

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

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1430 N STREET, ROOM 1101
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014
TIME: 4:41 P.M.

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

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

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD PRESENT:

ERAINA ORTEGA, Chief Deputy Director, Policy, Department of Finance, designated representative for Michael Cohen, Director, Department of Finance

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

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

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

SENATOR LONI HANCOCK

SENATOR CAROL LIU

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CURT HAGMAN

ASSEMBLYMEMBER ADRIN NAZARIAN

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD PRESENT:

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer
BILL SAVIDGE, Assistant Executive Officer

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

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer
JUAN MIRELES, Deputy Executive Officer

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

JONETTE BANZON, Staff Counsel

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: We will open as a Subcommittee until there are more members for our quorum. So I guess we'll go ahead and call the roll of those of us that are here.

MS. JONES: Okay. Assemblymember Hagman.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Esteban Almanza.

MR. ALMANZA: Here.

MS. JONES: Kathleen Moore.

MS. MOORE: Here.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Here.

MS. JONES: Eraina Ortega.

CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Here. Thank you. And we'll skip the Minutes and let's do Ms. Silverman's **Executive Officer** presentation.

MS. SILVERMAN: We have just a few items tonight and just to give the Board an update. We had a charter school filing round that opened up April 1st and it closed May 30th.

And just to report, there was an excessive amount of applications that came in, which is great; 66 applications that came in for over \$600 million in funding

1 requests.

2 So again, we'll be bringing those items forward.
3 So it's going to be a very competitive process related to
4 these applications.

5 The second item is the fund release. We wanted to
6 report out on April 7th, the Board took the action of
7 providing apportionments to \$372 million for 103 projects.

8 Just to remind those folks who have those awards,
9 you have a deadline of July 7th. So it's critical that you
10 provide us your information related to the fund release and
11 all related documentation so then that way, you could
12 successfully move on and get access to your cash.

13 And at this point in time, June 13th, we only had
14 about \$118 million that was released. So it was just
15 slightly under a quarter of what we anticipated being
16 release and again, the goal is to get \$372 million out to
17 those projects.

18 The priority in funding round -- and we actually
19 had a funding round certification that opened up May 14th
20 and it closed June 12th.

21 We wanted to share with the Board that we had over
22 36 projects that submitted certifications for this round for
23 slightly over \$100 million. And again, those certifications
24 will be valid from July 1st through December 31st.

25 And then the next item, again, those folk who have

1 a priority funding request, just realize if you do not
2 submit within a timely fashion, then you will lose your
3 apportionment and actually at the last round, we actually
4 did have a few projects that lost their award.

5 So again, it's really critical if you have a
6 project on the unfunded list and there is no certification
7 round, they you must submit for the certification.

8 And then the last item we wanted to share is just
9 there is no meeting in July, just wanted to share with the
10 members. And so we have a tentative scheduled for
11 August 27th and I understand there's probably going to be a
12 lot of competing priorities that week, so we'll be looking
13 forward to possibly a change in date.

14 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Thank you. And before
15 you go on, one item I neglected to mention at the top, the
16 appeal item regarding the Orange County issue has been
17 postponed. So if you were listening for that one -- go
18 ahead.

19 MS. SILVERMAN: So **financials**, give you an
20 overview really quick of some of the financials.

21 Basically the fund release report which is a
22 summation of all the cash that had been released since the
23 last time we came around, the activity for the month of May,
24 the Board did release over \$41 million in project funds.

25 And again, we're hoping to have more of a draw on

1 funds in the next couple weeks to report out, so when we
2 come back in August that we were able to release the whole
3 372 million. So it was very limited activity for the month
4 of May.

5 As far as the status of the funds, we wanted to
6 share with the Board, we have four projects that are seismic
7 funding that actually were part of the consent agenda, and
8 those four projects are related to seismic and that's just
9 slightly over \$600,000.

