Jeff, and thank you also,  
22 Ms. Buchanan.

23 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Thank you. And let me just  
24 say obviously we all know we're going to have limited  
25 resources, but I do think that it's important that we have

1 as much knowledge as we can going into it, which is why it's  
2 important to talk to you about your reports and talk to  
3 everyone else about their needs.

4           Ultimately we're going to have to figure out given  
5 those needs and all the wants what our priorities are, but I  
6 think it's important that we have the luxury of time because  
7 we know that we really won't get down to talking in depth  
8 about the bond until 2014 and we know what the voters might  
9 be willing to approve.

10           And so I appreciate the participation of everyone  
11 so that we can spend some time really having these quality  
12 discussions. So thank you.

13           And I know we have the PIW on as the last item,  
14 but I'm going to recommend since we're dwindling and we're  
15 approach three hours in a meeting which, you know, most  
16 lesson plans would cover 50 minutes when you're in  
17 schools -- that we delay that over to the next meeting  
18 because I know that Mr. Hagman wants to be part of that  
19 discussion.

20           MR. ALMANZA: Um-hmm.

21           MS. MOORE: Thank you.

22           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So we're adjourned. Thank  
23 you.

24           (Whereupon, at 11:42 a.m. the proceedings were  
25 recessed.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA            )  
  )  ss.  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO        )

I, Mary C. Clark, a Certified Electronic Court Reporter and Transcriber, Certified by the American Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Inc. (AAERT, Inc.), do hereby certify:

That the proceedings herein of the California State Allocation Board School Facility Program Review Subcommittee were duly reported and transcribed by me;

That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the proceedings as recorded;

That I am a disinterested person to said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on March 18, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary C. Clark  
AAERT CERT\*D-214  
Certified Electronic Court  
Reporter and Transcriber