

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  
STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

STATE CAPITOL  
ROOM 447  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2019  
TIME: 9:03 A.M.

Reported By: Susan Palmer  
eScribers

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:

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

BRIAN LaPASK, Supervisor, Program Services

JOSHUA POTTER, Supervisor, Program Services

LINDSEY GORDON

ALEXANDRA RUILOBA

JUSTIN NG

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

MR. LaPASK: Good morning. This is the stakeholder meeting for the full-day kindergarten new update that we have as part of SB75. I want to introduce everybody first. I'm Brian LaPask. I'm the Operations and Policy Manager at OPSC in Program Services. To my right is Joshua Potter, supervisor for the Full-Day Kindergarten Program. To his right is Lindsey Gordon. To my left is Alexandra Ruiloba and Justin Ng. All these folks you see here are the ones that are working on your full-day kindergarten applications and I'm glad that they're all here with me today.

So why are we here today? As part of this year's education omnibus trailer bill, part of what is allocated to our program is \$300 million for our full-day kindergarten projects.

In addition to the funds being increased, there was a lot of changes these time, some significant changes to the program, the structure of it, the way that we're going to be applying, and so we have gone through and made changes to our regulations to the program as well as the forms, the grant agreement. So we're going to be going over all those changes today.

We're hoping that we can get some feedback from

1 all of you -- well, the few of you that are here. If you  
2 have any suggestions, although we actually think that the  
3 changes we made are really straight from the statute. So we  
4 haven't really done anything outside of what those changes  
5 were, that I see anyway.

6           So a little bit of background on the program.  
7 This program provides one-time grants to either construct  
8 new facilities or retrofit existing facilities for the  
9 purpose of providing full-day kindergarten.

10           The new statute limits a portion of the program's  
11 funding to school districts that will be converting part-day  
12 kindergarten programs to full-day. We'll get into exactly  
13 what that means, but that's a really clear goal of the new  
14 allocations to ensure that we're encouraging that part-day  
15 to full-day conversion.

16           Some of the other highlights, formerly the  
17 matching share was 50 percent matching to districts for new  
18 construction, 40 percent for retrofit. Both types of  
19 projects will now be 75 state and 25 district, and we're  
20 actually going to be going back and adjusting the ones that  
21 we previously apportioned in the first two rounds so in the  
22 first round, ended up having second round -- or in the third  
23 round, I should say.

24           Also for the upcoming next two rounds, the third  
25 and fourth round, only projects that are converting from

1 part-day to full-day will receive funding. If there's funds  
2 left after that, in the fifth and final round, any district  
3 will be able to participate. So it will be opened up again  
4 the way the first and second rounds were.

5 Savings and interest realized from savings will be  
6 able to be retained for third, fourth, and fifth round  
7 projects, and we're going to go back and -- well, we already  
8 have actually.

9 I think we've already -- any adjustments that we  
10 made to new construction eligibility, school facility  
11 program new construction eligibility, which our first two  
12 rounds were classrooms that were added in those projects,  
13 we're backing those out.

14 Going forward, there will be no adjustment  
15 happening to new construction eligibility at all. So it  
16 will just be FDK. If there is classrooms added, we're not  
17 adding them to the district's inventory. So that provision  
18 has gone away.

19 So I'm going to let Josh go through the more  
20 nuanced details of everything that's in your packet. We do  
21 have packets in the back of the room, if you haven't gotten  
22 one already, and then when he's done with his presentation,  
23 we'll be inviting you to come up if you have any comments  
24 that you'd like to add or questions you have. So with that,  
25 I'll turn it over to Josh.

