

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 447  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2012

TIME: 2:07 P.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

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

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So I'm not going gavel down because the little wooden block's missing. So after wrecking my iPhone, I'm just afraid that I might do the same here.

But anyway I'd like to go ahead and call the meeting to order and can we go ahead and take roll to establish a quorum.

MS. JONES: Okay. Really there's no quorum on a Subcommittee.

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: All right. Well, we probably should --

MS. JONES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- take roll anyway.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Buchanan.

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Here.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Here.

MS. JONES: Esteban Almanza.

MR. ALMANZA: Here.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Curt Hagman.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Here.

MS. JONES: Kathleen Moore, absent.

CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: She's absent; right.

1 MS. JONES: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. And today we're  
3 going to be going into an in-depth look at currently how we  
4 determine new construction eligibility. So I'll let you go  
5 forward.

6 MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. Correct. And today  
7 Ms. Kampmeinert will be presenting those topics on how we  
8 project those various enrollments for new construction.  
9 There's a few of those projections that she's going to share  
10 with you the methodology.

11 And the last item that we're going to cover is  
12 some of the data we've been collecting over the last couple  
13 years related to new construction.

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

15 MS. SILVERMAN: Turn it over to Barbara.

16 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: All right. Great.

17 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Good afternoon. So as we -- we  
18 went over a little bit last meeting as far as the basic  
19 concept for new construction eligibility and what we had  
20 talked about last time was that the general concept is that  
21 new construction eligibility is basically the difference  
22 between the seats that the school district has available and  
23 the projected enrollment.

24 And today we're going to go into greater detail  
25 about how we get to that projected enrollment and how the

1 seats are counted. That will be the first part of the  
2 presentation.

3           So moving into the enrollment projections -- I'm  
4 on page 3 of the item. Basically the enrollment projection  
5 uses patterns of past enrollment to predict the future and  
6 the SFP program allows for some augmentations to this  
7 projection in the case where new circumstances have come  
8 about where the past patterns would not accurately project  
9 that enrollment.

10           A term that we'll be using a lot today is the  
11 cohort and that is something that has been used in the  
12 School Facility Program and actually in the Lease-Purchase  
13 Program prior to that. In general, it's the statistical  
14 term that is used to look at population changes and make  
15 projections and we're going to be looking at today as far as  
16 how it's done in the School Facility Program.

17           But the cohort is actually the Cohort Survival  
18 Projection Enrollment System. So when I'm referring to the  
19 cohort, that's what I'm talking about.

20           So when we project the enrollment, what we are  
21 looking at are the kids that are currently attending the  
22 school and then we look at the past several years' worth of  
23 data to come up with a trend and then that trend is applied  
24 five years out and that gives us a five-year projection.

25           Now there are also some cases where a district can

1 use a ten-year projection if they choose to do so. That was  
2 an amendment to the statute that came about in -- a couple  
3 years ago and that is an option for districts. However,  
4 when they use a ten-year projection, statute does not allow  
5 for any additional augmentations.

6 So when we're referring to the augmentations,  
7 we're speaking primarily to the five-year enrollment  
8 projection.

9 When looking at the enrollment projection, we need  
10 to see what students the district should be factoring into  
11 the calculation and the data that's collected for those  
12 purposes comes from an annual data collection that's done  
13 with the California Department of Education. It's the  
14 CBEDS, the California Basic Educational Data System and this  
15 is a count that's done in October.

16 School districts use this count, the CBEDS  
17 information, to report their enrollment and the data is due  
18 in October for most of the student populations with the  
19 exception SDC enrollment, Special Day Class enrollment,  
20 which is due in December and Community Day enrollment which  
21 is reported in April.

22 Now, not all students are counted when the  
23 enrollment projection is done. Basically the districts  
24 count the kids that will need a seat within the district.

25 So there's a list of exclusions for students that

1 would not be counted on page 3 and for many of the  
2 exclusions listed there, it's because another school  
3 district could count those children.

4           So, for instance, if a student is living in the  
5 district's boundaries but attending another school district,  
6 both districts can't report it. The district where the  
7 student is attending gets to claim that student's enrollment  
8 for purposes of their projection.

9           And also things like students that are receiving  
10 nonclassroom-based instruction -- maybe they're in an  
11 e-learning program, there's not really a need for a  
12 classroom, though some would argue that they need some  
13 space, but you don't need a full classroom for the students.  
14 So those students are excluded from the projection as well.

15           And then I think just a point of clarification on  
16 a couple of these bullets. In the main projection, Special  
17 Day Class students are not counted as part of the regular  
18 projection for K-12 students, but they have their own  
19 projection which I'll get into in a few minutes here.

20           And then Continuation High School students are  
21 reported in a slightly different spot and then factored back  
22 into the projection and the reason for the separation was  
23 that at the time this went into place, there was discussion  
24 about whether or not the loading standards for those  
25 students would be different.

1           So -- let's see. So the cohort survival, as I  
2 mentioned, it's -- it is a common tool to look at the  
3 population trends and it assumes that these trends are going  
4 to continue and it determines the future enrollment with the  
5 exception of kindergarten.

6           Kindergarten, there's no prior class to compare  
7 to. What you're looking at is today's first graders, how  
8 many of them become next year's second graders. What's the  
9 rate of change between those two grade levels. And then the  
10 second graders, how many of those second graders go on to  
11 become third graders within the district.

12           And you look at those enrollment patterns. Each  
13 particular grade level determines its own projection and  
14 it's -- at the end of the day, it's a K-6 projection and  
15 then a 9-12 projection, 7-8 projection.

