

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
March 9, 2012

Methods for Accepting School Facility Program Applications After Bond Authority is Exhausted

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To discuss methods for accepting, processing, and tracking School Facility Program (SFP) project funding applications once bond authority is exhausted.

DESCRIPTION

The State Allocation Board (Board) directed the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) staff to bring a discussion of methods for accepting, processing, and tracking SFP project funding applications once bond authority is exhausted to the Implementation Committee (Committee). This item provides background information regarding the history of Board unfunded lists.

AUTHORITY

SEE ATTACHED

BACKGROUND

Diminishing Bond Authority

As of the February 2012 Board meeting, approximately \$141 million remained in New Construction (NC) bond authority and approximately \$408 million remained in Modernization bond authority. Based on the typical processing timeline of applications and the average monthly drawdown on authority, NC bond authority will be exhausted in April 2012. Modernization bond authority is expected to be exhausted in October 2012.

An email was sent to local educational agencies (LEAs) on March 2, 2012 advising LEAs that “the value of New Construction funding application requests currently on file with the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) exceeds remaining bond authority for the New Construction program.” The OPSC is continuing to receive NC applications, as directed by the Board at the February 2012 Board meeting.

These applications are placed on the [New Construction Funding Applications Received Past Existing Authority](#) list which can be viewed on the [OPSC website](#). There is no guarantee that State funds will become available for the applications placed on this list.

At the September 2011 Board meeting, the Board created a sub-committee to consider the future of the SFP. In particular, members wished to take a look at where the Board stands with NC bond authority between now and the next potential school facilities bond that could be placed on the ballot. The New Construction Sub-committee (Sub-committee) met on November 7, 2011, and January 11 and February 14, 2012. The Sub-committee's recommendations were presented to the full Board at the February 23, 2012 Board meeting.

In order to demonstrate ongoing school facility needs in the State, the Sub-committee recommended that once the existing authority runs out, the Board should continue to accept applications and develop a method for tracking these projects. The Board directed Staff to discuss these issues at the Committee.

Lease Purchase Program to School Facility Program Unfunded List

In 1998 voters approved the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1998 (Proposition 1A), creating the SFP. At that time, there was a list of Board-approved projects from the previous Lease Purchase Program (LPP) which had not received funding because the program had exhausted its bond authority. Proposition 1A specified that LPP construction projects that were approved by the Board but had not received funding would be funded from the new bond, subject to program criteria and priorities.

School Facility Program Unfunded List

The Board also created unfunded lists in 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2006, when either SFP NC or Modernization bond authority was exhausted. The OPSC continued to accept and process SFP applications and present them to the Board for approval.

When voters approved Proposition 47, the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002, the act specified funds for NC and Modernization projects for which LEAs had filed applications on or before February 1, 2002 (those on the unfunded list).

In December 2008, due to the State's fiscal crisis, the Pooled Money Investment Board—which had made short term loans to the State School Facilities Fund between bond sales—could no longer provide interim funding for SFP allocations. As a result, the Board created in regulations a system where Board approved applications are placed on an “Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans)”. When cash becomes available, projects on the list are apportioned based on priority funding, pursuant to SFP Regulation 1859.90.2.

The following chart summarizes the history of SFP unfunded lists, including a breakout of those projects currently on the unfunded list:

Unfunded List Creation Date	Date Range on Unfunded List	Reason for Unfunded List	Apportionment Date
5/26/1999	5/26/1999 - 5/24/2000	Lack of Cash (Modernization)	7/5/2000
9/27/2000	9/27/2000 - 11/6/2002	Lack of Authority (Modernization)	12/18/2002
1/3/2001	1/3/2001 - 11/6/2002	Lack of Authority (New Construction)	12/18/2002
4/26/2006	4/26/2006 - 12/6/2006	Lack of Authority (Modernization)	1/24/2007
1/28/09 (2009 Grant Projects)	8/26/2009 - 1/27/10	Lack of Cash*	Ongoing
1/28/09 (2010 Grant Projects)	4/28/10 - 12/15/10	Lack of Cash*	Ongoing
1/28/09 (2011 Grant Projects)	1/26/11 - 12/14/11	Lack of Cash*	Ongoing

* Caused by the inability of the Board to access AB 55 loans

Workload list vs. Unfunded List

Currently, when the OPSC receives a funding application, it is processed as follows:

- The application is stamped with the date it is received.
- Staff reviews the application to ensure that the minimum necessary elements, such as the California Department of Education and Division of the State Architect approval letters, are included. If everything is present, it becomes an “Approved Application,” and is added to the OPSC Workload List.
 - The Workload List, which is posted to the OPSC website, includes the LEA and site names, the county, the OPSC application number and received date, and preliminary grant amounts.
 - Although applications on the Workload List are referred to as “Approved Applications” they have not yet received any approval from the Board, and are not guaranteed apportionment.
- Each application on the workload is assigned to an OPSC project manager for complete review. Once the review is complete and the OPSC has determined that the application meets the program requirements, it is presented to the Board for approval.
- At the monthly Board meeting, the Board approves the application, and the application is given a position on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans).
 - Placement on the Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans) does not guarantee that a project will receive funding, but this Unfunded List is within current remaining bond authority.

- If the LEA can certify that it will be able to submit the *Fund Release Authorization*, Form SAB 50-05, within 90 days, applications on this Unfunded List are eligible to participate in priority funding rounds through which they may be converted to actual apportionments as funds become available.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Current regulations specify that the OPSC will continue to accept both eligibility and funding applications for full review and presentation to the Board, when bond authority is exhausted, pursuant to SFP Regulation Section 1859.95. Any funding applications, if approved by the Board, would then be placed on an Unfunded List (defined as an “information list”) until such time as funding became available.

The regulation excludes from this process any eligibility applications that use alternative enrollment projection, or NC funding applications based on eligibility that has been generated through an alternative enrollment projection. The alternative enrollment projection allowed LEAs to generate NC pupil eligibility without using the cohort survival method, subject to criteria specified in Education Code Section 17071.75(a)(1). A maximum of \$500 million in Proposition 47 NC bond authority was reserved for projects that generated eligibility using that method. No additional bond authority has been provided for projects generating eligibility with this method.

At the February Board meeting, some members noted that compiling a list of projects once the program has exceeded all available bond authority will help demonstrate the need for a future school facilities bond.

The Board directed staff to discuss with the Committee options for tracking and processing incoming funding applications once bond authority has been exhausted. Specifically, the Board asked the Committee to discuss whether these applications should be processed and presented to the Board for placement on an Unfunded List, or if instead a new type of list should be created with applications that are not processed to the Board for approval until bond authority becomes available.

One possible solution is to create a simplified list that provides basic project information with a date stamp for each application. The simplified list could be modeled on the OPSC Workload List, with applications receiving only an initial review to ensure they have the minimum necessary components of an “Approved Application.”

Another possible solution is for the OPSC to fully process incoming applications but not present them to the Board for approval until bond authority becomes available. Implementing these options may require changes to the SFP regulations.