10 We also have a career tech education project that
11 did come back with a rescission. And very limited activity,
12 we have also some rescissions and close-out activity to your
13 left and that's \$2.9 million.

14 And so for the net result, we \$600,000 being -- as
15 a positive showing in bond account. So that's what we have
16 this month.

17 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Is there anything, let's see,
18 under Tab 9 that you wanted to -- 10 or 11, Lisa, that you
19 wanted to go over?

20 MS. SILVERMAN: Let's see. We the workload
21 reports that we have to share. Yeah, other than -- do you
22 want to go over the seismic report or --

23 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: No. Just if there's anything
24 else you wanted to actually talk about on --

25 MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah, if we want to look at the

1 workload reports and the appeals log, we're not reflecting
2 anything in the month of July because we don't have a July
3 meeting, but for the August workload, that's -- if we have
4 any questions related to the August workload --

5 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

6 MS. SILVERMAN: I'm not sure if we have any
7 questions.

8 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any questions from the
9 members on any of the issues we've just covered? No. Okay.
10 Just killing time.

11 Let's see. How about the **regulations proposal**?
12 Is there a staff presentation on this? Maybe we could
13 quickly do that and then act on it when we have a quorum.
14 Go ahead.

15 MR. MIRELES: This is on page 106. This is the
16 **implementation of Assembly Bill 308**.

17 Basically, what we're putting together for the
18 Board is a set of regulations to implement this program.
19 This is in regards to proceeds from the School Facility
20 Program.

21 If a school district sells a site, any proceeds
22 from the School Facilities Program within the prior ten
23 years is to be returned to the State.

24 Now, there are a couple of exclusions where
25 districts sell the site and use the proceeds for capital

1 outlay, they don't have to participate in the program.

2 If a school district sells a site to a charter
3 school, to a school district, or to an entity that provides
4 child care, they don't have to participate.

5 But what we did is we put together a set of text
6 and regulations that -- it's a little different than what
7 are normally used pertaining to the SFP because this bill is
8 outside the Green Act.

9 So there are some definitions that we have on
10 page 109 that we defined. You normally see these
11 definitions under SFP regulations, but again, because this
12 is a different set -- a different section of the California
13 Code of Regulations, we had to redefine them again just to
14 make it clear.

15 We also included a form to facilitate the
16 submittal for districts that are eligible to participate in
17 this program. That is on page 111 and 111a.

18 The form is incorporated by reference in
19 regulation, so it's part of the regulatory packet, but
20 that's the overall summary of the regulations. And again,
21 it's just to conform to the statute to implement the
22 program.

23 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Great. Any questions from
24 the Board members? No. Is there any public comment on this
25 item?

1 Okay. Seeing none, we will take a brief recess
2 until we have our quorum and we'll go to the action items
3 when we reconvene. Thank you.

4 (Off record at 4:44 p.m.)

5 (On record at 4:52 p.m.)

6 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: If you could call the absent
7 members.

8 MS. JONES: Okay. Senator Hancock. Senator Liu.
9 Senator Fuller. Assemblymember Buchanan. Assemblymember
10 Nazarian.

11 ASSEMBLYMEMBER NAZARIAN: Present.

12 MS. JONES: We have a quorum.

13 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Thank you.

14 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Move the regs.

15 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Let's start with the **Minutes**,
16 Item No. 2.

17 ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAGMAN: Oh, okay. Move the
18 Minutes.

19 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Minutes have been moved by
20 Mr. Hagman.

21 MR. DIAZ: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Second by Mr. Diaz. All in
23 favor.

24 (Ayes)

25 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. The Minutes are

1 adopted.

2 Mr. Nazarian, we have done the nonaction items, so
3 I'm going to skip ahead to Item 4, which is the **Consent**
4 **Agenda** and --

5 MR. ALMANZA: I'll move that we move the regs to
6 the Consent.

7 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. So there's a proposal
8 also to add the regs, Item 8, to the Consent Calendar.