1           MR. POTTER: Thank you, Brian. Good morning,  
2 everybody. Mic check?

3           MS. JONES: Do you have a red light on still?

4           MR. POTTER: Red light's on.

5           MS. JONES: Take it off so we can speak.

6           MR. POTTER: That work now? Okay. Thank you.  
7 Sorry about that.

8           Good morning, everybody. Thank you for those that  
9 are in attendance in person as well as those that are tuned  
10 in to streaming on the webcast. Like Brian said, there were  
11 quite a few changes that were called out in statute. So  
12 we'll go through the packet. Those that have a packet or  
13 those that are viewing online that have it, if you want to  
14 kind of follow along with me, we'll start with the staff  
15 analysis portion.

16           The first change is actually, as Brian kind of  
17 mentioned, the program eligibility criteria. As pointed out  
18 in statute, for the fiscal years of the '19-'20, and then  
19 '20-'21, the only funds that can go out will be for those  
20 districts that are actually converting a part-day to a  
21 full-day program.

22           So unlike the first two rounds where a district  
23 that was already doing a full-day program, this will apply  
24 based on lack of facilities. That's not the case for the  
25 third and fourth rounds, which we'll kind of go into the

1 details on later.

2           Just like with the '18-'19 budget, we do have a  
3 time frame in order to get this money apportioned out. So  
4 we do have the three-year program on that. So with what we  
5 have set up in here for any funds remaining, again, this is  
6 still called out in the statute.

7           Concluding the 2020 to 2021 fiscal years, we can  
8 revert back to the all facilities -- or all sites can  
9 actually apply.

10           Application submittal requirements is pretty much  
11 the same. It's still going to require the 70-01 to be  
12 submitted. This can be still in the design format, so  
13 nothing has changed in that.

14           There are if you are coming in for full funding  
15 would need all the approvals. Everything 70-01 need to be  
16 completed. For the design actually, we'll still need a site  
17 map, so we'll also get into those details later on in this.

18           Another change to the eligibility is that the  
19 statute now requires that the school districts provide  
20 enrollment for the current year as it was in the initial  
21 establishment of the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant  
22 Program.

23           It is not to provide for growth. It is for  
24 current students, but we would need the current year as well  
25 as the immediate three preceding years.

1           With that, in collaboration with the California  
2 Department of Education, we would be looking at the  
3 facilities that exist as well as that enrollment to  
4 determine whether a school district is restricted to only  
5 being able to do retrofit or if they would still be eligible  
6 for new construction.

7           For the funding, as Brian said, we did have 300  
8 additional million dollars put towards the program, less the  
9 DGS administrative costs, that leaves us with 292.5 million  
10 to apportion.

11           We are proposing the additional rounds which would  
12 be three additional rounds. The third and fourth rounds  
13 would be in those fiscal years that would be strictly for  
14 those that are converting from a part-day to a full-day  
15 program.

16           The fifth round would be opened up after the close  
17 of that 2020-2021 fiscal year in order to allow those other  
18 districts to apply who currently have a full-day program.

19           We are not restricting the amount of money to each  
20 of the rounds. It will be -- all of the money will be on  
21 the table for the third round. Anything that is remaining  
22 would then go to the fourth round and again if anything is  
23 still remaining concluding the fourth round, it would go to  
24 that fifth round.

25           For the matching share requirement, as Brian kind



1 of touched on, the statute did call out for a change to that  
2 matching share. Rather than the 50-50 for new construction  
3 or the 60-40 for modernization, it does change it to a 75  
4 state and 25 district. That is specific to only be for  
5 those that are converting from a part-day to a full-day  
6 program. So in the third and fourth rounds, those would be  
7 exclusive to those districts converting. So they would be  
8 in the 75-25 split.

9 In the fifth round, any districts who apply who  
10 are not converting would still be on the 50-50 and 60-40  
11 splits.

12 Also as mentioned, we will be retroactively  
13 adjusting. Any of those districts from the first and second  
14 rounds that receive funding would be adjusted to a 75-25  
15 split again if they are converting from a part-day to a  
16 full-day program.