16           The kindergarten enrollment is a straight-across  
17 comparison. So you look over the past years to see what  
18 types of kindergarten enrollment you're seeing as a trend.  
19 So that is a one-year projection. Everything else is based  
20 off the survival from one grade to the next.

21           The kindergarten projection, one of the  
22 augmentations that districts can use is a birth rate  
23 projection. So if your district is experiencing an unusual  
24 pattern in birth rates, then that enrollment projection can  
25 be augmented to account for that.

1           And typically any of the augmentations that are  
2 done on these are to account for the circumstances where the  
3 historical pattern is somehow changing. This is projecting  
4 five years out and the lead time is in there to give  
5 districts adequate time to plan for the school before the  
6 students actually arrive and need the seats.

7           Districts have a couple options when they're  
8 reporting their enrollment. They can either use a  
9 district-wide basis or they can break their district into  
10 high school attendance areas. And I'm actually moving onto  
11 page 5 and 6 of the item.

12           If you look at the graphic on page 6, we've got  
13 sort of a box representing our high school attendance areas.  
14 Of course they're never perfect rectangles, but in this  
15 picture, High School Attendance Area 1, you see three empty  
16 desks. That high school attendance area, if there kids  
17 coming into the school, they could accommodate the students  
18 with the seats that they already have available.

19           But if you look at Attendance Area 2 or Attendance  
20 Area 3, we've got a student standing holding his books  
21 waiting to come sit in the desk and he doesn't have any  
22 desk.

23           So taken as a whole, this district may or may not  
24 have new construction eligibility, but different parts of  
25 the district have differing needs. So districts have the

1 opportunity to break into sort of mini districts when  
2 they're doing their enrollment projections.

3           So that's one method that districts can use to  
4 tailor their new construction eligibility to their specific  
5 district needs but even more detailed into different areas  
6 of the district.

7           And once the district does receive funding using  
8 the high school attendance area basis, then they do need to  
9 continue to file their new construction applications on that  
10 basis for a period of five years and that helps maintain  
11 some stability in the reporting so that there's not flipping  
12 back and forth so that it's just a numbers situation. It's  
13 actually the method that's most beneficial to the district  
14 on an ongoing basis.

15           Let's see. The enrollment projection -- so to get  
16 into a little more detail about the augmentations and the  
17 things that districts can do to tailor their circumstances,  
18 the five-year projection can be augmented using modified or  
19 alternate weighting mechanisms.

20           There is a standard weighting mechanism that's  
21 done and it places more emphasis on recent history than  
22 further back, so it's considered a 3-2-1 calculation where  
23 the more current years get a heavier weight than two or  
24 three years back in the projection.

25           Now, districts can choose to switch that weighting

1 mechanism to perhaps a 1-2-3 or a 1-1-1 type of weighting  
2 and you would do this if the -- you would use a -- excuse  
3 me. I think I slipped up. 1-2-3 is the standard weighting  
4 mechanism.

5           But you would use the alternative if you were  
6 experiencing unusual patterns right now and you were  
7 anticipating that your future enrollment would be more  
8 similar to things that had happened a couple years ago.

9           You can also do an alternate weighting mechanism.  
10 So maybe there's something that makes sense for the district  
11 that has been contemplated. It's not just the simple 1-2-3  
12 or 3-2-1 mechanism.

13           The district can submit data on these modified  
14 weighting mechanisms and what OPSC would do is take a look  
15 at those and the district submits 18 years of historical  
16 enrollment data and then in order to be able to use these  
17 modified weighting mechanisms or alternate weighting  
18 mechanisms, it has to prove more accurate than the standard  
19 enrollment projection method.

20           There is also as I mentioned earlier the birth  
21 rate augmentation and that replaces basically the  
22 kindergarten projection calculation. That is based on  
23 county birth data or it can also be done on the ZIP codes  
24 that are served by the district if they end up crossing  
25 counties.

1           And that's verified against the actual county  
2 reports as far as the birth rate. So that's -- OPSC takes a  
3 look at that as well.

4           The next augmentation is the dwelling unit  
5 supplements and I think we've gone into this a little bit at  
6 the last meeting as well. But the dwelling unit  
7 augmentation is for those districts that are experiencing  
8 new housing developments that are going in.

9           So the children have not arrived on any of the  
10 enrollment scenarios yet because the houses haven't been  
11 built so the kids aren't necessarily in the district yet.

12           So a school district can add those dwelling units  
13 to its projection to help plan for the facility needs  
14 created by the new housing developments.

15           There are requirements for a school district to  
16 submit supporting documentation such as the maps that the --  
17 tentative maps or final maps that are approved and stamped,  
18 that have minutes to back them up that the local planning  
19 authority has approved these housing projects. So we --  
20 OPSC ends up looking at that as well.

21           And when looking at dwelling units, there is a  
22 standard state student yield factor. So there's an  
23 assumption that each house is going to yield a certain  
24 number of students and districts can use the standard yield  
25 factor or if they do a study, they can take a look and see

1 if their particular area is generating more students than  
2 the standard. So that is an option as well.

3           And the student yield factor is listed on page 9.  
4 For high school districts, it's .2 students. Elementary  
5 school districts is .5 and then unified is the sum of those.  
6 It comes out to .7 students per dwelling unit.

7           And the dwelling units tend to have more of an  
8 impact on districts whose enrollment is stable or declining  
9 and they have less of an impact on districts that are  
10 showing an increasing enrollment trend.