The following table lists some of the project application lists that currently exist or that would be created pursuant to SFP Regulation 1859.95:

	Workload List	Unfunded List	Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans)	Apportionment
Application Status	Application has been accepted by the OPSC	Application has been approved by the Board but not apportioned	Application has been approved by the Board but not apportioned	Application has been apportioned by the Board
Funding Determination	Includes projected (estimated) grant amount	The per pupil grant and site development amounts are determined based on the amounts in effective at the time of approval	The per pupil grant and site development amounts are determined based on the amounts in effective at the time of approval	Grant amount is Full and Final
Apportionment Status	Not fully processed by OPSC, not approved by the Board and no guarantee of funding	Implies the project will receive an apportionment once additional bond authority becomes available. If funded through a future bond, may need additional review as a result of any program changes.	Unfunded approval is within current bond authority and will be converted to an apportionment as bond funds become available, (through "priorities in funding" rounds)	Through priorities in funding rounds, LEA has 90 days to request a fund release or authority returns to the program (prior to priorities in funding, LEA had 18 months)

ADMINISTRATION COSTS

The School Facility Program administration costs are drawn from the SFP bond authority. These costs cover the administrative expenses of the OPSC, the California Department of Education, the California School Finance Authority, and the State Controller's Office. Because future administrative costs will potentially limit the number of projects funded through a particular program, the Board asked the topic of administrative cost funding be raised at the Committee. This issue will be discussed at a future Board meeting.

ATTACHMENT

AUTHORITY

Education Code

Section 100410 (a) "Three billion three hundred fifty million dollars (\$3,350,000,000) of the proceeds of bonds issued and sold pursuant to this part shall be deposited in the 1998 State School Facilities Fund, which is established by Section 17070.40, and allocated by the State Allocation Board pursuant to this chapter. Before requesting the sale of bonds pursuant to Section 100432 for deposit in the State School Facilities Fund, the State Allocation Board shall request, pursuant to Section 100432, the sale of bonds sufficient to finance all projects for which application was made pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene State School Building Lease-Purchase Law of 1976 (Chapter 12 (commencing with Section 17000) of Part 10) and for which an application was approved for construction, but funding was not available, prior to November 4, 1998."

Section 100620(a)(3) "The amount of two billion nine hundred million dollars (\$2,900,000,000) for new construction of school facilities pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10) of Part 10 for those school districts that have filed an application with the Office of Public School Construction on or before February 1, 2002, including, but not limited to, hardship applications. If the amount made available for purposes of this paragraph is not needed and expended for the purposes of this paragraph, the State Allocation Board may allocate the remainder of these funds for purposes of paragraph (1)."

Section 100620(a)(4) "The amount of one billion nine hundred million dollars (\$1,900,000,000) for the modernization of school facilities pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10) of Part 10, for those school districts that have filed an application with the Office of Public School Construction on or before February 1, 2002, including, but not limited to, hardship applications. If the amount made available for purposes of this paragraph is not needed and expended for the purposes of this paragraph, the State Allocation Board may allocate these funds for purposes of paragraph (2)."

Section 17009.5. "(a) Except as set forth in Section 17052, on and after November 4, 1998, the board shall only approve and fund school facilities construction projects pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10).

(b) A school district with a first priority project that has received a construction approval by the Department of General Services, Division of the State Architect, or a joint-use project approval by the board, prior to November 4, 1998, for growth or modernization pursuant to this chapter shall receive funding pursuant to this chapter for all unfunded approved project costs as it would have received under this chapter, and the increased capacity assigned to the project shall be included in calculating

the district's capacity pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10). Funds received for projects described in this subdivision shall constitute the state's final and full contribution to these projects. The board shall not consider additional project funding except when otherwise authorized under Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10).

(c) A school district with a second priority project that has received a construction approval by the Department of General Services, Division of the State Architect prior to November 4, 1998, for growth or modernization pursuant to this chapter shall elect to do either of the following:

(1) Withdraw the application under this chapter, submit an initial report and application pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10), and receive per pupil allocations as set forth in Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10). If the district withdraws the application, any funds previously allocated under this chapter for the project shall be offset from the first grant to the district under Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10).

(2) Convert the second priority project approved under this chapter to a first priority status and receive funds in accordance with this chapter.

(d) Notwithstanding priorities established pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10), projects authorized for funding as set forth in this section shall be funded by the board pursuant to this chapter prior to funding other projects pursuant to Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10).

(e) For purposes of funding priority for modernization grants under Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10), a district that applies under subdivision (b) or paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) shall retain its original project approval date.

(f) Notwithstanding Section 17017.1, West Contra Costa Unified School District shall be eligible for state facilities funds beginning November 4, 1998.

(g) The State Allocation Board shall adopt regulations to ensure that an appropriate offset is made from funds approved pursuant to this chapter, for funds awarded to school districts pursuant to Chapter 12 (commencing with Section 17000) prior to November 4, 1998."

School Facility Program Regulations

Section 1859.2. Definitions.

...

"Approved Application(s)" means a district has submitted the application and all documents to the Office of Public School Construction that are required to be submitted with the application as identified in the General Information Section of Forms SAB 50-01, *Enrollment Certification/Projection*; SAB 50-02, *Existing School Building Capacity*; SAB 50-03, *Eligibility Determination*, (Revised 03/09); and SAB 50-04, *Application for Funding*, as specified in Section 1859.2 "Form SAB 50-04", and the Office of Public School Construction has completed and accepted a preliminary approval review pursuant to Education Code Section 17072.25(a).

...

“Ready for Apportionment” means a final review of an Approved Application has been completed by the OPSC and it has been determined that it meets all requirements of law for an apportionment or eligibility determination, and the OPSC will recommend approval to the Board.

...

“Unfunded List” means an information list of unfunded projects, with the exception of the unfunded list defined below as “Unfunded List (Lack of AB 55 Loans)”.

...

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

Section 1859.10. Lease-Purchase Program and School Facility Program.

Projects approved under the LPP are subject to the regulations contained in Title 2, California Code of Regulations, commencing with Section 1865.1, and the SFP transition rules contained in this Article 2.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.11. Previously Approved Joint Use Projects.

Joint Use projects that were approved by the Board prior to November 4, 1998, shall be eligible for funding pursuant to the LPP for all remaining approved but unfunded project costs.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.12. Priority One New Construction.

Priority One new construction projects will be funded under the provisions of the LPP if the project received either: 1) Phase C approval by the Board prior to November 4, 1998; or 2) either Phase P or Phase P and Phase S, approvals, and DSA plan approval prior to November 4, 1998.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.13. Priority Two New Construction.

Districts with Priority Two new construction projects which received either: 1) Phase C approval by the Board prior to November 4, 1998; or 2) either a Phase P or a Phase P and Phase S approval with DSA plan approval prior to November 4, 1998, must declare to the Board that it intends to

convert the entire project to Priority One status by January 31, 1999 to receive funding for all remaining costs in accordance with the LPP provisions.

If the district has not declared its intention to convert the entire project to Priority One status by January 31, 1999, the project shall be deemed withdrawn under the provisions of the LPP and the district must submit a new application under the provisions of the SFP, pursuant to Section 1859.20. If the project is eligible for further funding under the SFP, the New Construction Adjusted Grant provided under the SFP will be reduced by any previous apportionments, with the exception of apportionments made for site acquisition, made under the LPP.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.14. Priority One Modernization.

