

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

PUBLIC MEETING

STATE CAPITOL
ROOM 447
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2019

TIME: 4:09 P.M.

Reported By: Peter Petty
eScribers

1 APPEARANCES:

2 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD PRESENT:

3 GAYLE MILLER, Director, Department of Finance

4 DANIEL KIM, Director, Department of General Services

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

7 JUAN MIRELES, Director, School Facilities and Transportation
8 Services Division, California Department of Education,
designated representative for Tony Thurmond, Superintendent
of Public Instruction

9 SENATOR SCOTT WILK

10 ASSEMBLYMEMBER ADRIN NAZARIAN

11 REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD PRESENT:

12 LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer

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

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer

15 BARBARA KAMPMEINERT, Deputy Executive Officer

16 REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES,
17 OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES PRESENT:

18 TOM PATTON, Assistant Chief Counsel

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MS. MILLER: So I think we're going to go ahead and get started as a subcommittee while we wait for one more member just to respect everyone's time that's here. I guess so you all know you should set your expectations low. This is my second day on the job and my first time chairing the committee. So I always if you set your expectations really low, maybe I'll exceed them. So I appreciate you being here and we'll go ahead and wait until we can establish a quorum, Lisa, to call the roll?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

MS. JONES: That's correct.

MS. MILLER: But before we get started, we have a resolution for Senator Allen who has been the star member of the State Allocation Board and I am not going to read -- Senator Allen, do you want to come up here.

I won't read everything on here, but the numbers are pretty remarkable in terms of his service and all of -- everything that you did with Prop. 51 and the \$2.6 billion worth of projects, over 630 projects for the School Facility Program, and all the other programs administered by the State Allocation Board. It's a huge accomplishment and made a huge difference for our schools and it's a big debt of

1 gratitude both as a former Senate staff and a huge fan and
2 just for your service in general. Thank you so much.

3 (Applause)

4 MS. MILLER: And then we have just a couple
5 announcements that he -- a couple items have been withdrawn
6 from the agenda, two appeal items, the Farmersville Unified
7 and San Bernardino City Unified, that are under Tab 6 for
8 those of you following have been withdrawn and the Career
9 Technical Education Facilities Program additional funding
10 cycles under Tab 7, although we're really grateful for those
11 of you that are here to speak on that item today and we'll
12 absolutely have you come up during public comment. But that
13 item itself was pulled from the agenda for discussion and
14 we'll update you with anything else as we go along.

15 So we're going to wait on approval of the **Minutes**
16 and we'll move the **Executive Officer's Statement**, please.

17 MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. Hi. I'd like to give an
18 update to the Board as far as activity tonight in the
19 agenda.

20 So a couple action items that we wanted to share
21 with you tonight is the Full-Day Kindergarten Facility
22 Program. So with that is our action item of 37 and a half
23 million dollars. That represents 12 projects and we'll
24 provide a presentation today related to those applicants.

25 So it's great news for the first round of

1 applicants that will receive funding and it'll have a direct
2 apportionment. And there is a current opening -- current
3 filing round that's open for the second round of applicants,
4 so that's \$60 million that's available for the program, and
5 we wanted to give the Board an update that we have. As of
6 May 3rd, we had over \$164 million in applicants that did
7 apply for the program so far.

8 So definitely very much interested -- folks are
9 interested in the program and anyone who's interested the
10 program has until May 30th to apply.

11 The second announcement we wanted to share is
12 military base projects that are being funded by this
13 program, we have four projects that in the Consent Agenda,
14 so we're trying to get six members to approve that today.

15 There is two facility hardship projects and two
16 career tech education projects and that's for the Desert
17 Junior and Senior High School. So that's at Edwards Air
18 Force Base. So we're super excited about bringing those
19 projects forward and that's the last of those base projects
20 at Edwards Air Force Base.

21 So they were seeking state funding as well as they
22 received over 82 and a half million dollars in Department of
23 Defense funding for those base schools and it's really
24 exciting.

25 I had an opportunity with my staff, Michael

1 Watanabe, to attend a ground breaking ceremony and it's
2 really exciting the amount of movement and those projects
3 are going to be moving forward in several phases and it's a
4 great opportunity for that community. So happy to see that
5 we're providing funding for those who serve in the military.
6 It's great news.

7 Career Tech Education Facility Program as well is
8 an action item today. \$125 million will be introduced as
9 part of the action item as well, and those projects that are
10 going to be approved today will have the opportunity to
11 submit for a certification round for the May 8th -- that
12 opens May 8th and it closes June 6th.