11           Now the ten-year enrollment projection is very  
12 similar to the five-year projection. It's just taking more  
13 data into account and projecting that out a little bit  
14 further. And again that does not use any sort of  
15 augmentations.

16           And then the other thing to point out, small  
17 school districts have a few options when they're reporting  
18 their enrollment because sometimes they experience  
19 enrollment patterns that either fluctuate or that are not  
20 typical.

21           So for districts with less than 2,500 pupils  
22 enrolled, they can lock in their enrollment for a period of  
23 three years. So that allows them some stability in planning  
24 knowing that the enrollment that is generating the  
25 eligibility, it's not going to disappear in year two and

1 then come back in year three so that the project is here  
2 today and gone tomorrow, but they can lock in for three  
3 years, plan their project, and move forward.

4           And then also districts with less than 300 pupils  
5 enrolled, so really small districts, they can report a  
6 five-year average for any grade level where the enrollment  
7 for that grade level has decreased by more than 50 percent  
8 from the previous year.

9           We don't tend to see that very often because there  
10 aren't many districts in this situation, but there is a  
11 mechanism in place for districts that are that small. The  
12 smaller the enrollment, the fluctuations have a big impact  
13 on what eligibility is generated.

14           So before I move onto the study that OPSC did  
15 recently on the cohort accuracy, are there -- did you want  
16 to address any questions on this topic or --

17           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: I have one quick question.  
18 So do we know -- I mean basically we give districts a number  
19 of different options for determining enrollment projections.

20           Do we ever take a look back at any of those to see  
21 which ones tend to be most accurate?

22           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Well, the next section takes a  
23 look at the basic cohort projection.

24           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

25           MS. KAMPMEINERT: For the other things like the

1 birth rates, ten-year projection, we don't have enough data  
2 to do any sort of comparison on that right now because it's  
3 relatively new and not a lot of districts have participated  
4 in it. So that is definitely something that we would like  
5 to take a look at as things keep moving forward.

6 But right now what we have coming up next is a  
7 cohort study and it's the I think second, maybe third, time  
8 that OPSC has -- second time that we've taken a look to see  
9 what the basic calculation does and what the accuracy level  
10 is for that piece of it with and without dwelling units.

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. Any other questions?  
12 Okay.

13 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Okay? Then moving onto page 10  
14 of the item, and this is the Cohort Enrollment Projection  
15 Study and what we're able to do is there's been enough time  
16 so that we have the enrollment projections submitted by the  
17 district at one point in time and then they have updated  
18 again within the time frame of potentially five years or  
19 more. So it allows us to look at what their original  
20 projection was and compare it to the enrollment that the  
21 district actually received to see if the projection turned  
22 out to be true.

23 So we took a look at all of the data that we had  
24 on file and the time frame that we were looking at is the  
25 2003-2004 reporting year to the 2011-2012 reporting year.

1           In this time frame, we got close to 1,400  
2 adjustments for enrollment projections that were processed.

3           The study looked at about 284, approximately  
4 20 percent of the projections submitted from school  
5 districts from 2003 to 2012. So we were looking for matched  
6 pairs of data so that we could make this work.

7           And so we did get -- about 20 percent of those  
8 were able to be used in the sample.

9           The study -- we had 162 distinct districts that we  
10 were able to look at from 37 counties and we had the average  
11 enrollment of about 30,584 students, but when we omit LAUSD,  
12 it goes down about 13,715. They just have such a large  
13 district that it does tend to change the numbers a bit.

14           So -- and then the smallest enrollment was 43  
15 students.

16           So looking at page 11, we've got the findings.  
17 Now the first table on page 11 shows the average trend and  
18 the overall inaccuracy and this was taking the enrollment  
19 projection as submitted basically with or without dwelling  
20 units.

21           So for all of the projections that we have, how  
22 did it compare to the enrollment based on whatever numbers  
23 that projection generated.

24           And the average trend is just how close it was to  
25 the actual enrollment and then the overall -- we're using

1 the term inaccuracy accounts for some districts that project  
2 over the enrollment and some districts that projected under  
3 the enrollment. The positives and the negatives tend to  
4 wipe out some of the numbers.

5 So the overall inaccuracy percentage is absolute  
6 value there and so that's probably the number that's more  
7 helpful to look at is the one you're looking at whether or  
8 not it was accurate.

9 Now, the nonsevere and the severe columns, their  
10 overall inaccuracy percentages are much higher at 18 percent  
11 and 37 percent respectively and that is a function of -- in  
12 part of how the calculation is done.

13 The K-12 calculation, the average is applied to  
14 SDC enrollment and it makes the assumption that SDC  
15 enrollment follows the same pattern as K-12 enrollment.  
16 That may not be true. We don't have any answers for why  
17 it's not appearing to work out that way. Some districts  
18 might be able to speak better to that, but the enrollment  
19 projection does tend to work a little bit better for just  
20 the straight K-12 students.

21 So after we took a look at that, we wanted to see  
22 if dwelling units had any sort of impact as well. So what  
23 we did is we took the enrollment projections that were  
24 submitted with dwelling units.

25 We re-ran the numbers without the dwelling unit

1 augmentation, so using the same enrollment that the district  
2 had reported. We simply took off the dwelling unit  
3 augmentation and we compared that to the actual enrollment.

4           And the accuracy actually increased. So the  
5 overall inaccuracy percentages declined. Therefore without  
6 the dwelling unit augmentation, the projection is more  
7 accurate on average.

8           And then we've included the scatter plots on  
9 page 12 through 19. So you can kind of see the -- where the  
10 outliers fall and everyone's kind of falling close to the  
11 actual enrollment there.