9 MR. DIAZ: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: And a second. And all in
11 favor.

12 (Ayes)

13 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Any opposed or abstentions?
14 No. That also passes. Is that it for action items? I
15 believe it.

16 So that is the end of the action items. So those
17 members who need to leave, should feel free to. I will
18 leave the rolls open to allow anyone who comes in to add
19 onto what we've already voted on and we're going to hold the
20 meeting open and go to the other nonaction item on the
21 seismic mitigation when the additional members join.

22 (Off record at 4:54 p.m.)

23 (On record at 5:15 p.m.)

24 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Go ahead and call the
25 absent members if you would.

1 MS. JONES: Okay. Senator Hancock.

2 SENATOR HANCOCK: Here.

3 MS. JONES: Senator Liu.

4 SENATOR LIU: Here.

5 MS. JONES: Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: So, Senators, we have taken
7 up all of the discussion items except for the seismic issue
8 and we have taken votes on the action items. So we can call
9 your names for -- let's see -- the Minutes. Those were the
10 Minutes from May 28th. And we -- go ahead.

11 MS. JONES: Okay. And how would you vote, Senator
12 Hancock?

13 SENATOR HANCOCK: Aye.

14 MS. JONES: Aye. Senator Liu?

15 SENATOR LIU: Aye.

16 MS. JONES: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: And then we had the Consent
18 Agenda which was under Tab 4 and we added Item 8 which was
19 the regulations from the Hagman bill to the Consent Agenda.

20 So call the roll on that, please.

21 MS. JONES: How would you vote, Senator Hancock?

22 SENATOR HANCOCK: Aye.

23 MS. JONES: Senator Liu?

24 SENATOR LIU: Aye.

25 MS. JONES: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. And we have postponed
2 the Orange County item. And so that takes us to Item No. 9
3 which is the **Seismic Mitigation Program**.

4 MS. SILVERMAN: So we wanted to provide some
5 updates or a follow-up to our meeting last month and just to
6 provide some additional information as far as providing a
7 summary of the different changes that we've gone through as
8 far as the Seismic Mitigation Program regulations and also
9 provide maybe a better road map or a layout of how the
10 current process is for funding as it results to seismic
11 mitigation project versus a facility hardship project and
12 also clarify some information that we received related to
13 the demand and provide some options for the Board.

14 So on the top of page 113, the number of changes
15 that we've gone through related to the seismic mitigation
16 regulations -- when the regulations were established, again
17 the ground shaking intensity was at a really high threshold
18 of 1.7.

19 At the time the Type 2 facilities, there were only
20 4 of the 14 Type 2 facilities that were provided as
21 criteria, and at that time, those particular regulations
22 only resulted in three applications coming through for
23 funding which equated to \$4.7 million.

24 The follow-up change in August of 2009, the ground
25 shaking intensity was reduced to 1.68. They expanded the

1 category Type 2 buildings to eight type of buildings and
2 there were no other changes made. And it did not result in
3 additional applications.

4 And in June 2011, as a result of the Board's
5 actions, as a result of the Seismic Subcommittee that came
6 forward with some recommendations, they removed the ground
7 shaking intensity. They expanded to all Type 2 facilities
8 which is 14 out of 14 Type 2 facilities and also added a
9 geological hazard or threat was added to the criteria.

10 So again try to provide more flexibility. With
11 that, that resulted in 17 funding applications that came
12 through for \$33 million.

13 And as part of the Consent Agenda, we did want to
14 acknowledge that there were at least -- over \$600,000 in
15 seismic grants provided for projects and that related to
16 four projects, although they weren't large projects, but
17 they did come through the seismic program.

18 We also want to acknowledge that there's at
19 least -- pretty close to \$20 million in projects in our
20 workload that we'll be processing at our next Board meeting.

21 As far as the chart of the process on page 113, we
22 wanted to highlight just the variances --

23 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Lisa --

24 MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Can you just elaborate a

1 little bit on the 20 million that will come up -- so those
2 are the -- are those items that are currently where they're
3 in the Step 2 and they're going to move into Step 3 or --

4 MS. SILVERMAN: Oh, actually --

5 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Explain the 20 million.