Priority One modernization projects that have either Phase C approval by the Board prior to November 4, 1998, or have Phase P approval by the Board and DSA plan approval prior to November 4, 1998, may proceed under either (a) or (b). Districts may either:

- (a) Receive funding under the provisions of the LPP; or,
- (b) By January 31, 1999, withdraw the Priority One modernization LPP project and submit a new application for funding under the provisions of the SFP, pursuant to Section 1859.20. The project approval date under the LPP will be retained for the project approval date under the SFP. If the project is eligible for further funding under the SFP, the Modernization Adjusted Grant provided under the SFP will be reduced by any previous apportionments made under the LPP.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.15. Priority Two Modernization.

Districts with Priority Two modernization projects that have either Phase C approval by the Board prior to November 4, 1998, or have Phase P approval by the Board and DSA plan approval prior to November 4, 1998, must declare to the Board that it intends to convert the entire project to Priority One status by January 31, 1999 to receive funding for all remaining costs in accordance with the LPP provisions.

If the district has not declared its intention to convert the entire project to Priority One status by January 31, 1999, the project shall be deemed withdrawn under the provisions of the LPP and the district must submit a new application under the provisions of the SFP pursuant to Section 1859.20. The project approval date under the LPP will be retained for the project approval date under the SFP. If the project is eligible for further

funding under the SFP, the Modernization Adjusted Grant provided under the SFP will be reduced by any previous apportionments made under the LPP.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.15.1. Application Deadline.

Districts with LPP or SFP conversions from LPP new construction and modernization projects that meet the provisions of Sections 1859.12, 1859.13, 1859.14 or 1859.15 shall receive first funding priority upon submittal of a complete eligibility and funding application through July 5, 1999. After this date, LPP or SFP conversions from LPP new construction and modernization projects shall be funded in the order of the date of receipt of a complete application which complies with all pertinent LPP and SFP statutes and regulations.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code and Section 15503, Government Code.

Reference: Sections 17009.3 and 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.16. Projects Not Eligible for Further LPP Funding.

A district with projects not meeting the requirements of Sections 1859.11, 1859.12, 1859.13, 1859.14 and 1859.15 must submit a new application under the provisions of the SFP pursuant to Section 1859.20 in order to receive funding. If the project is eligible for further funding under the SFP, the

- (a) New Construction Adjusted Grant provided under the SFP will be reduced by any previous apportionments, with the exception of apportionments made for site acquisition, made under the LPP.
- (b) Modernization Adjusted Grant provided under the SFP will be reduced by any previous apportionments made under the LPP.

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17009.5, Education Code.

Section 1859.95. Acceptance of Applications When Funding Is Unavailable.

When the Board has no funds to apportion or the application does not qualify for funding because of the Board's priority point mechanism pursuant to Sections 1859.91 and 1859.92, the Board will continue to accept and process applications for eligibility determination, with the exception of applications that include a request for review of an Alternative Enrollment Projection method. The Board will also accept and process applications for apportionment for purposes of developing an Unfunded List based on the date the application is Ready for Apportionment, with the exception of New Construction funding applications that utilize eligibility generated by the Alternative Enrollment Projection.

The Board will return any applications for the review of the Alternative Enrollment Projection method and New Construction applications that utilize eligibility generated by the Alternative Enrollment Projection once the funding apportioned for these projects reaches \$500 million or the Board has no funds to apportion from the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004.

If either the Executive Officer of the Board, the State Architect, the Director of School Facilities Planning Division within the CDE or the Chief of the School Property Evaluation and Cleanup Division within the Department of Toxic Substances Control certify to the OPSC that the district's application was delayed for a specified number of calendar days in relation to other similar applications submitted to that agency at the same time, the application may, at the discretion of the Board, receive a date on the Unfunded List or receive funding pursuant to Section 1859.91 based on the date the application is ready for Apportionment, adjusted back in time for the number of calendar days the application was delayed.

Applications for New Construction Adjusted Grants for a project where the site was apportioned pursuant to Section 1859.75.1 shall receive a date on the Unfunded List based on the date the environmental hardship site apportionment was made for the project.

With the exception of financial hardship eligibility, a district with an application included on an Unfunded List shall not be required to re-establish eligibility for that application prior to apportionment.

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

Note: Authority cited: Sections 17070.35 and 17072.25, Education Code.
Reference: Sections 17070.35 and 17071.75, Education Code.

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
March 9, 2012

SB 128: High Performance Incentive grants for Career Technical Education Facilities
Program projects

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present a proposal to implement Chapter 622, Statutes of 2011 (Senate Bill (SB) 128 – Lowenthal).

AUTHORITY

See Attachment B.

BACKGROUND

SB 128 amended Education Code to allow schools districts with School Facility Program (SFP) Career Technical Education Facilities Program (CTEFP) projects to request High Performance Incentive (HPI) grant funds, including HPI grant funds above the CTEFP per-project maximum grant allowances.

Career Technical Education Facilities Program

Chapter 35, Statutes of 2006 (Assembly Bill (AB) 127 – Nunez) and 2006's Proposition 1D allocated \$500 million for the CTEFP. As of February 22, 2012, \$3.3 million in bond authority remained in the CTEFP account.

Pursuant to statute:

- The CTEFP grant amount is based on project costs.
- Some CTEFP projects consist solely of equipment.
- Not including CTEFP projects receiving HPI grants, the CTEFP new construction grant amounts cannot exceed \$3 million per project per schoolsite and CTEFP modernization grant amounts cannot exceed \$1.5 million per project per schoolsite.
- The district matching share requirement for both CTEFP new construction and CTEFP modernization projects is 50 percent.

At the May 25, 2011 State Allocation Board (Board) meeting, the Board decided to continue providing unfunded approvals to CTEFP applicants in the third funding cycle using all available bond authority and to keep the third funding cycle open. 73 CTEFP applications totaling approximately \$101.3 million in State funds have been received by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC), but have not been approved by the Board.

Pursuant to SFP Regulation Section 18959.107, the 73 CTEFP applications that have been received by the OPSC, but that have not been approved by the Board, are not eligible for any new regulation that applies the HPI grant to the CTEFP unless the districts withdraw and resubmit the applications. The resubmitted applications would only be accepted by the OPSC if the Board establishes an additional CTEFP filing round.

The average CTEFP new construction project has received \$1,626,661 in State funding (including State loans). The average CTEFP modernization project has received \$575,289 in State funding (including State loans).

High Performance Incentive Grant

Chapter 35, Statutes of 2006 (AB 127 – Nunez) and 2006's Proposition 1D allocated \$100 million for the HPI grant. As of February 22, 2012, \$60.3 million remained in HPI bond authority.