12           So overall the accuracy, not too bad for a  
13 five-year projection. And that's fairly consistent with  
14 what we saw when we ran this study a few years ago. It was  
15 pretty accurate.

16           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, they're all scattered  
17 around the trend line, but overall it seems like we have far  
18 more that are overestimated and underestimated; right?

19           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Yeah, they are showing a little  
20 bit --

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Which reflects your overall  
22 average.

23           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Um-hmm. Right. With dwelling  
24 units included. Without the dwelling units, they tend to be  
25 just a little bit under-projecting.

1           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. Any questions? No?

2           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Okay. So that's the enrollment  
3 piece, so that's step one of the equation.

4           The next piece beginning on page 20 looks at  
5 inventory -- classroom inventory and it kind of gets at the  
6 question of what -- for the purposes of SFP inventory, what  
7 is considered a classroom.

8           Now, once we determine whether or not it is a  
9 classroom, we've got State loading standards. So we assume  
10 that if we're calling it a classroom at the K-6 level, we're  
11 going to assume that 25 children are in there. At the 7-12  
12 level, 27 children are loaded in there, and then nonsevere  
13 is 13 and severe is 9.

14           But to determine the actual capacity that a school  
15 district has, there's a number of steps that a district  
16 takes when establishing that.

17           Now, the classroom inventory is done as a snapshot  
18 in time, so it's done one time for new construction. It's  
19 done one time for modernization, which we'll touch on in the  
20 future, but the district reports a gross classroom inventory  
21 and then there are some classrooms that can be excluded.

22           So the result of that plus a couple other things  
23 is the classrooms that are considered available to house the  
24 projected enrollment.

25           On page 21, we've got a very basic -- very basic,

1 very tiny school site map that would show an elementary  
2 school that has six classrooms, a library, a multipurpose  
3 room, and an administration building.

4 Now, at the basic level, when we look at this site  
5 map, one of the classrooms, the one kind of in the middle of  
6 the campus there that was built in 1982 is less than  
7 700 square feet.

8 So that by the SFP regulations is not considered a  
9 classroom. It's too small of a space to be a classroom even  
10 if the school district is using it as one.

11 So when they're doing the classroom capacity, we  
12 would look at the site and at the basic level, we would say  
13 there are five classrooms there, not six. So that one that  
14 is under 700 square feet does not count against the  
15 district.

16 The -- I'm actually going to skip to page 23 and  
17 24. We've got a listing here of what types of spaces are  
18 counted as classrooms and then there's a list of the  
19 classrooms that are excluded.

20 Some of the things to point out as far as the  
21 gross classroom inventory of what should be counted, if it's  
22 under contract and not built yet -- even if there's no  
23 school there, if it's under contract, it would be counted in  
24 the gross classroom inventory.

25 If it was originally built as a K-12 classroom, if

1 the district's using it as a preschool, it still counts for  
2 K-12 classroom usage because K-12 students could be put in  
3 that classroom.

4           Converted to a nonclassroom purpose: If it was  
5 built as a K-12 classroom, it would still be counted.

6           Let's see. Included in a closed school, that's  
7 another one that comes up a lot. So the district has closed  
8 the school, that entire school campus, the classrooms on  
9 that campus still need to be counted for purposes of  
10 determining the classroom inventory.

11           Now looking at the other list, once we've  
12 determined everything that should be counted, here's where  
13 we start taking off things like the classroom that's less  
14 than 700 square feet.

15           If it was, for instance, a preschool -- used as a  
16 preschool at a school that's been operated on a year-round  
17 schedule and continually used at least 50 percent of the  
18 time for the five years prior to the submittal of the  
19 application, then you can exclude that classroom.

20           Trailers, anything on wheels, that's not counted  
21 as a classroom.

22           If it's owned but leased to another school  
23 district, that is also excluded from the district that is  
24 leasing it out. So the district that is on the other end of  
25 that transaction would count that in its capacity.

1           And -- so those are just some examples there.

2           The other thing that is factored in -- and I'm  
3 going back to page 21. The other thing that's factored in  
4 when we look at the classroom capacity, once the district's  
5 determined the total number of classrooms and after the  
6 exclusions have been adjusted for, there are options as far  
7 as how they report their classrooms to us.

8           They can choose to -- and you can run both these  
9 options to see which one is beneficial and by beneficial, to  
10 generate new construction eligibility, you're looking for  
11 the method that would report or show the least number of  
12 classrooms.

13           There is a method that has a 25 percent exclusion  
14 for portables. So basically there's a certain number of  
15 portables that are okay to have in the district and anything  
16 over that is called an excluded portable.

17           And you can use new construction eligibility to  
18 replace those portables and then that excluded portable  
19 comes off of your excluded portable inventory. So it helps  
20 with districts that had to put a lot of portables on their  
21 campuses. It's not held against them.

22           A certain percentage is okay and then anything  
23 over that doesn't count.

24           And then also there is capacity that's added  
25 potentially to a school district to account for if the

1 school district is not using year-round education. So part  
2 of the law requires districts to alleviate about 6 percent  
3 of their capacity by using year-round education. So you  
4 wouldn't in theory need space for those students because  
5 multiple students are using the same space at different  
6 times of the year from a very broad definition there.

7           So there's an adjustment that's done to the  
8 district's capacity to add back in 6 percent if the district  
9 is not -- does not meet the requirements for a waiver on  
10 this.

11           And they can -- if they're a high school district  
12 or if they qualify for a waiver, then this is not counted  
13 against them.

14           So the waiver -- the Board actually makes the  
15 authorization for the waiver based on the recommendation of  
16 the Department of Education.