17 Going in to the calculations, to kind of display  
18 how this looks. The statute still calls for the  
19 modernization and new construction base grants based on the  
20 pupil amounts from the current year's CCIs. So the actual  
21 base grant amount and the calculation for the total project  
22 would not change. The only thing that is changing in the  
23 funding is going to be that 75-25 split.

24 So we've put two different charts in here to kind  
25 of show how that is. So in Example No. 1, which is the new

1 construction project, it is a two classroom example. On the  
2 left side, you would see as it is currently set on a 50-50  
3 split. We would go through the new construction base grant.  
4 We included a few of the additional grants, the site  
5 development, fire alarm, fire sprinklers, project assistance  
6 which gets you to that 50 percent state share of 841,758.

7           Since it's a 50-50 match, it would be duplicated  
8 to the district share for a total project cost of 1,683,516.

9           That same numeric is copied into the chart  
10 next door to the one on the right side of that and shows  
11 that the total project cost is still the same at 1,683,516.

12          The change then is 75-25 split is adjusted and the total  
13 state share would now be 1,262,637 versus the previous  
14 version of a 50-50 split, that 841,758. And the district's  
15 share at 25 percent would be 420,879.

16           On the next page, we gave a secondary chart to  
17 kind of break down a retrofit. Again, this does still go  
18 into a 75-25 for the conversion from a part-day to a  
19 full-day.

20           So the left side chart on the retrofit is again a  
21 two classroom example. It shows the base grant of 232,200,  
22 the supplemental grants, site development, fire alarm, and  
23 project assistance, for a total state share at 60 percent of  
24 the project cost, 328,480, and the district's share of  
25 40 percent being 218,897 for that total project cost of

1 547,467. A lot of hope the numbers work out there.

2 For the right side of that chart again, this just  
3 kind of shows basically how that 75-25 applies. It's not  
4 changing the total project costs. So again the project cost  
5 is 547,467 and the state share changes now to 410,600 and  
6 the district share at 25 is 136,867.

7 So we put these in here as a visual to really show  
8 how that it is not changing, again, the actual base grants  
9 which pulls from the pupils. It's just changing that  
10 project cost split to the 75-25.

11 One change that we did incorporate that was not in  
12 the statute that we think would actually be a little bit  
13 more equitable for the districts and this is definitely one  
14 of the things we would like to get insight from the  
15 stakeholders on is for the tiebreakers.

16 In the first establishment for the FDK program, we  
17 had included a lottery draw for any districts who were tied  
18 for preference points. So, for example, for any district  
19 that did not receive the financial hardship 40 points, if  
20 they had 86.3 FRPM, they would get the 26 points. It's a  
21 rounding process.

22 If you had a district that was 86.2, they would  
23 also get the 26 points. So again, you've created a tie. So  
24 we've included an additional level to the ways for the  
25 tiebreakers to default to the actual FRPMs to the first

1 decimal. So again, in that circumstance of 86.3 and 86.2,  
2 sticking true to the statute of a higher priority for the  
3 higher FRPM, the 86.3 would automatically get funding first.

4 We would only default for a lottery draw if they had  
5 exactly the same FRPM.

6           Going into some of the other changes for savings  
7 use, there is included in the statute all applicants can  
8 retain the savings, so including those that are financial  
9 hardship. They are still tied to the time frames as far as  
10 when the expenditure reports need to be submitted and a  
11 savings report and any savings (indiscernible) which you do  
12 return.

13           So instead of the first two rounds where financial  
14 hardship districts could not retain the savings for one  
15 year, they are included in a grouping of nonfinancial  
16 hardship districts that can retain that savings for one year  
17 and there's specifics on what those can be expended on.

18           In addition to the high priority capital outlay  
19 facilities needs, they can also expend those savings on  
20 professional development to build capacity for the  
21 implementation of a full-day program. Instructional  
22 materials to build capacity for implementation of the  
23 program. I know those two -- those are actually the two  
24 additional ones in there.