13 So again, so if you have an unfunded approval as a
14 result of a career tech education project, you have the
15 ability to submit a certification.

16 And for other projects that have an unfunded
17 approval, there again we have a current filing round for
18 priority funding. You have the ability to submit a
19 certification through June 6th and those certifications will
20 be valid from July 1st through December 31st.

21 And again, it's very important for you have to
22 submit those certifications during that period. So again,
23 once you have the two strikes, unfortunately, you'll lose
24 your project without prior Board notification.

25 So we do do a lot of reach out and community

1 efforts to communicate with districts so they're well aware
2 of the priority funding round.

3 We also lastly want to share with the Board, we
4 have a bond accountability audit that was recently noted on
5 May 1st, and it was a follow-up to some of the corrective
6 action statuses with the follow-up prior audits. And we
7 wanted to share with the Board that there is no additional
8 corrective action at this point in time and that audit could
9 be found on Department of Finance's website.

10 And with that, the next Board meeting is
11 June 26th.

12 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions
13 from the committee? Any public comment? Senator.

14 SENATOR WILK: No, no. I -- I swallow it down
15 there.

16 MS. MILLER: Oh, excuse me. So we can go ahead
17 and as a subcommittee just hear the items on consent from
18 Ms. Silverman, if you will, and then if members have any
19 questions when they come back, we will let them ask them at
20 that time.

21 MS. SILVERMAN: Or we can proceed with the
22 financial reports since it's no action.

23 MS. MILLER: Oh, perfect. Did I skip that? Yes,
24 please. The **financial reports**.

25 MS. SILVERMAN: So on the financial reports, I

1 just want to highlight to the Board we had updates. No fund
2 releases as far as the agenda is concerned for May, but we
3 did want to highlight as far as the activity in the **Consent**
4 **Agenda**.

5 We had a lot of approvals -- unfunded approvals
6 moving forward in the agenda and I wanted to highlight
7 there's 52 projects that are part of the Consent Agenda that
8 represent over \$91.2 million. So that's great news for the
9 program and we actually have a grant adjustment that
10 represents a closeout adjustment of \$4.5 million, so a
11 district will have a grant increase as a result of the
12 closeout audit. So that's great news for that district.

13 So that's the activity we want to report back to
14 the Board, and then we'll show some adjustments next month
15 for the full-day kinder where we'll show a reduction of the
16 funds that was awarded for full-day kinder.

17 So as a result, I don't have any -- if you have
18 any questions for the financials.

19 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions?
20 Any public comment on the financials? No. Thank you. And
21 then may we do the **Status of Funds** too.

22 MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. I'm sorry. I just --
23 really quickly on that.

24 MS. MILLER: That was super-fast. Okay. So then
25 maybe we will do just the consent items, if you just want to

1 give the explanation and we'll do that as a subcommittee,
2 unless there's -- is there anything else on the agenda that
3 doesn't need -- that has no action items?

4 MS. KAMPMEINERT: We could perhaps cover the
5 action items and do the presentation and wait for the vote
6 on those.

7 The **Consent Calendar** is some standard items in
8 there. We wanted to highlight, as Lisa mentioned, that we
9 have a number of unfunded approvals that are contained
10 inside the Consent Calendar. There are also some facility
11 hardship projects included. We've got one for Benicia for a
12 fire alarm and then another facility hardship for Wasco.

13 MS. MILLER: Okay.

14 MS. KAMPMEINERT: And we have an additional
15 Charter School Facilities Program preliminary apportionment,
16 standard items that do meet the program criteria and as part
17 of the Consent Calendar, staff is recommending approval.

18 MS. MILLER: Okay. Thank you. So then while
19 we're waiting for a quorum and before we go to LAUSD, maybe
20 we can go to the **Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant**
21 **Program**. Does that work?

22 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Sure. So on Tab 7, stamped
23 page 193 of your agenda today, we have an action item
24 related to the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant
25 Program and this item is asking the Board to approve

1 apportionments for the first round of funding for this
2 program.

3 The 2018-'19 budget included a hundred million
4 from the general fund to provide one time grants to school
5 districts to construct either new facilities or to retrofit
6 existing facilities for the purposes of providing full-day
7 kindergarten classrooms.

8 And at the October 2018 State Allocation Board
9 meeting, the Board approved 37.5 million for the first
10 funding cycle that opened in January of 2019.

11 That funding cycle was oversubscribed as we
12 received 261 applications from 72 different school districts
13 requesting a total of 324 million for that round, and as a
14 result, staff applied the regulatory criteria for
15 determining the final funding order which provides
16 preference points to financial hardship districts and school
17 districts with a high percentage of pupils eligible for free
18 and reduced price school meals.