17           So -- let's see. So to sum it up, capacity takes  
18 a look at your gross classroom inventory, so all the space  
19 you have available. It eliminates those areas that the  
20 regulations do not see as suitable classrooms or things that  
21 are not being counted as K-12 classroom purposes. So that  
22 gives you your net classroom inventory.

23           You then take a look at whether or not you have  
24 more portables than is desirable and -- so you can choose  
25 which option to file under and then you apply if necessary

1 the substantial enrollment requirement adjustment to account  
2 the year-round education.

3           Once those calculations are done, the numbers at  
4 the end are the classrooms that are deemed available to  
5 house the projected enrollment. And then from there, you  
6 look at your projected enrollment which we talked about  
7 first and compare it to this number.

8           If you have more projected enrollment than you do  
9 classrooms, then you qualify for new construction  
10 eligibility. And this is adjusted on an annual basis.

11           Every time the enrollment is updated, if a  
12 district is filing a new construction application, they need  
13 to adjust their new construction eligibility because part of  
14 the formula has changed.

15           So every October, that's the last date to submit  
16 under last year's enrollment projections and then you do a  
17 new enrollment projection. And so any questions on that?

18           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Any questions? Okay.

19           MR. ALMANZA: So we fund portable classrooms;  
20 right?

21           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Yes.

22           MR. ALMANZA: So theoretically it's possible that  
23 we fund classrooms that we don't count towards capacity?

24           MS. KAMPMEINERT: Yes. In the initial count, yes.  
25 So when you have an excluded portable, you do not have to

1 replace it with a permanent classroom. It's a little bit  
2 different than programs like the Overcrowded Relief Grant  
3 Program where you are removing portables off the site.

4 In this one, the classroom is basically ignored --

5 MR. ALMANZA: Um-hmm.

6 MS. KAMPMEINERT: -- and you generate new  
7 construction eligibility and that new construction  
8 eligibility can be used for permanent or modular or portable  
9 construction.

10 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: And we provide the same  
11 grant amount for a portable as we do for permanent  
12 construction.

13 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Are there any other  
15 questions?

16 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Okay?

17 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

18 MS. KAMPMEINERT: So with that, the next section  
19 relates to data on what we are building in the program and  
20 Brian O'Dell, Program Services Supervisor, will be walking  
21 us through that.

22 MR. O'DELL: Hello. As Barbara mentioned, I'm  
23 Brian O'Dell, Program Services Supervisor for OPSC, and if  
24 we turn to Tab 5, page 25, What are We Building, we just  
25 have a few charts that are collected from the PIW and also

1 from information collected on the application for funding  
2 regarding the facilities that were actually constructed for  
3 new construction and also charter school facilities. So it  
4 doesn't include critically overcrowded schools, overcrowding  
5 relief, modernization programs. It doesn't include any of  
6 those.

7           If we turn to page 26, facilities built, this  
8 graphic shows -- or it focuses on the core facilities that  
9 were built. So it lists restroom buildings, admin  
10 buildings, MPRs, library, some of those core facilities.

11           And the first chart there shows -- or bar graph  
12 shows the hard count and we of course have our Other which  
13 is a larger number.

14           And then if we look at classrooms versus  
15 nonclassrooms, the point of trying to show the classrooms  
16 versus nonclassrooms is classrooms is the vast majority of  
17 what the program is built in new construction. That's  
18 appropriate. That was the purpose.

19           And so to try to give some perspective that  
20 there's a lot more of that than all of the other facilities  
21 combined, but we still see a large number of nonclassrooms  
22 that were built.

23           The second bar chart there, shows the actual  
24 square footage in millions of what all of them added up to  
25 based on the PIWs submitted. So it's not every single new

1 construction or charter project but just the ones that we  
2 have PIWs for.

3 And then the last table there at the bottom shows  
4 the average square feet per facility and shows the breakdown  
5 for all of those as well.

6 And so the next chart on page 27 --

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: When you show the average  
8 square footage of classrooms is 1,280 square feet, what are  
9 you including in that count there?

10 MR. O'DELL: The -- it's the classroom buildings  
11 that -- so on the PIW, when it asks for the classroom square  
12 footage, it's talking about everything within that building.  
13 So --

14 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So if you have an indoor  
15 hallway, that average is there even though the classroom may  
16 be 960 square feet.

17 MR. O'DELL: That's correct.

18 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay.

19 MR. O'DELL: Um-hmm. On page 27, it lists the  
20 square footage per pupil housed and this was a calculation  
21 by taking the total square footage indicated on the  
22 worksheet for all the different types of facilities that we  
23 looked at and then divided that by the total number of  
24 pupils that were requested for that particular project.

25 So there could be some different variations, but

1 it does show the additions versus the new schools.

2           So for each pupil grant that was provided for that  
3 type of project, that would be the square footage that  
4 actually was constructed for that.

5           And facility hardship projects weren't included  
6 because it doesn't represent unhoused pupils. That program  
7 is for a different purpose. So this is trying to show the  
8 unhoused pupils what was built and also use of grants as  
9 well because it doesn't have the same correlation where 9-12  
10 pupils were used to build K-6 facilities. It just didn't  
11 seem appropriate for this type of a graph.

12           And the next chart is -- or map is the classrooms  
13 per CTE regions and the reason the CTE regions are used is  
14 because it's just a -- it just seems to be a very good  
15 breakdown of the different regions throughout the State.  
16 It's unrelated to the CTE program, but it was an existing  
17 way of breaking down the State and this shows the hard count  
18 of the classrooms that were reported on the applications for  
19 fundings.