25           As Brian did talk about, the statute does actually

1 include there will be no adjustments to the SFP eligibility  
2 for new construction for the districts can receive funding  
3 for new construction. We have, in fact, reversed the  
4 adjustments that were made for those that receive funding in  
5 the first round. So those have already been done and  
6 approved.

7           And as we are concluding the second round  
8 processing, there have been no adjustments for those and  
9 there will be no adjustments when they are completed.

10           That concludes the actual cover item itself. I  
11 did want to go through and kind of highlight a few things.  
12 We do have included in a packet the regulation packet we put  
13 together with the adjustments and the changes in there. We  
14 do also have the forms and the grant agreement.

15           There were not a lot of changes to these things.  
16 All of it's kind of been stuff already in the specifics of  
17 what we've covered, but I did want to go through some of the  
18 things and highlight a few of them.

19           On page 8 of your packet in the definitions, we  
20 did actually include a definition of full-day kindergarten  
21 program as it relates to Education Code Section 8973. We  
22 received a lot of questions regarding that in the first two  
23 filing rounds, so we added it as a definition in here for  
24 clarity for the districts and the applicants.

25           Going in to page 11, we're getting into the

1 regulation section 1860.3 which is our general. We -- in  
2 order to delineate the monies that are being apportioned, we  
3 actually put them in. Anything that came from an '18-'19  
4 budget is actually associated with 1860.3(a). Anything  
5 associated with the 300 million for the new funds is  
6 actually associated as 1860.3(b).

7           This actually helps clarify things as we get into  
8 especially if we have a fifth funding round where only those  
9 that are converting receive the 75-25 split as well as when  
10 we were having funds returned we need to make sure anything  
11 we can get back out is delineated where it came from.

12           So going to the regulation packet, if you have  
13 identified those references, that's why we did that  
14 separation for those monies.

15           Going into page number 13 which is your 1860.6  
16 which is your application submittals, we did actually call  
17 out here those funding rounds proposals. 1860.6(c) would be  
18 the third funding round which would actually be -- is  
19 proposed to be for April 1st, 2020, through April 30th,  
20 2020, and again, there will be no cap to the funding  
21 allotted to that round. It would be whatever we have, the  
22 292.5 million.

23           Anything remaining would go to a fourth round,  
24 which we have proposed as January 4th, 2021, to  
25 February 2nd, 2021, and should any funding remain -- be

1 remaining after the fourth round, we would have that fifth  
2 round and again we have to have that in order for all the  
3 sites to be able to apply including those that currently  
4 offer. So that would be after the 2020-'21 fiscal year, so  
5 we propose July 1st, 2021, to July 30th, 2021. Each one of  
6 those rounds allows for an equal amount of dates to apply  
7 for the program.

8           On page 17, it kind of has a pull-over from  
9 1860.11 for the new construction from page 10. It provides  
10 a chart down there still outlining where that split is. So  
11 again even though there's a third and fourth filing rounds,  
12 it would only be for those converting. It does show that  
13 when you are converting from a part-day to a full-day. It  
14 would be -- if you're not converting from a part-day to a  
15 full day, it would still be a 50-50 split, and if you are  
16 converting, it would be a 75-25.

17           Towards the bottom of the page, we included the  
18 same chart for retrofit projects. Those that are not  
19 converting would still be at a 60-40 split and those that  
20 are converting would be at a 75-25.

21           Moving onto page 19, this goes into our actual  
22 tiebreaker concept, as I explained, where we would actually  
23 default to the first decimal place of the FRPM actual  
24 numbers. Again, the funding concept would still run in the  
25 two waves as it did in the first two rounds, where we would

1 fund the districts first priority projects in order of their  
2 preference points and then the second wave would include  
3 anything remaining beyond the first priority project going  
4 in that preference point priority order. And it just adds  
5 to that tiebreaker concept of the default to the actual FRPM  
6 and the second tiebreaker option which is a lottery draw.