6 MS. SILVERMAN: -- those projects already have --
7 we have projects that are in our workload. They already
8 have a DSA plan approval.

9 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

10 MS. SILVERMAN: So they have already gone through
11 the whole process and have gotten approval from DSA.

12 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. So we'll be acting on
13 the \$20 million --

14 MS. SILVERMAN: We'll be acting on those --

15 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: -- allocations.

16 MS. SILVERMAN: -- projects that have about
17 \$20 million and that will be coming up in August since we
18 won't have a July meeting.

19 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Thank you.

20 MS. SILVERMAN: So, yeah, there's a few projects
21 that we have working down that path.

22 And as far as the process being laid out on
23 page 113, for the Facility Hardship Program, we rely on an
24 industry specialist that would have to identify what the
25 health and safety issue is and likewise, the seismic

1 program, we are going to rely also on an industry specialist
2 that identify any structural issues and seismic issues.

3 We also require government concurrence and the
4 concurrence comes in for the seismic program from Division
5 of State Architect and it would come from California
6 Geological Survey. And so we would have to get concurrence
7 from those folks in order to come into the program.

8 We require a cost benefit analysis -- so they
9 pretty much mirror each other with the exception of the
10 first step. The industry specialist is going to be an
11 engineer or a professional there.

12 On page 114, again just highlighting that we do
13 have close to \$20 million in projects that we're going to be
14 moving forward for funding and taking action coming soon.

15 The chart here on the bottom of 114, we wanted
16 just to emphasize those projects that are in Step 3 are
17 really projects that have plan approvals that are seeking
18 final clearance for those approvals so then those projects
19 could move forward for funding.

20 And that is \$37 million associated with those plan
21 approvals that are currently getting finalized at DSA.

22 We did get knowledge -- Garden Grove did notify
23 our office -- and just to share -- that they have two
24 projects that they were submitting for plans to be reviewed
25 at DSA.

1 So there's two additional projects that are not
2 laid out here. And so those projects are pretty large in
3 volume, so -- as far as additional demand, we state there's
4 7 million, but it could be another 15- to 20 million also
5 with those plans as well.

6 So again, those projects will be maturing and will
7 be -- again, hopefully, those projects will turn into
8 funding applications rather quickly with those approvals.

9 So what we wanted to highlight as far as the
10 timing and the funding --

11 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Lisa, you want to pause for
12 one second.

13 MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Go ahead.

15 SENATOR LIU: No. It's okay. She's -- you're
16 going to talk about the timing right now? Yeah.

17 MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. The timing of the funding
18 is what I'm highlighting -- are what we have in our workload
19 which is about \$20 million the Board could take action the
20 next month or two.

21 And then the timing of those other projects that
22 are coming through with the final plan approvals at DSA,
23 again acknowledging there's five currently plus the other
24 two. So there's seven additional projects that are at that
25 final stage of plan approvals.

1 SENATOR LIU: Can you tell me from Step 1 to
2 Step 2 - Step 3 on page 114, how long is the process to get
3 to an opportunity to really have -- get allocation of
4 monies.

5 MR. ALMANZA: I could answer that.

6 SENATOR LIU: Okay.

7 MR. ALMANZA: I talked with our State Architect
8 who, unfortunately, wasn't able to be here. He's out of the
9 state.

10 But on the eligibility phase, when the school
11 comes in to establish eligibility of a building, it
12 typically takes two to four weeks for the State Architect to
13 review and say -- provide them a letter of eligibility that
14 the facility is eligible for the seismic program.

15 At this point, there's only one application that's
16 in process of being -- and so there's no backlog. And that
17 application came in in May and they've done their initial
18 review, requested some additional information from the
19 school district. So they're waiting for that.