20           So this isn't PIW data, but it's rather based on  
21 what was processed through the Board.

22           All right. So this includes everything since 1998  
23 for every application that was processed.

24           And the final chart, page 29, shows the same  
25 regions, but this is based on the PIW and this shows the

1 permanent modular and portable square footage that was  
2 reported per region. And again this is the new construction  
3 and charter projects for the PIW.

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Do we know -- I mean from  
5 my recollection on the board, I mean we brought in most of  
6 our portables when class size reduction was implemented  
7 trying to -- you know, we had to increase our capacity  
8 kindergarten through third grade by 50 percent.

9 When you show these numbers, do we know from -- is  
10 it -- was there a period where we had more portables than  
11 others or is it -- is there any way to break that down in  
12 terms of --

13 MR. O'DELL: We haven't yet. We could take a look  
14 and see if there's a way to do that.

15 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. I mean I -- it may  
16 or may not affect our decision making, but, you know, when  
17 you think about the investment in portables, I'd just be  
18 curious as to whether or not we had a bubble around that  
19 time period because that -- you go back a decade, that's  
20 when we were bringing so many of them in.

21 MR. SAVIDGE: I mean I think it's interesting if  
22 you look at the data, so only -- so statewide, less than  
23 7 percent of the square footage of the buildings built is  
24 portable buildings, but they're -- if you disaggregate the  
25 data a little bit, there are some pretty wide disparities in

1 the Bay Area, which is the red section there. That's less  
2 than half of 1 percent of building areas built with  
3 portables.

4 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

5 MR. SAVIDGE: And if you look at the Central  
6 Valley, that's over 21 percent of the square footage of  
7 buildings is built in portables.

8 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right.

9 MR. SAVIDGE: And I think there are some wealth  
10 disparity issues there that may --

11 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, you also have  
12 declining enrollment in the Bay Area. So like when you had  
13 class size reduction, you didn't have to have classrooms and  
14 some of the --

15 MR. SAVIDGE: That may --

16 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: -- depending on where you  
17 were because they had classrooms available.

18 MR. SAVIDGE: This is portables built in the  
19 program after class size reduction.

20 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well, I know, but you  
21 wouldn't build a program if you had empty classrooms where  
22 you could house the students.

23 MR. SAVIDGE: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: You would build the  
25 portable if you were growing and if you think about, you

1 know, our census data that we just finished getting, you  
2 know, a little over a year ago, all the growth has been in  
3 the Central Valley.

4           So I would expect more portables there. You know,  
5 the question then becomes is the one Mr. Hagman is  
6 constantly asking is I mean are we incentivizing the right  
7 kind of construction because we're giving the same grants to  
8 portables that we are to permanent construction and then you  
9 can't modernize, you know, and 20 years later you're  
10 replacing them.

11           MR. SAVIDGE: I think there's a couple ways you  
12 could look at that question. One of them would be that  
13 districts don't voluntarily build with portables in my  
14 experience. I mean they normally would do it because they  
15 didn't have enough money to build permanent construction,  
16 but there's probably a lot of other things --

17           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Right. Well, with class  
18 size reduction though, I remember we were trying to get them  
19 on quickly so we could get into the program.

20           MR. SAVIDGE: Right.

21           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So that impacted us.

22           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: I'm saving up my questions  
23 on this section, but I have a bunch when it's appropriate.

24           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. Yeah, we can -- you  
25 want to finish and then ask questions or --

1 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Yeah, go ahead and finish.

2 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. Go ahead. There's  
3 one more page we have to go over here?

4 MR. O'DELL: Just for everyone's reference, it  
5 just shows the counties within each region if someone wanted  
6 to compare.

7 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Okay. For the CTE. Go  
8 ahead.

9 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Madam Chair -- okay. I  
10 appreciate the report. It's enlightening in different ways.  
11 I'm surprised -- I mean it roughly averages about 10 percent  
12 for the portables per region, which isn't too bad, but  
13 obviously I still always have the problem with paying the  
14 same amount for a portable building as a permanent building,  
15 whatever that definition is.

16 Even with the new construction techniques, you can  
17 make something pretty portable and very affordable but still  
18 have a life span of a, you know, brick and mortar or a stud  
19 frame type building.

20 One of the issues that we've been concerned with  
21 or future concern with is sometimes boards are very  
22 shortsighted. So you may have eligibility especially with  
23 the delay in building that you may not need the classroom  
24 space even though you're eligible because you predict these  
25 people coming, but right now the public pressure is for one

1 of these other -- quote, other buildings that may not  
2 actually be a classroom.

3           And when we give them money and they go off and  
4 build it, they're compliant and then ten years down the line  
5 and the new board faces, they're not eligible no more  
6 because they got the money, but now they don't have the  
7 classroom spaces. So now we go to critically overcrowding.

8           How do we put into the fact or somehow put in  
9 checks that if you get money for new construction for  
10 classrooms, they're actually growing the number of  
11 classrooms in the right space for the right purpose and not  
12 necessarily these other buildings?

13           And I guess the second part of that is, you know,  
14 looking at your chart with all the different kind of  
15 buildings built, everything from performing arts to  
16 standalone cafeteria, a lot of others which -- conference  
17 rooms and resource rooms and staff rooms, those type of  
18 things, how do you keep the locals having the freedom to do  
19 this but at the same time, not the taxpayers or the  
20 residents of California long term being faced with the thing  
21 that the schools are overcrowded because we built the wrong  
22 type of stuff?