7 Both of those waves are included and go between  
8 pages 19 into 20.

9 Page 21 is where we get into the project savings.  
10 Again, this does outline that even the districts in the  
11 third and fourth rounds or any of the applicants that  
12 receive the funding from the 300,000,000 do get to retain  
13 their savings even if they are financial hardship as long as  
14 they're expended for the specified criteria which includes  
15 the professional development and materials in order to build  
16 the capacity implementing the full-day program.

17 Moving onto page 26, which would be your 70-01  
18 form. For the first two pages of the form, we just updated  
19 the instructions to capture this, but on the actual first  
20 page of what is filled out and completed by the district  
21 which again is page 26 in the handout.

22 We have added a dual-scope option. In the first  
23 two rounds, we did identify there were quite a few sites  
24 that maybe didn't have the capacity to only do new  
25 construction, whether they were restricted by campus size or



1 just keeping their kindergarten complex together. We added  
2 this option to be able to select a dual scope and again, if  
3 you're doing a dual-scope design or not.

4           We would for accounting purposes internally  
5 separate those to capture the accounting process of that.  
6 So when we do actually complete those expenditure reports,  
7 the districts would still need to separate those costs  
8 delineated with each side of that scope where there's been  
9 new construction or retrofit, but for simplicity and for  
10 expeditious approach for the application process, we added  
11 that in here to avoid having a doing double submittal of an  
12 application.

13           On page 27, which includes the certification  
14 portion for the districts, you'll see in the right-hand  
15 column, the third bullet from the bottom, since there is a  
16 different share split for those that are converting from a  
17 part-day to a full-day program, we've included a simple  
18 certification section for districts.

19           You have two options in here. The first one to  
20 select would be full-day kindergarten instruction is not  
21 currently offered at the project site or if there isn't  
22 currently offered, you would check that box and include the  
23 date of when the district or the site began offering that  
24 full-day kindergarten.

25           Since you can still have started after the

1 beginning of this fiscal year, so if any district is  
2 applying when we come into the third round and they are just  
3 starting this year, they would still be eligible for the  
4 funding, but this way if there is a district that started  
5 prior to the statute that gave us the additional money, at  
6 the fifth round, we would know if the district would be  
7 eligible for the 75-25 or 50-50, 60-40 split. So this is a  
8 real easy way to certify to that and for us to be able to  
9 validate that as far as what the share would be for the  
10 project.

11           There were no changes necessary to the 70-02 which  
12 is the expenditure report for the first setting as far as  
13 actual expenditures, but on the savings portion, you'll see  
14 in the 70-03, we've actually included an additional blurb in  
15 there at the bottom of the certification, and again, this is  
16 going into the different changes that have been allocated  
17 for the savings portion.

18           So since financial hardship districts couldn't  
19 participate in the retention of savings for that additional  
20 year, we need to change the language to that and you'll see  
21 that captured in there.

22           And going into the grant agreement, we really just  
23 added the savings aspects of it as far as including that the  
24 financial hardship districts could retain those savings if  
25 they are doing a conversion and receiving the money from the

1 300,000,000 and so we've actually included those different  
2 expenditures that are allowed in there as far as the  
3 professional development as well as the materials in order  
4 to implement the full-day program.

5           On page 40, which is still in the grant agreement,  
6 there is an additional add-in there and this is just for the  
7 accounting and audits process in there. It does spell out  
8 in here how those savings on those expenditures can be  
9 retained. Again, with those in the fifth round should we  
10 have monies to apportion in that round, if they are not  
11 converting, they would not be able to retain those savings.

12       And so we've actually just spelled out that it could be up  
13 to two years because it just depends on whether that  
14 expenditure report or that savings report is coming in. So  
15 that was the change in the grant agreement as well.

16           There's really no other highlight changes to go  
17 through. I'm hoping some people had an opportunity to go  
18 through the packet ahead of time or if you're going through  
19 it at this moment, if there are any additional questions or  
20 comments, we welcome anybody come up and please feel free to  
21 address us on any questions or comments you may have.