20 So other than that, there isn't anything in the
21 queue for eligibility and like I said, typically it'll take
22 two to four weeks for that.

23 And then on the Step 2, when a school district
24 comes in to make a determination whether it's going to be
25 replacement or rehab, there are -- let's see. Those usually

1 take three to four weeks for the review and analysis at the
2 State Architect's office.

3 Right now, there have been 23 projects that were
4 reviewed and that the State Architect did ask for additional
5 information, but they haven't heard bad. The school
6 district hasn't -- I guess hasn't decided whether they
7 really want to pursue the project or not.

8 And everything else has been processed, of the --
9 let's see -- there's been 261 approvals.

10 SENATOR LIU: So you're saying that it takes about
11 three months to get approval?

12 MR. ALMANZA: No. Maybe a month, maybe a month
13 and a half typically for most of them. They don't have any
14 that are being reviewed right now. There are those 23 that
15 over the last, what, six years or whenever this started
16 where the school just stopped the process. They didn't
17 resubmit their paperwork.

18 SENATOR LIU: So it's not so much the State
19 process, it's the school districts that are holding this up?

20 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: I think it's not a holdup. I
21 think that's one of the things that is confusing about the
22 kind of questions that have been asked and the way we're
23 looking at it is that if you -- if a school district comes
24 in under Step 1 and seeks eligibility, they can get their
25 eligibility from the State Architect in two to four weeks

1 and the that process is done.

2 And then they may not choose to go forward to
3 Step 2 or they may choose to go forward right away or not
4 for six months or a year and there isn't any -- there's no
5 holdup on either side.

6 It's not that the school is holding something up.
7 It's maybe that that project isn't in the queue to come up
8 next for the school. So the school's not choosing to go
9 forward and the Architect isn't -- they're not doing
10 anything either.

11 They've done what they've been asked to do under
12 the first step, but they don't -- they keep it as an item
13 that's been -- you know, a school has applied for
14 eligibility.

15 SENATOR LIU: So is there any experience that
16 somebody comes in and wants to be declared eligible and then
17 carries out -- goes through all the steps and determines
18 that they want to go forward and so we get to Step 3?

19 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: I think those are the five
20 projects that are listed in the item and then plus the two
21 Garden Grove projects that Ms. Silverman mentioned. So
22 those schools have all chosen to go through to each step.

23 SENATOR LIU: And how long are those schools in
24 the -- between the State and the school districts, how long
25 have they been in the pipeline -- those projects?

1 MR. MIRELES: We don't have that information,
2 Senator, in terms of from the beginning -- when they first
3 submitted the eligibility documents to DSA for Step 1 to
4 State apportionment. We don't have that.

5 We can go back and look at the ones that we've
6 funded. We don't have that timeline.

7 MR. ALMANZA: Right. But I mean the first two
8 steps are -- the school district's in decision mode.
9 They're trying to determine whether or not they want to have
10 a project.

11 So for the State Architect, it isn't a project
12 until plans are submitted and many of them for whatever
13 reason decide not to fund this project. Maybe it's not the
14 highest priority. I don't know. But they're not in a
15 pipeline. They're not stuck anywhere.

16 SENATOR HANCOCK: Right. That is of great
17 interest to me. This whole chart is very interesting
18 because I know for many schools, just talking to school
19 districts in the state and in the district I represent and
20 the region I represent, you know, many schools are almost
21 afraid to find out because of the issues that come once you
22 know, you need to fix.

23 So it was of interest to me that we had so many
24 more schools that found out and then there's that fall-off
25 to take the next step because usually if you found out you

1 were actually eligible, that would be an added impetus to
2 try to get it done as soon as possible.

3 And I wonder if anyone ever had asked, like did we
4 make an effort to reach out to those applications just to
5 find out. Did they decide it wasn't worth it? Are there
6 other things in the pipeline? What do we know --

7 MR. ALMANZA: I understand the State Architect,
8 when a project has come in for -- say like, for example, the
9 23 that hadn't responded on the review of whether to rehab
10 or replace.