23           Is there a standard layout for a school, so to  
24 speak, that we should be hopefully funding with the amount  
25 of money.

1           So if I build a great pool and gymnasium, I got  
2 portables, and now I'm good as a school board member for  
3 15 years. I'm off the school board, but now new guys coming  
4 in and portables are falling apart, but I got the state of  
5 the art pool and gymnasium.

6           You see what I'm saying? It's that mix of stuff.  
7 Are we building the school -- classrooms in the right place.

8           It sounds like your formulas -- your math worked  
9 out, you know, the predictions and stuff, but that's in a  
10 five-year study. Are we looking 10, 15 years in advance?  
11 Are we building the right things to actually house students  
12 in a classroom?

13           MR. MIRELES: The way the program works right now  
14 is we do take a look at the unhoused students based on the  
15 formulas that we just talked about in terms of projected  
16 enrollment versus capacity.

17           Once a district has the eligibility, meaning  
18 unhoused students, then they submit funding applications and  
19 the funding application, that's where we take a look to see  
20 that there's classrooms in the plans.

21           There are a few exemptions, but for the most part,  
22 to qualify to use that eligibility, we need to see  
23 classrooms -- that you're building classrooms in the  
24 project.

25           Along with that, they can also be adding

1 additional minimum essential facilities, but the main check  
2 for us is usually the classrooms.

3           There are provisions in the regulations right now  
4 that all districts to use some of that eligibility for  
5 nonclassroom space in terms of what we call use of grants.  
6 So they basically use the eligibility to build other  
7 facilities instead of classrooms, but for the most part, the  
8 general requirement is that they have to have classrooms in  
9 the plans to qualify for funding.

10           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: But for that later part of  
11 it, there may not be a lot out there.

12           MR. MIRELES: Um-hmm.

13           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: What's the logic behind  
14 that? Why would give them the opportunity to use their  
15 eligibility for a future number of students coming in but  
16 not have the capacity to take those future students and let  
17 them build other buildings?

18           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN:

19           MR. MIRELES: That's something that could be  
20 changed -- could be looked in terms of changing. That's the  
21 way the program works now.

22           The other thing that the program allows right now,  
23 there's flexibility to use eligibility from one grade level  
24 to another. School districts have to submit a school board  
25 resolution saying that they can house these students through

1 other means.

2           Sometimes it's loading higher -- a classroom  
3 standard, but that's part of what we have in the program  
4 right now and that's something that could be looked at  
5 because it is right now through regulation in terms of  
6 limiting or changing that current process.

7           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: And I feel for these  
8 schools that want the other facilities. It actually rounds  
9 out the students' experience going through school and, you  
10 know, hopefully we're doing them justice. God knows we pay  
11 enough for these schools that hopefully they'll get all  
12 their buildings.

13           But, you know, I would like to see some safeguards  
14 that we're giving expansion or new eligibility for students  
15 that it's actually doing for capacity of those schools and  
16 at the right campus.

17           You know, either into the existing campus or a new  
18 campus, so we're not saying, well, I have this eligibility  
19 at one high school area, but I'm really building them over  
20 here because I want to beef up the school and all of a  
21 sudden, these students have to shipped or something.

22           I mean how do we balance that flexibility at a  
23 local level but still have the guarantee that they aren't  
24 going to come back to us or the students are going to suffer  
25 because they have overcrowded classrooms later.

1           And I'm hoping that could be done by you  
2 supervising. I hope it's not rules and regulations that put  
3 everyone in boxes. I'm hoping that's something you could  
4 look at, you could read the numbers, and you could make a  
5 judgment call and say, okay, this makes sense.

6           I'm just trying to figure out when that  
7 eligibility may be used for a nonclassroom or --  
8 nonclassroom type project. It could be with classrooms and  
9 some other buildings. When that scenario may go through and  
10 how that would be justified. I'm using the justification --  
11 or eligibility, but I'm building a new cafeteria.

12           I just -- you know, what -- can you kind of give  
13 me an example of a scenario that may work?

14           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Could I piggyback on that a  
15 little bit.

16           We do our enrollment projection using the  
17 five-year cohort because if we use a ten-year cohort, you  
18 can't add in dwelling units; correct? Right?

19           MR. MIRELES: Right.

20           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: You can't augment it.

21           MR. MIRELES: That's correct.

22           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So then we augment that  
23 based on tentative maps and whether or not we're using the  
24 student generation -- the standard student generation  
25 number.

1           We've gone out and done our own door-by-door  
2 survey to find out how many students are really moving into  
3 our community, but then we augment -- we came up with a  
4 number because you -- this is our district, you've got a new  
5 development coming in. These are the students we expect to  
6 have from that development and we want the school to be  
7 ready when the people move into the houses to avoid  
8 overcrowding.

9           But when you have a situation like you do in  
10 today's world where some developers have -- you know, aren't  
11 ready to build right away or they're extending their  
12 tentative maps, a district hangs onto that eligibility --  
13 okay -- but they don't need to build the school yet because  
14 the developer's waiting a year or two, whatever, to start  
15 construction.

16           In the meantime over in this part of their  
17 district, it's like, you know, we have three schools without  
18 multiuse rooms and we want to take and use some of that  
19 eligibility to build our multiuse rooms, but in the meantime  
20 five years down the road when these houses go in, now you  
21 need a school, but you've used your eligibility to build,  
22 you know, facilities in the current part of the district and  
23 you don't have the ability to -- if you want to enter into a  
24 developer fee agreement where you're going to split, you've  
25 got have the ability to do that. You don't and it's tough

1 for a bond.