Qualifying SFP projects receive:

- a percentage increase to their per-pupil grant amount relative to the HPI “points” the Division of the State Architect (DSA) awards the project and
- a High Performance Base Incentive Grant (HP BIG):
 - \$150,000 for New Construction projects on new sites
 - \$250,000 for New Construction projects on existing sites and Modernization projects

Projects receive HPI points if the project design and materials include attributes that promote:

- the efficient use of energy and water,
- the maximum use of natural lighting and indoor air quality,
- the use of recycled materials and materials that emit a minimum of toxic substances,
- the use of acoustics conducive to teaching and learning, or
- other characteristics or high performance schools.

For projects accepted by the DSA using the 2009 Edition of the California-Collaborative for High Performance Schools Criteria, SFP projects require a minimum of 27 HPI points for New Construction (new site) projects or 20 HPI points for New Construction (existing site) and Modernization in order to receive HPI grants.

DISCUSSION

Because the CTEFP grant amount is based on project costs, whereas the HPI grant combines a percentage increase to the per-pupil grant and a base incentive grant, the SFP regulations that specify the HPI grant calculations cannot be directly applied to the

CTEFP. Therefore, regulatory updates are necessary to apply the HPI grant to the CTEFP.

At the February 2012 Implementation Committee meeting, OPSC staff presented options for applying the HPI grant to the CTEFP.

In this proposal, the HPI grant for CTEFP projects would consist of applying the existing HP BIG to the CTEFP. The methodology for receiving HPI points, the minimum number of points necessary to receive the HP BIG, and the amount of the HP BIG remains the same.

Under this proposal, CTEFP projects would be eligible for the HP BIG if they meet the current HPI grant thresholds: \$150,000 for 27 HPI points for new construction (new site) projects or \$250,000 for 20 HPI points for new construction (existing site) and modernization. By applying the HP BIG to CTEFP projects, districts would be incentivized to include high-performance work in their career technical education projects and will easily know exactly how much HPI funding they may receive.

HP BIG

The HP BIG was created, in part, to encourage districts with modernization projects to participate in the HPI Grant program. SFP modernization projects receiving the HP BIG have received an average total State share of approximately \$2,532,000, including an average HPI grant amount of approximately \$339,000. Therefore because that \$2,532,000 average is close to the CTEFP new construction project maximum grant amount of \$3,000,000, OPSC staff believes that the existing HP BIG amounts are appropriate.

Percentage increase

A percentage increase is not included in this proposal.

Including a percentage increase would incentivize districts to earn more than the minimum HPI points. However, components that are already within the CTEFP cost estimate may earn HPI points. To avoid funding those components out of both the CTEFP and an HPI percentage increase, the costs would need to be separated by the school district into high-performance and non-high-performance categories, creating additional work for school districts prior to their application submittal.

OPSC staff does not believe it is possible to separate every high-performance component. For example, to obtain points for energy performance, which is one of the largest point-generating categories, a project includes a variety of components. These components, as a whole, work together to achieve “high performance” with regard to energy. Considered individually, however, many of these components may not be considered “high performance.”

CTEFP “Reservation of Funds” and DSA Approval

Some CTEFP projects may receive an apportionment without DSA approved plans and specifications. In these cases, districts have up to 12 months after the “reservation of funds” to submit the plans. However, without plans, the DSA is unable to verify the work that would qualify the project for the HPI grant. OPSC staff is currently developing options to address this issue.

The following are two of the options OPSC staff is analyzing; however, they are not an exhaustive summary of all potential options to address this issue. Staff welcomes public comment and is open to discussing options not included below:

Option 1) Require DSA review prior to apportionment to determine whether or not the project is eligible to receive the HPI grant.

Considerations:

- HPI bond authority would only be allocated to CTEFP projects with the requisite high-performance work.
- Projects requesting a “reservation of funds” that do not have DSA approval would be prevented from receiving the HPI grant.

Option 2) Allow CTEFP projects to receive the HPI grant at the “reservation of funds” stage without DSA approval. Rescind the HPI grant at the fund release stage if, when the DSA approved plans are submitted, the project has not received the required HPI points.

Considerations:

- Districts requesting a “reservation of funds” would be eligible to receive the HPI grant.
- An additional Board action may need to be taken to adjust the project apportionment if a rescission of the HPI grant is required.
- This option would require additional regulatory changes.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

For the complete proposed regulatory changes, see Attachment A.
The proposed changes are summarized below.

SFP REGULATION SECTION 1859.71.6

Section 1859.71.6 applies the HPI grant to new construction projects on new sites.

The proposed amendment adds a paragraph to apply the HP BIG to CTEFP new construction projects on new sites.

SFP REGULATION SECTION 1859.77.4

Section 1859.77.4 applies the HPI grant to new construction projects on existing sites and to modernization projects.

The proposed amendment adds a paragraph to apply the HP BIG to CTEFP new construction projects on existing sites and to CTEFP modernization projects.

SFP REGULATION SECTION 1859.193

Section 1859.193 outlines how the CTEFP grants are determined.

The proposed amendment adds language to add the HPI grant to the CTEFP grant after the existing CTEFP grant determinations are made. The HPI grant would be added to the CTEFP grant whether or not the CTEFP grant reaches the per-project maximum grant amounts.

SFP REGULATION SECTION 1859.194

Section 1859.194 describes districts' CTEFP matching share requirements.

The proposed amendment adds language to clarify that the HPI grant matching share requirement is on a dollar-for-dollar basis (50 state/50 district) for both CTEFP new construction projects and CTEFP modernization projects.

ATTACHMENT A

Section 1859.71.6. New Construction Additional Grant for High Performance Incentive.

(a) In addition to any other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall provide the grant amounts identified in ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) or (c), as applicable, if all the following are met:

(1) The project meets the mandatory measures of the California Green Building Standards, California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11, as applicable.

...

(b) Excluding Career Technical Education Facilities Projects, to To determine the High Performance Incentive grant, multiply the New Construction Grant by the percentage allowance in accordance with the eligible high performance points as follows:

(1) For those projects accepted by the DSA prior to October 1, 2007, pursuant to (a)(8), in which the level of high performance attained, as concurred by the DSA, is a minimum of 23 points, the New Construction Grant will be multiplied by:

(A) Two percent at 23 points plus 0.03 percent for each point attained from 24 through 33 points; or

...

(c) For Career Technical Education Facilities Projects, for those projects accepted by the DSA utilizing the 2009 CA-CHPS Criteria, in which the level of high performance attained as concurred by the DSA is a minimum of 27 points, the Board shall provide \$150,000 one time per school site as a High Performance Base Incentive Grant.

If there are no funds remaining in the High Performance School Account or the funds remaining are insufficient to fully fund

the additional grant authorized in ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) or (c), the district may either withdraw its application and resubmit it should additional funds be made available in the High Performance School Account or continue with the new construction project and accept a full and final apportionment without the additional grant authorized by ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) or (c).

Any funds apportioned pursuant to this Section shall be expended only on high performance related costs (and components as approved by the OPSC.)

Note: Authority cited: ~~Section~~ Sections 17070.35; and 17078.72(l), Education Code.

Reference: Section 101012(a)(8), Education Code.

Section 1859.77.4. Addition to a Site and Modernization Grant for High Performance Incentive.