19 And if I can draw your attention to stamped
20 page 195, we've included in the agenda some demographic
21 information for the 12 projects that are receiving funding
22 today. We'd like to note that 11 of the 12 projects are for
23 new construction and we do have one district that is doing a
24 retrofit project.

25 Also nine of the sites previously offered full-day

1 kindergarten programs in non-Title 5 compliant kindergarten
2 classrooms. So they have brought in portables or converted
3 teacher workrooms, things like that.

4 Three of the sites that are receiving funding did
5 not have the ability to full-day kindergarten without the
6 additional facilities, so those will be new full-day
7 kindergarten programs.

8 Also all of the school districts that are
9 receiving funding qualify for financial hardship and also
10 receive Title 1, Part A funds and in total, 54 new
11 kindergarten classrooms will be constructed with this
12 funding.

13 On page 196, we've listed the 12 school districts
14 that will receive apportionments and they range in free and
15 reduced price meal school percentages from 84 to 96 percent.

16 MS. MILLER: Ms. Kampmeinert -- did I say that
17 right?

18 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Close. Kampmeinert.

19 MS. MILLER: Kampmeinert. Can we just pause to
20 establish a quorum since we have one. Thank you. Lisa,
21 will you call the roll, please.

22 MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

23 SENATOR WILK: Present.

24 MS. JONES: Senator Leyva.

25 Senator Roth.

1 Assemblymember Nazarian.

2 MR. NAZARIAN: Present.

3 MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

4 Assemblymember Gallagher.

5 MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

6 MR. MIRELES: Here.

7 MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

8 MR. DIAZ: Here.

9 MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

10 MR. KIM: Here.

11 MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

12 MS. MILLER: Here.

13 MS. JONES: We have a quorum.

14 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Sorry. Do you want to
15 continue with this.

16 MS. KAMPMEINERT: Sure. So just a few final
17 points on this item. These are cash apportionments because
18 we have the funding from the general fund. So the school
19 districts will have up to 12 months to request the release
20 of funds. They do not need to participate in the priority
21 funding process.

22 Also the projects are subject to a local audit,
23 pursuant to statute, upon completion, and with that staff
24 recommends approval of the projects summarized on
25 Attachment A, stamped page 198.

1 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions
2 from the committee on this item? Any public comment? Well,
3 this is remarkable to the State Allocation Board that
4 managed to get this up and running. I think it's really
5 exciting. So thank you for that.

6 Is there a motion from the committee?

7 SENATOR WILK: So moved.

8 MR. DIAZ: Second.

9 MS. MILLER: Moved by Senator Wilk and seconded by
10 Mr. Diaz. Secretary, could you please call the roll.

11 MS. JONES: Will do. Senator Wilk.

12 SENATOR WILK: Aye.

13 MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian.

14 MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

15 MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

16 MR. MIRELES: Aye.

17 MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

18 MR. DIAZ: Aye.

19 MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

20 MR. KIM: Aye.

21 MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

22 MS. MILLER: Aye.

23 MS. JONES: And that motion carries.

24 MS. MILLER: Thank you. So before we continue, I
25 just wanted to go back to housekeeping and, Senator

1 Nazarian, do we want to postpone the audit for the -- or the
2 appeal for the LA Unified School District, just for -- to
3 give us a little bit more time to ask questions and get all
4 the information?

5 MR. NAZARIAN: Thank you. So I'm happy to
6 accommodate. I think I personally wanted some time to grasp
7 the issue a little better. I just had an opportunity this
8 last week to get better engaged and I still have some
9 questions and I'm not sure if LAUSD wants to make a
10 presentation and be heard, but then push the issue over or
11 if it's just better to wait and make a presentation at a
12 later time.

13 MS. MILLER: I think if we're gathering additional
14 information and if a member, as a courtesy, puts the measure
15 over, my understanding from Ms. Silverman is that it doesn't
16 count against the district at all in terms of districts get
17 two opportunities to set an appeal for hearing.

18 MS. SILVERMAN: That's correct.

19 MS. MILLER: Is that correct?

20 MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

21 MS. MILLER: So I think in that regard if we
22 wanted to gather more information -- I'm trying to look in
23 the audience and see if I see LAUSD out there -- gather more
24 information -- hi -- and hear it in June, we have another
25 hearing set for June 26th.

1 MS. SILVERMAN: Correct.

2 MS. MILLER: And so we could put it over until
3 then, gather more information. Obviously the timing in
4 terms of everything going on in the Legislature on the
5 budget, we'll have a little bit more space to gather
6 information.