2 I will tell you to pass a bond for new houses  
3 that are coming in because people who live already don't  
4 want to pay for schools for kids in those new houses.

5 So is there some way with eligibility -- and so  
6 I'm just -- I'm not asking for an answer, but give you  
7 something to ponder as we go through this journey.

8 Is there some way that we can sort of bifurcate  
9 the eligibility so that we have part of the eligibility  
10 that's based on the five-year cohort, but the augmentation  
11 that we're doing for new dwelling units that we don't allow  
12 that to be spent unless it's on those new dwelling units so  
13 we can be assured that we have eligibility for those  
14 students when they do move in?

15 You know, and the other question I would ask of  
16 all of us to think about or we can ponder is that, you know,  
17 there were schools that were built 40, 50 years ago that  
18 never had a -- I mean my kids went to an elementary school  
19 that never had a multiuse room. We finally passed a bond  
20 after they were all -- after the five of them were out.

21 Then they went a middle school that never had a  
22 gym, you know, and we built that.

23 So I would think with the grant amounts, you know,  
24 we would be expecting schools to have these kind of core  
25 facilities even though we haven't defined them, but there

1 are schools that are older that don't have them that we do  
2 have some kind of responsibility and I don't know you deal  
3 with that with future eligibility, but I wouldn't want to  
4 see a school that was built in 1970 never be able to have a  
5 multiuse room or a gym.

6 I think that's sort of a different issue there. I  
7 don't know how we might deal with that with future  
8 eligibility, but we do need to make sure that there's  
9 classrooms for students at the schools or what we would  
10 consider as complete and that will probably be another topic  
11 for discussion, but that we also are not using future  
12 eligibility, forgoing that and not having schools there when  
13 those students -- in classrooms when those students arrive  
14 because people don't want to drive their kids five miles  
15 across town to a school.

16 They want their kids to go to a school in their  
17 neighborhood.

18 MR. MIRELES: We can definitely take a look at  
19 that.

20 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: So -- I have one other  
21 question on the year-round education. Do we know what  
22 percentage of our school -- I mean most districts when  
23 they've the opportunity to move away from year-round  
24 education have moved to a more traditional calendar.

25 Do we know, you know, what percentage of our

1 schools are still even on year-round? I mean I question  
2 whether or not that we should be continuing that as we go --  
3 as we move into the future.

4 MR. YEAGER: I left that paper at the office, but  
5 we're getting it now.

6 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Well -- and you can provide  
7 it later, but I mean --

8 MR. YEAGER: It's going down.

9 CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah, it is going down. So  
10 the question is do we still want to -- you know, that we  
11 need to talk about it at some point in time, is do we still  
12 want to include that, I would call the penalty.

13 You know, when we pretty much -- you know, schools  
14 pretty much have decided for academic purposes that they're  
15 abandoning the year-round and moving to a more traditional  
16 calendar.

17 I don't know if I have any other questions.

18 The last question I had here ties with it. That's  
19 a whole nother discussion and probably with CDE, but that is  
20 what is the definition of a school. You know, if we're  
21 building a new school, what do we expect to be built.

22 Any other questions from any of the other members?

23 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: I think that was -- yeah.  
24 I mean just the safeguards and it sounds like the number's  
25 more on than I expected --

1           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah.

2           ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: -- as far as -- especially  
3 with the portables and with the predictions. So there  
4 doesn't seem like there needs to be a lot of changing there.

5           It's just -- it's always been those exceptions  
6 that hopefully you don't have to legislate or put in  
7 statute. It's something that you give the flexibility to  
8 your office, look, does this make sense, are you thinking  
9 both short term or long term.

10           If you use -- if you're supposed to be growing a  
11 district, do you have the classroom capability to handle  
12 that. You may build a room that's a multipurpose room now  
13 that five years from now is going to be converted into  
14 classrooms. That's when the students move up. Good with  
15 all that, just as long as you use that --

16           We just don't want someone to build facilities and  
17 now have the capacity later to do the primary function which  
18 is to have a classroom and educate.

19           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. The problem is, is  
20 when you're dealing with the numbers of portables that we  
21 are and you've got to replace them 20 years down the road,  
22 that's a big price tag that you're looking at. Because I  
23 don't -- Bill, maybe you know, but I don't know how you  
24 modernize a portable.

25           MR. SAVIDGE: You don't.

1           CHAIRPERSON BUCHANAN: Yeah. So -- you know, when  
2 you look at the life cycle cost, it's much more expensive.

3           Is there any public comment? No other comments?

4           Well -- boy, this is -- it's nice to get out of  
5 here in an hour.

6           So then we will adjourn this meeting and we've got  
7 a number of others coming up on modernization and others.  
8 So hopefully -- you know, the plan is to continue with these  
9 informational meetings so we have a good solid foundation  
10 and then we'll start doing the hard part in terms of talking  
11 about, you know, any changes we'd like to see in the program  
12 as it moves forward.

13           So thank you very much.

14           (Whereupon, at 3:00 p.m. the proceedings were recessed.)

15   ---oOo---

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

1  
2  
3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA            )  
  )  ss.  
4 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO        )

5  
6           I, Mary C. Clark, a Certified Electronic Court  
7 Reporter and Transcriber, Certified by the American  
8 Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Inc.  
9 (AAERT, Inc.), do hereby certify:

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

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

15           That I am a disinterested person to said action.

16           IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on  
17 December 1, 2012.

18  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 Mary C. Clark  
21 AAERT CERT\*D-214  
22 Certified Electronic Court  
23 Reporter and Transcriber  
24  
25