(a) In addition to any other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall provide the grant amounts identified in ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) or (c), as applicable, if all the following are met:

(1) The project meets the mandatory measures of the California Green Building Standards, California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11, as applicable.

(b) Excluding Career Technical Education Facilities Projects, to To determine the High Performance Incentive grant, multiply the New Construction or Modernization Grant, as appropriate, by the percentage allowance in accordance with the eligible high performance points as follows:

(1) For those projects accepted by the DSA prior to October 1, 2007, pursuant to (a)(8), in which the level of high performance attained, as concurred by the DSA, is a minimum of 23 points, the New Construction or Modernization Grant, as appropriate, will be multiplied by:

(A) Two percent at 23 points plus 0.03 percent for each point attained from 24 through 33 points; or

...

(c) For Career Technical Education Facilities Projects, for those projects accepted by the DSA utilizing the 2009 CA-CHPS Criteria, in which the level of high performance attained as concurred by the DSA is a minimum of 20 points, the Board shall provide \$250,000 one time per school site as a High Performance Base Incentive Grant.

If there are no funds remaining in the High Performance School Account or the funds remaining are insufficient to fully fund the additional grant authorized in ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) **or (c)**, the district may either withdraw its application and resubmit it should additional funds be made available in the High Performance School Account or continue with the addition to an existing site/modernization project and accept a full and final apportionment without the additional grant authorized by ~~Subsections~~ Subsection (b) **or (c)**.

Any funds apportioned pursuant to this Section shall be expended only on high performance related costs (and components as approved by the OPSC.)

Note: Authority cited: ~~Section~~ **Sections** 17070.35; **and 17078.72(l)**, Education Code.

Reference: Section 101012(a)(8), Education Code.

Section 1859.193. Career Technical Education Facilities Grant Determination.

A Career Technical Education Facilities Project may construct a new facility or modernize or Reconfigure an existing school building. The application for Career Technical Education Facility funding may accompany an application for new construction funding pursuant to Section 1859.70 or may be submitted independently.

(a) For new construction of a Career Technical Education Facilities Project included in a qualifying New Construction Grant, the Career Technical Education Facilities grant amount shall be the lesser of either (1) or (2):

(1) The sum of the costs uniquely related to facilities required to provide Career Technical Education as determined below:

(A) 50 percent of the cost of construction of the Career Technical Education Facilities Project, as determined by the project architect, subject to OPSC review and approval.

...

(2) \$3 million per Career Technical Education Facilities Project.

...

(b) For stand-alone new construction of a Career Technical Education Facilities Project, the grant amount shall be the lesser of either (1) or (2):

(1) The sum of the costs uniquely related to facilities required to provide Career Technical Education as determined below:

(A) 50 percent of the cost of construction of the Career Technical Education Facilities Project, as determined by the project architect, subject to OPSC review and approval.

...

(2) \$3 million per Career Technical Education Facilities Project.

...

(c) For Modernization of a Career Technical Education Facilities Project, the grant amount shall be the lesser of either (1) or (2):

(1) The sum of the costs uniquely related to facilities required to provide Career Technical Education Facilities Project as determined below:

(A) 50 percent of the cost to modernize or Reconfigure the Career Technical Education Facilities, as determined by the project architect, subject to OPSC review and approval.

...

(2) \$1.5 million per Career Technical Education Facilities Project.

...

(d) If an applicant meets the eligibility criteria in Section 1859.192, but does not have the necessary approvals from the DSA and/or the CDE at the time of apportionment, the Board may apportion funds for the Career Technical Education Facilities Project and reserve them for a period of up to 12 months. The grant amount to be reserved for the project will be the maximum funding as determined above in (a), (b), or (c).

(e) Funding provided by Sections 1859.71.6 and 1859.77.4 are considered High Performance Incentive grants, not Career Technical Education Facilities Project grants, and are therefore not affected by the determinations listed above.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 17070.35, ~~and~~ 17078.72(k), **and 17078.72(l)**, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17078.72, Education Code.

Section 1859.194. Career Technical Education Facilities Program Matching Share Requirement.

Any funding provided by these regulations, **including funding provided by Sections 1859.71.6 or 1859.77.4**, shall require an applicant matching share contribution on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The applicant matching share may come from any source including, but not limited to, private industry groups, school districts, county offices of education, and joint powers authorities.

If the applicant's available matching share does not equal the grant amount or the matching share is not immediately available, a loan may be made to the applicant. The amount of the loan shall be determined by compliance with (a) below. If the need for a loan is substantiated, it shall be paid over time through loan payments authorized by the Board.

...

Note: Authority cited: Sections 17070.35, ~~and~~ 17078.72(k), **and 17078.72(l)**, Education Code.

Reference: Sections 17076.10 and 17078.72, Education Code.

ATTACHMENT B

AUTHORITY

SB 128 adds paragraph (l) to Education Code (EC) Section 17078.72:

17078.72

(a) The Career Technical Education Facilities Program is hereby established to provide funding to qualifying local educational agencies-for the purpose of constructing new facilities or reconfiguring existing facilities, including, but not limited to, purchasing equipment with an average useful life expectancy of at least 10 years, to enhance educational opportunities for pupils in existing high schools in order to provide them with the skills and knowledge necessary for the high-demand technical careers of today and tomorrow.

...

(d) Grants shall be allocated on a per-square-foot basis for the applicable type of construction proposed or deemed necessary by the board consistent with the approved application for the project.

(e) New construction grants shall not exceed three million dollars (\$3,000,000) per project per schoolsite, inclusive of equipment, and shall only be allocated to comprehensive high schools that have an active Career Technical Advisory Committee pursuant to Section 8070, in either of the following methods:

(1) For a stand-alone project on a per-square-foot basis for the applicable type of construction proposed, based on the criteria established pursuant to subdivision (b), consistent with the approved application for the project.

(2) For new school projects, as a supplement to the per pupil allocation pursuant to Section 17072.10. The supplement is intended to cover excess costs uniquely related to the facilities required to provide the career technical education program or programs.

(f) Modernization grants shall not exceed one million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000) per project per schoolsite, inclusive of equipment and may be awarded to comprehensive high schools or joint power authorities currently operating career technical education programs that have an active Career Technical Advisory Committee pursuant to Section 8070 for the purpose of reconfiguration. For comprehensive high schools, the grant shall be supplemental to the per pupil allocation pursuant to Section 17074.10. The supplement is intended to cover excess costs uniquely related to the facilities required to provide the career technical education program or programs.

(g) (1) A school district shall contribute from local resources a dollar amount that is equal to the amount of the grant of state funds awarded under subdivisions (d), (e), and (f). The required local contribution may be provided by private industry groups, the school district, or a joint powers authority....

...

(l) Notwithstanding paragraphs (e) and (f), a project approved pursuant to this section is also eligible for an incentive grant from the funds specified in paragraph (8) of

subdivision (a) of Section 101012 if the project meets the criteria prescribed in that section.

EC Section 101012

(a) The proceeds from the sale of bonds, issued and sold for the purposes of this chapter, shall be allocated in accordance with the following schedule:

...

(4) The amount of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) for the purposes set forth in Article 13 (commencing with Section 17078.70) of Chapter 12.5 of Part 10, relating to facilities for career technical education programs.