7 Are you comfortable with that, sir? May he
8 address the Board? Does that work, Ms. Silverman?

9 MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

10 MS. MILLER: Okay. So maybe just for now, sir,
11 just on the issue of whether or not to put the appeal over
12 to next month so that the committee has an opportunity to
13 gather more information. So if you could state your name
14 for the record, please.

15 MR. HOVATTER: I'm Mark Hovatter. I'm the chief
16 facility executive for the Los Angeles Unified School
17 District. Just so -- do I speak the item now or just --

18 MS. MILLER: If you could just speak to the
19 question of waiting a month, please.

20 MR. HOVATTER: Okay. We could wait for a month on
21 this, of course, but I think there's a different approach
22 that we would like to take. We do not necessarily want to
23 challenge the decision on this but rather the process
24 itself. And I wanted the opportunity to explain to these
25 members why this process is unintentionally, I'm sure, but

1 hurting the children of Los Angeles.

2 MS. MILLER: Well, I think in terms of the
3 process -- you mean in terms of how the decision is reached
4 for the appeal itself? I think if that's part of the
5 conversation, I'd rather that be reflected in the analysis
6 by Ms. Kampmeindert in the future. Does that make sense?
7 And then -- what I don't think we want to do is discuss an
8 appeal if what we're looking for is any adjustment to the
9 process or any further questions, I think it would make
10 sense to do all of that on June 26th, and then any
11 additional information you'd like the staff to analyze, we
12 could do that in advance of that meeting.

13 Ms. Silverman, do you want to add anything to
14 that?

15 MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. We'd be happy to talk with
16 you post -- conversation post meeting and then gather some
17 more information.

18 MR. NAZARIAN: So I'm happy to make the motion to
19 push this over -- to postpone this for -- at a later meeting
20 whether it's June or whatever the appropriate next meeting
21 that is.

22 MS. MILLER: Well, maybe what we can do then is
23 postpone it for today with no penalty to the district and
24 then continue discussions as to the appropriate next hearing
25 to meet your needs in terms of process and the staff's needs

1 in terms of analysis. So do we have a second to put --

2 SENATOR WILK: Second.

3 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Oh, and we don't need a
4 motion to put it over. I told you guys I was new at this.

5 So with that, we look forward to hearing this
6 appeal at a future date and really do appreciate you being
7 here. Thank you very much in representing LAUSD. Thank
8 you, sir.

9 Hi, Mr. O'Donnell.

10 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Oh, Madam Chair.

11 MS. MILLER: I know right.

12 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: How are you?

13 MS. MILLER: I'm well. How are you? So
14 Mr. O'Donnell was a fellow with Assemblymember Lowenthal in
15 '99.

16 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: So I know her from
17 going way back.

18 MS. MILLER: Yeah. Even --

19 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: You still don't have
20 gray hair. I do, but you don't, so it works.

21 MS. MILLER: I have a solution for that.

22 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Oh, do you. Okay.

23 MS. MILLER: Yeah. Notice Ariana Grande if you
24 listen to her.

25 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Okay. Probably a lot

1 of money too. Well, welcome. I just -- maybe someone said
2 it earlier, but I think it's great you're here. Look
3 forward to working with you.

4 MS. MILLER: Thank you. So I think with that,
5 we're going to go back to the top of the agenda and just
6 approve the **Minutes** from last -- April 24th. Thank you.
7 And is there a motion -- any public comment on the Minutes
8 from April 24th? Nope? Okay.

9 MR. DIAZ: So move.

10 MR. NAZARIAN: Second.

11 MS. MILLER: Great. It's been moved by Mr. Diaz,
12 seconded by Assemblymember Nazarian. Secretary, please call
13 the roll.

14 MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

15 SENATOR WILK: Aye.

16 MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian.

17 MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

18 MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

19 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

20 MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

21 MR. MIRELES: Aye.

22 MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

23 MR. DIAZ: Aye.

24 MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

25 MR. KIM: Aye.

1 MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

2 MS. MILLER: Aye.

3 MS. JONES: And that motion carries.

4 MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you. And then we're
5 going to go back in line and now we're on the **Consent Agenda**
6 that I was so desperate for.

7 MS. SILVERMAN: Consent is ready for your
8 approval.

9 MS. MILLER: Great. Is there any comment or
10 questions on the agenda? Anyone come in after -- no.
11 Great. Do we have a motion then on the Consent Agenda.