22           We do also, for those that may not have noticed,  
23 we have sign-in in the back as well. So if there is any  
24 other correspondence we could follow up with you on, we  
25 capture that information on there as well.

1           So with that, if nobody else has any other  
2 comments, I'd like to open it up.

3           MR. LaPASK: Just please do sign in if you haven't  
4 already, at least before you leave. We'd appreciate that.

5           Also I forgot to mention when we're done with our  
6 presentation and our questions, we have a lottery happening  
7 today. It's pretty cool. Hopefully, it goes well. It is  
8 for the team concluding processing of round two projects and  
9 there are four projects again that are vying for the  
10 remaining funding. So we're going to be actually  
11 determining their funding order when we conclude today. So  
12 if you want to stick around, you can check out that. It  
13 should be entertaining. And it will also be on the webcast  
14 if you wanted to watch that later as well, so please come up  
15 if you have any comments. If you have any comments, we  
16 invite you to come up and speak.

17           I know there's not too many of you here, but we  
18 would love to hear from everybody if you anything to offer.  
19 Start handing out Starbucks cards or something.

20           MR. GUILLEN: Good morning. My name's Abel  
21 Guillen with CSW and I have a question related to the order  
22 of applications and I may have missed this. Is this going  
23 to be a rolling application period like you did for the last  
24 round or would it be on a first come, first serve basis.

25           MR. POTTER: The third, fourth, and fifth rounds

1 will be duplicative of the first and second rounds. There  
2 will be a filing period. No applications could be received  
3 prior to the opening of the round and no applications may be  
4 received at the end of the round and the funding order is  
5 determined by the preference points, so there is no order  
6 based on date received.

7 MR. GUILLEN: Great. Thank you.

8 MR. POTTER: Thank you.

9 MR. GOIL: Good morning. My name is Sumeet Goil.  
10 I'm also with CSW. I had two questions that I'm hoping you  
11 could help address.

12 One is for the next round, which begins in April  
13 2020, is all of the available funding -- is all funding  
14 available to be distributed if sufficient applications are  
15 received that meet the criteria?

16 MR. POTTER: Yes. We did not set aside any monies  
17 for additional rounds. We are opening the first -- the  
18 third round up would be for all monies remaining out of the  
19 300- which would be the 292.5. So it is an open table for  
20 all of that money. To stick to the statute which has  
21 clearly delineated that it would like to support those that  
22 are the conversion from a part-day to a full-day; we have  
23 not reserved any of that money. So if we do happen to be  
24 oversubscribed, all that money would go out in that round.

25 MR. GOIL: Thank you. And then the handout made a

1 reference to CDE being consulted for recommendation as to  
2 whether projects would be qualifying for new construction or  
3 retrofit. What criteria will CDE use to make that  
4 recommendation?

5 MR. POTTER: We do still need to conclude those  
6 meetings with CDE to delaying that specific attribute.  
7 There are certain things that will be looked at from OPSC's  
8 side as far as enrollment and that's why there is the  
9 current year enrollment that needs to be submitted as well  
10 as the immediate preceding three years to identify if there  
11 is a decline.

12 Maybe it's plateauing or maybe it's actually going  
13 up and in that case, if there is a need for additional  
14 facilities, obviously if all facilities on the site are  
15 occupied and loaded fully, there would be no additional  
16 facilities to retrofit, so there would be no other option  
17 but new construction.

18 However, if there are additional facilities on  
19 site especially within or near that kindergarten complex  
20 where they can actually be retrofitted and the enrollment  
21 has declined, then it would be stuck to a retrofit project.

22 We are still continuing to conclude those ideas  
23 with CDE. So we'll have those in our final stakeholder  
24 meeting (indiscernible).

25 MR. LaPASK: Yeah. I was going to say we are

1 planning a second meeting to follow up to this one on  
2 October 15th.

3 I don't think the location has been determined  
4 yet. That will be on our website, but we could maybe have  
5 some more information on that for the next meeting on the  
6 15th of October.