...

(8) The amount of one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) for incentive grants to promote the use of designs and materials in new construction and modernization projects that include the attributes of high-performance schools, including, but not limited to, the elements set forth in Section 17070.96, pursuant to regulations adopted by the State Allocation Board.

...

Section 1859.193. Career Technical Education Facilities Grant Determination.

...

(a) For new construction of a Career Technical Education Facilities Project included in a qualifying New Construction Grant, the Career Technical Education Facilities grant amount shall be the lesser of either (1) or (2):

(1) The sum of the costs uniquely related to facilities required to provide Career Technical Education as determined below:

(A) 50 percent of the cost of construction of the Career Technical Education Facilities Project, as determined by the project architect, subject to OPSC review and approval.

(B) 50 percent of the cost to equip the Career Technical Education Facilities Project with necessary equipment.

(C) Minus an allowance for New Construction Grants provided for Career Technical Education classrooms, determined by:

1. Multiplying 960 square feet by the number of classrooms in the Career Technical Education Facilities Project that were included in the New Construction project.

2. Multiplying the amount determined in (a)(1)(C)1 by 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost for non-Toilet Facilities.

(2) \$3 million per Career Technical Education Facilities Project.

...

Note: Authority cited: Sections 17070.35 and 17078.72(k), Education Code.

Reference: Section 17078.72, Education Code.

SFP Regulation Section 1859.199. Program Accountability

...

An applicant district may not retain savings realized by a Career Technical Education Facilities Project.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 17070.35 and 17078.72(k), Education Code.

Reference: Section 17078.72, Education Code.

SFP Regulation Section 107. Amending and Withdrawal of Applications

...

A funding application, with the exception of funding applications identified in Subsection (a) below, submitted to the OPSC that has not received an approval will receive funding under the provisions of the regulations that were in effect when the application was submitted to the OPSC and any funding adjustment authorized by Sections 1859.71.2(c) or 1859.78.4(b). If the funding adjustment is a result of Sections 1859.71.2(c) or 1859.78.4(b), the district must submit an amended Form SAB 50-04. The amended application shall retain its OPSC processing date. At the option of the district, a funding application submitted to the OPSC that has not received an approval may be withdrawn and resubmitted for SAB approval under the provisions of any amended or new regulation once it is effective. The district must request that the application be withdrawn and removed from the OPSC workload list. The resubmitted application will receive a new processing date by the OPSC.

(a) A district that submitted an Approved Application request for either a Modernization Adjusted Grant or a Separate Design Apportionment for a modernization project pursuant to Section 1859.81.1 that meets the criteria in (1) and (2) below must submit a new Form SAB 50-04 that meets the criteria in Subsections (b) or (c) no later than 60 calendar days after the effective date (September 16, 2002) of this Subsection:

(1) The Approved Application was received by the OPSC after April 29, 2002 but no later than the date this Subsection becomes effective (September 16, 2002).

(2) The Approved Application has not received an approval or has received an approval pursuant to Section 1859.95, but has not received an apportionment.

...

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Sections 17070.35, 17070.63, 17074.15, 17074.16 and 17074.56, Education Code.

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
March 9, 2012

Improvements to the Project Information Worksheet (PIW)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To discuss potential improvements to the PIW.

DESCRIPTION

The State Allocation Board (Board) directed Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) staff to discuss improvements to the PIW at the Implementation Committee (Committee). This item provides information on the background and purpose of the worksheet for that discussion.

AUTHORITY

Education Code (EC) Section 17072.11 (b) states, "On or after January 1, 2008, the [Board] shall increase or decrease the per-unhoused-pupil grant eligibility determined pursuant to subdivision (a) by amounts it deems necessary to cause the grants to correspond to costs of new school construction, provided that the increase in any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall not exceed 6 percent."

School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.71 states, "The new construction per-unhoused-pupil grant amount, as provided by (EC) Section 17072.10(a), may be increased by an additional amount not to exceed six percent in a fiscal year, or decreased, based on the analysis of the current cost to build schools as reported on the Project Information Worksheet (New 09/07) which shall be submitted with the Forms SAB 50-05 and 50-06 and as approved by the Board."

SFP Regulation Section 1859.104.1 states, "A school district filing a (PIW) with the best information available will not be subject to a Material Inaccuracy for that information."

BACKGROUND

The Board approved the PIW in September 2007 and modified it in May 2010 (see Attachment). The worksheet was approved by the Board for the following purposes:

- To analyze the relationship between the pupil grant eligibility and the cost of new construction pursuant to EC Section 17072.11(b).
- To demonstrate bond accountability

- To identify the changes in the bid climate over time.
- To evaluate the High Performance Incentive Grant.

The PIW is based largely on a survey developed by a new construction grant adequacy ad hoc committeeⁱ assembled by the Board in December 2005. The PIW incorporates the Committee's input and was tested by a sample of districts prior to Board approval. At the time of development, stakeholders commented that the PIW should be independent of the *Expenditure Report* (Form SAB 50-06). Various stakeholders/districts provided additional input that the collection of data for the PIW should also include all locally funded expenditures because districts only report the minimum expenditures necessary to establish compliance with the local match requirement on the Form SAB 50-06.

At the March 2011 Board meeting, the Board requested that a discussion of the PIW be placed on the Board Agenda. At the June and July 2011 Board meetings, OPSC staff presented information on 567 new construction projects apportioned from 2008 to 2011, representing 84 percent of all new construction projects that have received a full apportionment during this time. The data presented included pupils housed, square footage built (by construction type), facility component types, and expenditures.

At the January 2012 Board meeting, the Board directed staff to bring a discussion of improvements to the PIW to the Committee.

Staff brought the PIW to the February 2012 Committee meeting to seek input and suggestions for improvement from Committee members and other stakeholders. At this meeting, staff demonstrated the online entry of the PIW.

The input and suggestions received at the meeting have been compiled along with other feedback from various stakeholders for review at the March 2012 Committee meeting.

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PIW

Global

Other State sources for this information:

- Various Board Forms and funding shells
- Division of the State Architect (DSA) records
- California Department of Education (CDE) records

Stakeholder comments/concerns:

- The purpose of the PIW needs to be re-examined, and the questions should all be evaluated in light of the purpose(s).

ⁱ Grant adequacy ad hoc committee consisted of school districts, architectural, construction, and construction management firms, consultants, the California Building Industry Association, the Department of Finance, the CDE and the Office of Public School Construction.

- The PIW should be simplified in order to make it easier for districts and to improve the quality of the data collected.
- The PIW only collects data for new construction projects. What about Modernization and other programs?

Suggestions:

- As much information as possible should be captured through other sources and auto-populated in to the PIW.
- The OPSC should begin working with CDE and DSA to gain access to the information gathered by those agencies so that that information can be populated in to the PIW.
- Expand the scope of the PIW to include all SFP funded projects.

Duplicated Information Gathering

Other State sources for this information:

- Various SAB Forms and funding shells
- DSA records
- CDE records

Stakeholder comments/concerns:

- Much of the data collected through the PIW is also collected through other sources.