12 MR. DIAZ: So moved.

13 MS. MILLER: Moved by Mr. Diaz.

14 MR. KIM: Second.

15 MS. MILLER: Seconded by Mr. Kim. Secretary,
16 please call the roll.

17 MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

18 SENATOR WILK: Aye.

19 MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

20 MR. MIRELES: Aye.

21 MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

22 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

23 MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

24 MR. DIAZ: Aye.

25 MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

1 MR. KIM: Aye.

2 MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

3 MS. MILLER: Aye.

4 MS. JONES: And, Madam Chair, we'll leave it open
5 for Mr. Nazarian.

6 MS. MILLER: Thank you. And then we're going to
7 move to -- as we said, the -- on Tab 6, the Farmersville
8 United item was withdrawn from the agenda and the San
9 Bernardino City was withdrawn from the agenda. And we are
10 now -- oh, and LA Unified was pulled from the agenda. So we
11 are now at the final item on the agenda, the **Career**
12 **Technical Education**. Ms. Silverman, please.

13 MS. SILVERMAN: So on Tab 7, I'd like to direct
14 your attention to page 212. So we have an action item for
15 the Board for the approval of the fifth funding cycle for
16 Career Tech Education, and we have -- Proposition 51 had
17 allotted \$500 million for the Career Tech Education Program,
18 and the Board back in August 2017 had set two funding cycles
19 of 125 million each.

20 And so we wanted to introduce the applications
21 before you. There are 70 applications that are ready for
22 your approval for 122.4 million. We still have \$2.6 million
23 to present at a future meeting.

24 The program was definitely oversubscribed, so we
25 wanted to definitely bring that forward next month. And

1 Attachment A-1 is on page 214 and that's ready to present
2 for you for an approval, and in some instances, we wanted to
3 share with the Board we actually had some tiebreakers in
4 which we had districts that had projects with the same
5 score.

6 So when necessary, the first tiebreaker is
7 determined with the highest rated score and the second
8 tiebreaker is based on whether an applicant has already
9 received funding for another project. With that, that's how
10 the determination of the tiebreaker was allocated.

11 So all applicants must participate in the priority
12 funding process as we shared currently underway and with
13 that, once the apportionment is granted, those with the
14 reservation of funds must submit with an approval within the
15 12-month period and after that, those projects will be
16 rescinded.

17 So staff recommends the approval of Attachment 1.

18 MS. MILLER: Thank you very much. Are there any
19 questions from the committee? Is there any public comment
20 on this item? No. And we will open Item 7 up for public
21 comment for those of you waiting. Thank you for being so
22 patient.

23 So on this item, is there a motion?

24 MR. DIAZ: Move to approve.

25 MR. KIM: Second.

1 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Lisa, will you call the
2 roll, please.

3 MS. JONES: MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

4 SENATOR WILK: Aye.

5 MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

6 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

7 MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

8 MR. MIRELES: Aye.

9 MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

10 MR. DIAZ: Aye.

11 MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

12 MR. KIM: Aye.

13 MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

14 MS. MILLER: Aye. And we'll leave that open
15 for -- thank you. Thank you for that.

16 So on the item that was withdrawn from the agenda,
17 I understand we have a few folks in the audience that would
18 like to -- thank you for being here. I appreciate you being
19 up in Sacramento today. Just -- Ms. Jones, do I call
20 everyone up individually or do they just form a line?
21 What's the --

22 MS. JONES: Yes. You'll go ahead and call each
23 one up individually.

24 MS. MILLER: Oh, great. Okay. And thank you for
25 filling these out. So -- and I hope I get all your last

1 names right. Emily Shaeer. Did I get that?

2 MS. SHAEER: Yes.

3 MS. MILLER: And then -- and then we'll just have
4 you folks come up maybe and then if we could also have
5 Cheryle Sutton, please, from Washington Unified. And Emily,
6 you're from Santa Barbara Unified?

7 MS. SHAEER: That's correct.

8 MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you.

9 MS. SHAEER: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and
10 read if I may --

11 MS. MILLER: Please.

12 MS. SHAEER: -- that I don't skip anything.

13 MS. MILLER: And if you could just state your name
14 for the record as well, even though I just said it.

15 MS. SHAEER: My name is Emily Shaeer and I am here
16 representing the Santa Barbara Unified School District. And
17 I thank you for the opportunity to speak today about an item
18 that has been withdrawn and in anticipation of it being
19 addressed in the upcoming meeting, as I understand it on
20 June 26th.

21 So I'm here to talk about the remaining
22 250 million for the CTEFP program and I'm here to make a
23 recommendation about how to allocate it. And I'm joined
24 tonight by some other representatives from school districts
25 who will also be speaking to this issue, and I have been in

1 contact with over 20 school districts throughout the state
2 in recent weeks regarding this current fifth funding cycle,
3 which as Lisa Silverman, mentioned was oversubscribed.