11 They do fall off at the school district in regard
12 to are you going to resubmit, you know, the additional
13 information so we could make a determination. They'll do
14 that two or three times and then after that --

15 SENATOR HANCOCK: And do they keep any data? And,
16 you know, I'm asking this because I've been an
17 administrator. I did work in the U.S. Department of
18 Education, at the time when we first came up with the 21st
19 Century Learning Center After School Grant and we had
20 applications that went directly from the department out to
21 school districts in California.

22 It was -- they were aimed at the districts -- the
23 lowest income districts. We looked at the results and we
24 found that we weren't getting applications from those
25 districts.

1 So one of the things that we did was we had some
2 interns call up with a five- or six-question questionnaire
3 about what's holding it up or why aren't you applying. And
4 we found fascinating answers of people saying your
5 complicated partnership requirements are not going to work
6 in my school.

7 One principal said, Lady, I'm out in the hall
8 trying to stop fights. I can't put together -- I don't have
9 the capacity to do what you're asking.

10 And, you know, when I got interested in this
11 because of one of the school districts in my senate district
12 was turned down, even though they had this engineering
13 report saying they were a dangerous school.

14 But -- so I just wondered if -- in other words,
15 did we have the motivation or the interest to actually try
16 to find out once you find out you're eligible, well, what do
17 you do with that information.

18 SENATOR LIU: Right.

19 SENATOR HANCOCK: Right? Do you just -- it's hard
20 for me to believe that a district would just say, well, it's
21 not my priority anymore because they wouldn't have asked in
22 the first place.

23 So for me, it's just -- it's an interesting
24 question if we administer State programs, as we look at the
25 possibility of another bond, like, what's going on here,

1 and, you know, I would love to be able to find that out.

2 I did notice that in the suggestions that were
3 made, you know, I think -- I don't know that we want to
4 convene anything, but there was the suggestion that the
5 Board consider writing a letter to DSA requesting that the
6 process be evaluated.

7 I'm thinking maybe we have to write you a letter.
8 Maybe we could just -- you know, if there are any ideas
9 about how to find out why we're getting this fall-off, what
10 we might want to do, and actually I was thinking maybe a
11 meeting of the Implementation Committee would be good.

12 I don't think they've met for a while and these
13 are the people with boots on the ground, so to speak -- to
14 see if they have any suggestions or what they think. I
15 would be, you know, very interested in that.

16 And I was actually also -- I found this chart very
17 helpful which listed the projects as to where they were in
18 all the different three processes and where they were and
19 that sort of thing.

20 So I was thinking that maybe we could have, for
21 the Board and especially for some of us who are very
22 interested in looking at this, if we could have the
23 information about where the projects are in the pipeline by
24 school district and by the schools. Because I notice Garden
25 Grove, Long Beach Unified has a lot, a number in Simi Valley

1 Unified.

2 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: So you mean this page 114
3 table by district?

4 SENATOR HANCOCK: Here, I can show you this. It
5 was in my book. I don't know where I got it.

6 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

7 SENATOR HANCOCK: But you see how you can --

8 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Um-hmm.

9 SENATOR HANCOCK: -- you can track it and we can
10 see projects move up or fall off or -- because I am very
11 interested now. I know that -- there are about five
12 projects that I just happen to know about that were going to
13 subject and then didn't because of the budget at the time
14 that there was consideration of sweeping the seismic from
15 the budget.

16 They may come in again, but just, you know, how do
17 we try to get an idea of the universe of need. That's been
18 controversial in the Legislature because we kind of hesitate
19 to make schools tell us for the whole reason of if you're
20 not going to fix it, don't bother finding out, I guess;
21 right?

22 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: If I could ask, Lisa, can you
23 just remind us of the reporting requirement for March on the
24 program that was approved in the budget, what the scope of
25 it is?