Suggestions:

- As much information as possible should be captured through other sources and auto-populated in to the PIW.
- The OPSC should begin working with CDE and DSA to gain access to the information gathered by those agencies so that that information can be populated in to the PIW.

Number of Submittals

Other State sources for this information: not applicable.

Stakeholder comments/concerns:

- Large districts that are currently getting large numbers of projects funded in in the Priorities in Funding (PIF) rounds are impacted by having large numbers of PIWs all due with the Fund Releases (and then on the same schedule at the first expenditure report a year later).

Suggestions:

- The number of required submittals should be changed to no more than two, possibly even to just one.

Project Funding (PIW Page 1)

Other State sources for this information:

- The SAB funding shell.
- Expenditure Report, SAB for 50-06 (State Apportionment, Local Match, and Interest Earned only)

Stakeholder comments/concerns: none recorded.

Suggestions:

- Import data from funding shell to fill out Financial Hardship status, state apportionment and district match fields.
- Eliminate “Actual” and “Estimate” check boxes.
- Eliminate everything except “State Apportionment”
- Eliminate all of the separate “project” fields.

Project Costs (PIW Page 1)

Other State sources for this information:

- *Expenditure Report*, SAB Form 50-06 (Total project expenditures, excluding any expenditure beyond the required district match, only –other information may be provided but is not entered in to any database)

Stakeholder comments/concerns:

- Projects aren’t bid out in a way that separates site development costs from building costs, and it is very difficult to separate these costs for the PIW
- The amounts associated with service site, offsite, utility connection fees, etc., are relatively small so it’s not really important to break these costs out.
- Project costs are not reported consistently from one district to another because factors such as the construction delivery method can skew the data (e.g. general conditions are likely not be included if the project uses a construction manager, but will be included if the project doesn’t not use a construction manager).
- It’s very difficult, even impossible, to break out NC-only costs from a larger project that receives both NC and mod funding
- COEs often build projects as joint ventures with districts, so that the COE passes the money through to the district which does the actual bidding and so forth—this makes it very difficult for a COE to fill out the project costs section
- Unusual costs for some projects skew the numbers.
- The detailed breakout of costs doesn’t serve any real useful purpose, and decreases the accuracy of the figures reported.
-

Suggestions:

- Eliminate check boxes for “actual” and “estimated.”
- Restructure entire section so that it is more similar to the format of the Expenditure Report, SAB Form 50-06.
- Remove requirement to break out site development costs.
- Restructure entire section so that only the following fields are included: “Final Construction Cost Data,” broken down as “Final Prime Contract(s) Amount,” “Final Construction Management Fee and General Conditions

Amount,” and “Soft Costs (E.g. tests and inspections, architect fees, permits and fees, program/project management fees, and F & E).”

- Eliminate all the questions except for total project cost.

Joint Use (PIW Page 1)

Other State sources for this information: Unknown.

Stakeholder Comments/Concerns: none recorded.

Suggestions:

- Eliminate this section.

Project Information (PIW Page 2)

Other State sources for this information:

- Funding Application (school type, grades served, number of classrooms, master plan site capacity)
- CDE (partial square footage information, school type, Master Plan Site Capacity)
- DSA (school type)

Stakeholder Comments/Concerns:

- Under component types, OPSC staff is telling to districts to fill in the number of classrooms, but the instructions say to fill in the number of classroom buildings, so the data collected in these fields is flawed.
- The average classroom size reported using PIW data is inflated because the square footage includes other types of space in classroom buildings.
- The “Component Types” area can be confusing because the categories are not always well defined.
- Square footage does not typically change during the life of a project.
- The “Grade and Number of Students Served” box yields different totals from the “Master Plan Site Capacity.”
- The outdoor facilities questions yielded some unexpected results.
- The information gathered on this page doesn’t serve a useful purpose.

Suggestions:

- Eliminate this page.
- Redesign the “Project Type” and “School Type” drop-downs in the online PIW so that they don’t default, and districts must actively select the answers.
- Eliminate most of the columns for square footage change, leaving only one or two columns total.
- Simplify the component type categories through one or more of the following:
 - Revise the format for the component types so that it uses a drop-down menu from which the district would select the component type name.

- Ask for the total square footage, and then ask for breakouts for a few categories only, so that we could have breakouts for classrooms space, gym-shower/locker, etc, and the balance would be “other.”
- Use the component types definitions used in the old LPP program
- Automatically calculate the “Total Square Feet All Facilities” fields based on the data in the “Component Types.”
- Automatically calculate the “Total Cost per Square Foot” based on the data in the “Component Types,” and the “Project Costs.”

Additional Information (Bid Climate) (PIW Page 3)

Other State sources for this information: Unknown.

Stakeholder Comments/Concerns:

- No meaningful purpose is served in attempting to analyze market or building trends, and bid data is of little or no values in arriving at useful conclusions.
- This page is cumbersome and time consuming; there are already other sources that track the bid climate, and the only information really necessary to track the bid climate is the project costs and the bid dates.
- Most of the questions on this page are not meaningful.
- It is difficult to identify costs for question 8 (local requirements not funded with state funds).
- Question #9, regarding re-use of plans, is not useful because there are too many factors that affect project costs for the reuse of plans to be a meaningful data point.
- Questions 1 (regarding the number of bidders) and 2 (the date the bids opened) might be worth keeping.

Suggestions:

- Eliminate this page.
- Eliminate this page, and create a new “Additional Information” section that would include the following:
 1. Please indicate the grades being served by this project
 2. Does this project as constructed meet the CDE definitions of a complete school?
 3. If the answer to the previous question is “no,” please provide a narrative describing the list of missing components.
 4. Indicate which facilities or components were eliminated or deferred to meet the project budget and/or indicate any facilities that were added to the project. Provide a brief explanation.
 5. Were there any local requirements or ordinances the district had to meet that were not funded with State funds (e.g., road, street improvements, utilities, fees)?
 - a. If yes, how many times were these plans re-used within the district? Project names(s)?
 - b. Indicate which other districts have used these plans, if known. Who was the architect?

Comments/Additional Information

- Eliminate question #5 “Did the contract(s) include any facilities not included on this form?”
- Question #6, “Was the project modified due to cost?” should be broken in to two questions: “Was the project modified due to cost at time of bid?” and “Was the project modified due to cost during project?”

High Performance Incentive (PIW Page 4)

Other State sources for this information: Unknown.

Stakeholder Comments/Concerns:

- This section is only required for Modernization projects that receive HPI, what about the New Construction HPI?
- The current questions are difficult to answer, and are not quantifiable.
- Interest was expressed in using section to collect information that shows what elements districts are including in projects to earn HPI points.

Suggestions:

- Change to ask about the each following elements: Thermal Comfort (HVAC), lighting, air quality, acoustics, interior finish, water conservation, and waste reduction (all the possible “HPI” features).
- Collect HPI info at a later time so that we can ask if districts were able to realize anticipated energy cost savings.
- Require this section for New Construction projects that receive the HPI.