4 And I have been collecting letters in support of
5 the recommendation that I'm going to be speaking about
6 today. It is our understanding, as I have said, that this
7 is going to be addressed and perhaps voted on on June 26th.

8 As you know, the CTE facilities program funding is
9 a competitive application process. Programs must
10 demonstrate through the applications that they are high
11 quality based on a number of criteria, including strong
12 industry partnership, strong enrollment strategies and
13 student outcomes, and strong evidence of facilities project
14 viability.

15 Something unique about the CTE facilities program
16 is that the funding requires a 50 percent local match for
17 the proposed project, be it modernization or new
18 construction. So when this Board approves 125 million in
19 funding to be released, as happened for the first two
20 cycles, 250 million was actually released because it
21 released local funds.

22 This is important because there are numerous high
23 scoring projects that are sitting in limbo right now simply
24 because the state has not released enough money to fund them
25 and these projects are for high quality programs that have

1 earned very high scores from the CDE and are shovel ready
2 with millions of dollars sitting in accounts waiting to be
3 spent to bring them to fruition.

4 For example, about 60 projects in the most recent
5 fifth funding cycle that you just approved scored over
6 86 percent. That's over 121 out of 141 possible points
7 which are very high scores, and they were not funded.

8 And please consider that it takes an incredible
9 amount of resources to put these competitive applications
10 together to revise or resubmit them and it's labor intensive
11 for the CDE to rescore them and it's redundant to rescore a
12 very high scoring application.

13 If the next funding cycle is limited to only
14 125 million as the first two have been, these high scoring
15 applications are not necessarily going to be funded again
16 because as we have seen, it's oversubscribed and then the
17 money runs out and high scoring applications are not funded.

18 We ask that the remaining 250 million be released
19 during one final funding cycle so that more of these
20 projects will receive funding and the intention of
21 legislation to support innovative CTE facilities projects
22 throughout the state will be realized more effectively.

23 And finally, we ask that you consider the
24 efficiency of perhaps allocating some of the remaining
25 250 million to fund down the line of unfunded projects from

1 the fifth funding cycle.

2 As I mentioned, these projects have high scores
3 and they're ready to go. They have been fully vetted by CDE
4 and they are just sitting in a holding pattern. All they
5 need is funding to be released for them to move ahead.

6 And these projects will inevitably turn up during
7 the sixth funding cycle anyway, so why not speed the process
8 along. In the name of efficiency, I propose releasing
9 50 million to fund down the list of unfunded projects from
10 the fifth funding cycle and then allocating the remaining
11 200 million in one more funding cycle.

12 If the Board decided to release 50 million more to
13 fund the projects -- fund more projects from the fifth
14 funding cycle, approximately 30 more projects with scores of
15 90 percent or higher would be able to move forward and I
16 think we can agree those are very, very high scores.

17 It would also streamline the sixth funding cycle
18 by removing these high scoring projects from the mix of
19 applications that need to be reviewed and accounted for and
20 the CDE has already scored them and vetted them and it makes
21 sense to expedite the process of funding them.

22 I understand from my contacts at OPSC that there
23 is a legal question regarding releasing more funding for the
24 fifth funding cycle and I respectfully request that legal
25 counsel look into this to resolve the legal question and to

1 report to the Board members so that they have the
2 information they need to make a decision.

3 I also respectfully request that this item be
4 added to the agenda for discussion at the June 26 meeting as
5 part of the action item related to how to allocate the
6 remaining 250 in Career Technical Education Facilities
7 Program funds.

8 I would appreciate hearing discussing about the
9 idea of releasing additional money to capture more high
10 scoring projects currently on the unfunded list of the fifth
11 funding cycle.

12 Thank you for your time and your consideration of
13 this matter.

14 MS. MILLER: Thank you very much. Can you please
15 state your name for the record.

16 MS. SUTTON: Hello. My name is Cheryle Sutton and
17 I came from Washington Unified School District over in West
18 Sacramento and I came to talk a little bit about -- to build
19 on what Emily was talking about -- creative and innovative
20 places to teach students how to be efficient and successful
21 in a competitive work force and releasing extra money and
22 having programs being built with state of art, innovative,
23 and creative technologies to teach students. They come out
24 of school with an excitement about starting a career that
25 might not be related to college but is career training.

1 And so these innovative spaces create competitive
2 programs where students can find a home both academically
3 and train for something in a career and it just -- it takes
4 more than just an upgrade in the facilities to be creative
5 and innovative with these CTE programs. The technology
6 needs -- component really needs to be there as well.