1 MR. MIRELES: It was another -- it was a report to
2 explore ideas -- ways to streamline the process as well.

3 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

4 MR. MIRELES: That is something that we have to
5 report back in March of 2015 --

6 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

7 MR. MIRELES: -- regards to the seismic program.

8 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. So that -- I think
9 there's substantial overlap there on the request --

10 SENATOR HANCOCK: I do too.

11 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: -- item. Perhaps what we can
12 do is make as part of that also trying to get, you know, if
13 only anecdotal, maybe a little discussion of what happens
14 between Step 1 and Step 2 and what kind of information we
15 might be able to gather about the drop-off and that might
16 help inform the discussion.

17 And then I think on the information that you have
18 there, I'm sure that Lisa probably -- we can certainly talk
19 about, you know, what adding to that would be helpful.

20 SENATOR HANCOCK: Yes. To me, this was just a
21 very helpful thing. We just could --

22 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Um-hmm.

23 SENATOR HANCOCK: -- continue to sort of have that
24 updated.

25 MS. MOORE: I can just say that we can support

1 also going to the Implementation Committee and getting the
2 stakeholder input as to is there anything that we're missing
3 that could streamline it or could encourage greater
4 participation, particularly on that Step 1 to Step 2
5 drop-off. So we can support that as well.

6 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

7 SENATOR HANCOCK: Thank you. I think we don't --
8 we don't even have a quorum now; right?

9 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: No. No. Can someone remind
10 me who the Chair of the Implementation Committee is?

11 SENATOR HANCOCK: No. The Chair -- I know where
12 she is. We just left her.

13 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Oh, okay.

14 SENATOR HANCOCK: She was hearing our bill.

15 SENATOR LIU: That's right. And so is
16 Mr. Nazarian.

17 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

18 MS. MOORE: The Implementation Committee is
19 administered by the staff.

20 MR. SAVIDGE: I'm the Chair.

21 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Okay.

22 MS. MOORE: Yeah. And Bill Savidge is the Chair
23 of that.

24 SENATOR HANCOCK: Oh. So if Mr. Savidge could do
25 that, that would be great.

1 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

2 SENATOR HANCOCK: And maybe -- okay -- do some of
3 the updating of the list and everything, I think that would
4 be terrific.

5 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

6 SENATOR HANCOCK: You know, part of the reason I'm
7 interested in this too is I did go down to Northridge
8 because I worked for the U.S. Department of Education after
9 that, and it was very scary to look at some of the
10 elementary schools around the state university. Very
11 dangerous light fixtures -- I mean, you know, if there had
12 been children in some of those buildings when the earthquake
13 happened, it would have been scary and we're so much further
14 ahead now. I'd like to see it --

15 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Anything else on --

16 MS. MOORE: So are we going to direct a meeting of
17 the Implementation Committee? Can we do that with an item?

18 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Well, we can't take an
19 action. So I think we need to just do that informally.

20 MS. MOORE: Okay.

21 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Since we don't have a quorum,
22 we can't actually have an action item, but I don't see why
23 we can't --

24 MS. MOORE: But we can ask them to consider it?

25 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Yeah. Exactly. I don't know

1 why that can't be done informally.

2 MS. MOORE: So they can agendize the issue and --

3 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Right.

4 MS. MOORE: -- and move it forward.

5 SENATOR HANCOCK: Thank you. I think that would
6 be great.

7 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay.

8 SENATOR HANCOCK: Thanks, Mr. Savidge. Hint,
9 hint.

10 MR. SAVIDGE: Okay. I'll work with the Chair.

11 SENATOR HANCOCK: If you could do that, yeah.

12 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Great.

13 SENATOR HANCOCK: I think that would be --

14 CHAIRPERSON ORTEGA: Okay. Anything else? Is
15 there any public comment on this or any other item?

16 Okay. Anything else from the Board? No? Then
17 we'll be adjourned. Thank you.

18 (Whereupon, at 5:40 p.m. the proceedings were
19 adjourned.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