The information collected using this form is necessary in order to conduct an analysis of the relationship between the per-unhoused-pupil grant eligibility and the per-pupil cost of new school construction for grades K - 12 pursuant to Education Code Section 17072.11, to meet the requirements for bond accountability, and status of the bid climate.

COMPLETED BY	TITLE
PHONE NUMBER	DATE COMPLETED
APPLICATION NUMBER(S)	
SCHOOL DISTRICT	COUNTY
PROJECT TRACKING NUMBER	PROJECT NAME
REPORTING PERIOD	
<div><input type="checkbox"/> FUND RELEASE (FORM SAB 50-05)</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> ANNUAL REPORTING PERIOD (FORM SAB 50-06)</div> <div>PERCENT COMPLETED _____</div>	

PROJECT FUNDING

1. Is this a Financial Hardship Project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2 . Funds Available:

	AMOUNT	ESTIMATE	ACTUAL
a. Total Amount of State Apportionment(s):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Project:.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Joint-Use (if applicable):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Interest Earned on State Apportionment for this project:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Total District Match:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Project:.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Joint-Use (if applicable):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Additional Local Funds Necessary to Complete State Funded Project:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PROJECT COSTS

	AMOUNT	ESTIMATE	ACTUAL
1. Total cost for site acquisition (<i>State share & District amount</i>):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Bid/Construction Contract Data:			
a. Accepted Base Bid Amount Prior to additive/deductive alternates:.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Amount of accepted additive/deductive alternates:.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Total Construction Cost:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Building Cost in Contract(s):	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Site Development in Contract(s):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Other (<i>Interim Housing, Demolition, General Conditions, if applicable</i>):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Soft Costs (<i>e.g., tests and inspections, architect fees, etc.</i>):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Estimated Remaining Project Cost Not Yet Contracted (<i>Hard Costs</i>):.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Construction Management Fees (<i>General Conditions, if applicable</i>):	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Contingency:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Furniture and Equipment:	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Total Project Cost (Sum of 2c, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7):	\$		

JOINT-USE INFORMATION:

1. Did the project include a joint-use partner? ☐ Yes ☐ No OPSC Application Number (*if applicable*): _____

2. Which type of joint-use partner did it include? ☐ Non-Profit ☐ Government ☐ Higher Education ☐ Other (*Explain*)

3. Did the joint-use partner contribute any capital funding towards the construction of the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how much? \$ _____

4. Which facilities were involved? ☐ Gymnasium ☐ Multi-Purpose Room ☐ Teacher Education Facility
☐ Library ☐ Childcare Facility ☐ Other (*Explain*)

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Type

School Type

Master Plan Site Capacity of project (Based on single-track use and local district loading standard):	
Square footage of parking structure (If applicable):	
Net Useable Site Size (Acres):	

Outdoor Physical Education Facilities: (Check all that apply)	
FACILITY	NUMBER
<input type="checkbox"/> Baseball Diamond	
<input type="checkbox"/> Softball Diamond	
<input type="checkbox"/> Football/Soccer Field	
<input type="checkbox"/> Playground/Hardcourt/Turf	
<input type="checkbox"/> Track	
<input type="checkbox"/> Swimming Pool	
<input type="checkbox"/> Stadium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain)	

COMPONENT TYPES:		CONSTRUCTION TYPE (CHOOSE FROM PULL DOWN MENU)	SQUARE FOOTAGE FROM DSA APPROVED PLAN	FUND RELEASE (FIRST REPORT) SQUARE FOOTAGE	FIRST ANNUAL REPORT	FINAL EXPENDITURE REPORT
(Complete if applicable)	NUMBER				SQUARE FOOT	SQUARE FOOT
<input type="checkbox"/> Classrooms						
<input type="checkbox"/> Classrooms						
<input type="checkbox"/> Classrooms						
<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Purpose Room/Cafeteria						
<input type="checkbox"/> Cafeteria - Stand Alone						
<input type="checkbox"/> Kitchen						
<input type="checkbox"/> Library						
<input type="checkbox"/> Gym/Shower Locker Room						
<input type="checkbox"/> Administration/Support						
<input type="checkbox"/> Performing Arts Facility						
<input type="checkbox"/> Restroom Building						
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain)						
Total:						

GRADE	
<input type="checkbox"/> K	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	
<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
<input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
<input type="checkbox"/> 7	
<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
<input type="checkbox"/> 9	
<input type="checkbox"/> 10	
<input type="checkbox"/> 11	
<input type="checkbox"/> 12	
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Severe	
<input type="checkbox"/> Severe	

Total Square Feet All Facilities:
Permanent:
Modular:
Portable:

Total Building Cost (Per Square Foot)	
ORIGINAL ESTIMATE	CURRENT ESTIMATE / ACTUAL
\$	\$

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: *This information is being collected to evaluate the bid climate.*

1. How many bidders bid the project? _____
2. What date did the bid(s) open? _____
3. How many times was the project re-bid? _____
4. Please describe the accepted additive/deductive alternates:

☐ Facilities (e.g., Multi-Purpose, Gym, Library) SQ. FT. _____

☐ Building Elements (e.g., metal roof, glazing) _____
5. Did this contract(s) include any facilities or other construction that has not yet been identified on this form?

☐ Yes ☐ No Explain. _____

6. Was the project modified due to cost? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. What measures were taken? (e.g., permanent to portable) Explain _____

7. Indicate which facilities or elements were eliminated to meet the project budget and/or indicate any facilities that were added to the project. Provide a brief explanation of why they were eliminated. _____

a. Answer the following question only if the project received an Adjusted Grant fund release on or after November 1, 2007. Were the facilities and/or square footage that was added or deleted approved by:

the CDE ☐ Yes ☐ No

the DSA ☐ Yes ☐ No

the SAB ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please attach the appropriate documentation.

b. Are these buildings considered deferred until a later date? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, explain. _____

8. Were there any local requirements or ordinances the district had to meet that were not funded with State funds (e.g., road, street improvements, utilities, fees)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If yes, were these costs included in the contract? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. If yes, please specify the local requirement and the associated cost. _____

_____ Cost: \$ _____

9. Did you utilize existing architectural plans from another project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If yes, how many times were these plans re-used within the district? _____ Project Name(s): _____

b. Indicate which other districts have used these plans, if known. _____

Who was the architect? _____
- Comments/Additional Information _____

- 32

HIGH PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE GRANT INFORMATION

1. Is this a Financial Hardship Project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2 . Number of HPRC Points attained: _____

3. Total State Apportionment:.....

a. State Share HPI:.....

4. Total District Match:

a. Total HPI Match

AMOUNT	ESTIMATE	ACTUAL
\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Differential Hard Costs of achieving High Performance:

Component/Element	High Performing Cost	Standard Cost	Difference
	\$		
	\$		

6. Differential Soft Costs of achieving High Performance:

Component/Element	High Performing Cost	Standard Cost	Difference
	\$		
	\$		

ADDITIONAL HIGH PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE GRANT INFORMATION

	AMOUNT	ESTIMATE	ACTUAL
1. Energy Savings:.....	\$	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Description of Energy Savings _____			

2. Student Achievement _____			

3. Other Benefits realized _____			