7 So I'm here to advocate that -- build on what
8 Emily was talking about for those programs too and I can't
9 tell you how many students have come to me and said if it
10 wasn't for culinary, if it wasn't theater, if it wasn't for
11 robotics, if it wasn't for a number of CTE programs, I don't
12 know if I would have made it through school.

13 And so from the teacher's point of view, it's --
14 we get to help those students because of that.

15 MS. MILLER: Thank you. We appreciate you being
16 here today.

17 MS. SUTTON: Thank you.

18 MS. MILLER: Thank you for being here. And then
19 if we may have Katie Salcido and Kathy Pon and Melanie
20 Patterson, please. If you could all state your names for
21 the record as well, we'd appreciate it.

22 MS. SALCIDO: Good evening. My name is Katie
23 Salcido. I'm the director of curriculum projects for Lucia
24 Mar Unified School District in San Luis Obispo County.

25 I'm here today to talk about the Prop. 51 CTE

1 funding matching funds for CTE facilities. To build upon
2 what Emily was talking about, I wanted to give a person face
3 to some of the districts.

4 So our district services a very small area. We
5 have no major cities close to us. We have about 10,000
6 students, 3 high schools, 3 middle schools, 11 elementaries.
7 We have a population of about 55,000 people in our area and
8 our school district services all of those people.

9 So being very isolated geographically, we have
10 limited resources, but we have fantastic people doing
11 amazing things for kids and we have amazing kids who need
12 the facilities to explore options for their future.

13 With that, we applied for Prop. 51 funding and did
14 everything ourselves. I think you'll see a lot of districts
15 hire consultants or grant writing firms and we are not in
16 that situation. So I personally with the help of teachers
17 wrote the applications and those are very labor intensive.
18 A lot of passion goes into those. I just want you to give
19 kind of a personal face to that that is.

20 We also have amazing business partners, community
21 organizations who put up not only their time and energy in
22 supporting us, but also their fiscal match in pledging to us
23 that they will support whatever matching funds that we get,
24 which is an amazing place to be.

25 We also raised a local bond for matching funds for

1 facilities. So the ask is that the release of all
2 250 million at one time and in one funding cycle would help
3 the funding of additional projects down the line because it
4 is a competitive grant and the scores are so high.

5 With the competitive application process, the
6 opportunity to fund more at a single time will help not only
7 districts like ourselves, but districts across the state
8 because as time passes, construction costs are continually
9 rising.

10 So what we thought it would cost us a certain
11 amount at the beginning of a grant writing, by the time this
12 entire process is finalized, we can no longer afford because
13 construction cost is rising so quickly. And so the quicker
14 we can release money and get these projects going, the more
15 we're going to have some backing with our money.

16 We also are using the local bond funding to
17 support the matching funds in Prop. 51 and by securing
18 matching funds, we are raising our CTE projects on the bond
19 list, which helps us kind of get priority for those
20 programs.

21 The additional ask would be how schools are
22 assigned to categories and the round robin style of
23 assigning -- of funding those applications. So the first
24 categories -- there's three categories, suburban, urban, and
25 rural.

1 It's an interesting characterization for
2 districts. We are considered suburban, which is kind of
3 hard for our local people to understand and we are then
4 competing against true suburban districts and those are very
5 difficult for us to compete against.

6 So a look at those three categories, I think would
7 help to eliminate some of the barriers for some of the
8 smaller school districts, but then funding down the line
9 competitively. It's a competitive grant. Let's look at the
10 scores as they are because in the round robin style with the
11 three different categories, many school districts are being
12 funded in a certain category at a much lower score than in a
13 different category.

14 So I would just encourage the look at that
15 particular phenomenon to see how the funding is happening
16 within those categories to see if it really is equitable for
17 all of our districts.

18 So with that, I just wanted to kind of present
19 that personal aspect on our personal case and ask for the
20 discussion in June.

21 MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you very much. We
22 appreciate you being here.

23 MS. PON: Good evening. I'm Kathy Pon. I'm the
24 deputy superintendent at Rocklin Unified and I have a
25 partner here who's also from Rocklin Unified.

1 We have submitted two CTE grants and our projects
2 in cycle four received -- they received fairly good scores,
3 85 and 88 percent -- were not funded. We also did not go to
4 consultants. We spent a lot of nights and weekends writing
5 them ourselves.

6 The next funding cycle, we worked very hard. One
7 of them went down to 77 percent and we worked very hard to
8 improve it and even some of the same verbiage that was used
9 in the first grant was used in some places and those were
10 scored differently -- lower than the others. And then one
11 did get a little bit more of a bump to 91 percent.

12 As you've heard, it just takes an incredible
13 amount of time and resources for school districts and school
14 board members, our teachers, our partners, and other
15 personnel to put these competitive grants to -- applications
16 together and revise and resubmit them. Very labor intensive
17 and it just seems very redundant to CDE to rescore
18 applications that have already been scored and have fairly
19 high scores in previous cycles.

20 I'm going to say also having a project rescored at
21 121 points in cycle four be rewritten and improved and then
22 after extensive work, rescored at 109 was rather
23 disheartening, and so we are questioning -- and I know you
24 don't have a lot of control over that piece of it, but just
25 a consistent process for calibrating and scoring the

1 rubrics.

2 Many projects with a high range, as you've heard,
3 in the suburban category have not been funded and that also
4 feels very inefficient. And again, if we had the remaining
5 250 million released in one final grant cycle, more of our
6 high scoring projects, including at least my partner's,
7 would be funded.

8 We also have to -- through developer fees, we are
9 holding onto and really have frozen in our budget \$6 million
10 matching funds for each of these. Now we're going on two
11 years sitting on that money, just waiting to spend it, and,
12 you know, the most important thing is that there are
13 students -- that's two years of a cohort that are working
14 towards a Capstone project that won't ever get to work in
15 state of art facilities because we're just -- we have, you
16 know, 91 percent here and we're not able to move forward
17 with some state of the art facilities for our students.

18 So we would ask again that that be considered on
19 June 26 and we thank you very much for consideration.

20 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Thank you very much for
21 being here.

22 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Board
23 members. My name's Melanie Patterson, Rocklin Unified
24 School District. I'm a program specialist for our LCAP and
25 strategic planning and spent the last two years working very

1 hard with our instructors, our students, and our community
2 members and the industry sector partners to develop high
3 quality applications for the CTE facilities grant for our
4 Building Industry Technology Academy.

5 And there's a couple of things. I know Dr. Pon
6 mentioned this already, but this was the application that
7 received in the fourth cycle a score of 124 and we just
8 missed the funding by a few points, and then again worked
9 very hard with ourselves on our own time to increase that
10 score to 127.5, to a very high quality project that
11 established the need in the industry sector which our
12 students are working as interns and can enter the work force
13 immediately and even while they're still in school, as well
14 as enter the programs in college to continue their education
15 through Sierra College and other community colleges and
16 four-year universities.

17 And so I would say that with the project, you
18 know, we -- to be able to provide -- initially, when our
19 school was built, while it's not extremely old, it was built
20 with a cabinet making, old school, if you will, industry
21 standard and it needs to be updated to the current industry
22 standard in order for our students to be relevant and also
23 efficient and safe in the classroom as well as in the work
24 force and be ready to be employed in this high demand
25 industry and in the State of California.

1 And so I won't belabor it, but just to say that,
2 you know, missing it by that much and working hard for two
3 years is not easy, as you might expect, but really mostly
4 for our students who we just want to provide for them the
5 highest possible quality education and to be college and
6 career ready as possible upon graduation.

7 And the asks that I have is please consider
8 allocating some of the remaining resources to those grant
9 applications that are high quality and passing already and
10 then releasing the remainder of the funds so that those that
11 are sitting there waiting with \$6 million behind it and
12 additional mass amounts of human and school resources to
13 make those grants happen, they would be honored.

14 Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

15 MS. MILLER: Thank you. We really appreciate you
16 all being here and letting us know the personal touch on the
17 programs. Thank you for your time.

18 So we're just going to go back through the agenda
19 quickly and make sure that everyone votes on the open items.
20 The Consent Agenda, Ms. Jones, if you could call the absent
21 members.

22 MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian, how do you
23 vote on the Consent Calendar?

24 MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

25 MS. JONES: Thank you. Then that motion carries.

1 MS. MILLER: Thank you.

2 MS. JONES: And then we have the action item for
3 our full-day kindergarten and Assemblymember O'Donnell, how
4 do you vote on that item?

5 ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

6 MS. JONES: And that motion carries. And then we
7 have the Career Tech unfunded approvals and that would be
8 Assemblymember Nazarian, how do you vote on that item?

9 MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

10 MS. JONES: Okay. And that motion carries too.

11 MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you. And with that, we
12 are adjourned for today. Thank you, everyone.

13 (Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the proceedings were
14 adjourned.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO)

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

That the proceedings herein of the California State Allocation Board, Public Meeting, were duly transcribed by me;

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

That I am a disinterested person to said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on
May 27, 2019.

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