7 In addition too, to the folks we have here today,  
8 if you have -- those of you that are watching us now or see  
9 it later on the webcast, if you wanted to send information  
10 in to us via email, we'd be happy to review that and  
11 incorporate it into our comments for the next meeting.

12 Again, we want as much feedback as we can get.  
13 Even though a lot of this stuff comes straight out of  
14 statute, we'd like to hear your thoughts on it.

15 So there's that option available to you as well if  
16 you prefer to do it over email. We'd be happy to look at  
17 those.

18 MR. SATTLEY: Good morning. Mike Sattley, Hemet  
19 Unified School District. So as far as the fund release,  
20 (indiscernible) as far as once we receive the funds, you  
21 have one year to spend the money and report it or what's the  
22 status as far as the timeline there?

23 MR. POTTER: Correct. Yes. On the timelines,  
24 once a full fund release has been submitted, the district  
25 would have one year to complete the project or submit the

1 actual expenditure report.

2           So there is one year from that release to the  
3 point on which that expenditure report needs to be  
4 submitted.

5           Beyond that for the savings, you have an  
6 additional one year to complete that and then at that point,  
7 any savings that would still be remaining would have to be  
8 returned at that point.

9           MR. SATTLEY: So once the district is notified  
10 sometime after April, how much time does the district have  
11 to ask for the fund release at that point?

12           MR. POTTER: (Indiscernible) apportioned in  
13 that April round --

14           MR. SATTLEY: Yes. So yeah. So you get an  
15 apportion in April --

16           MR. POTTER: There would be a filing round in  
17 April, so we have to determine an actual Board date it's all  
18 going to be determined on the volume of applications being  
19 submitted as to when we actually can take the item to the  
20 Board for those approvals. It would be one year from that  
21 apportionment date so when the SAB approves those projects,  
22 so it wouldn't be the April date.

23           MR. SATTLEY: So a few months after, somewhere in  
24 there --

25           MR. POTTER: Correct.



1           MR. SATTLEY: -- one year essentially since we'd  
2 complete the project.

3           MR. POTTER: Correct.

4           MR. SATTLEY: It would be one year for savings.

5           MR. POTTER: Correct.

6           MR. SATTLEY: Has anybody have comments or  
7 questions about that. I'm here to say, hey, one year's --  
8 let's say the district doesn't have, you know, the money to  
9 put up front, hardship, or whatever, to start a project from  
10 scratch -- if they haven't already started on, to start a  
11 project from scratch, to bid and build it may be a tight  
12 time frame especially in today's market.

13           MR. POTTER: It is a fairly tight time frame  
14 because of the restraints that we have from the funds coming  
15 from general fund, we only have three years in order to get  
16 those funds out. And so it is very expeditious and very  
17 aggressive program in that nature.

18           For those that are still kind of trying to get  
19 things together, unlike SFP where in order to qualify for  
20 design or in the FDK grant program, you have the advanced  
21 funding.

22           Even districts who are not financial hardship can  
23 apply for that and you can get some funds early on to get  
24 the project started.

25           With those that receive a full funding

1 apportionment or a State Allocation Board approval, they  
2 have six months to submit for that full fund release. Those  
3 that are getting an advance actually have one year to come  
4 in for that. So it does kind of buy a little bit of time in  
5 that realm for those that might be concerned with time  
6 frames.

7 MR. SATTLEY: Thank you.

8 MR. LaPASK: Anyone else?

9 MS. STRAUSS: Hi. Julie Strauss with School  
10 Advisors. Just a point of clarification. These projects do  
11 not need to participate in a priority in funding round to  
12 certify, correct?

13 MR. POTTER: That is correct. Full-day  
14 Kindergarten Facilities Grant Program projects do not  
15 participate in PIF. The money coming out of the general  
16 fund means that it's readily available which is why we can  
17 be expeditious on it.

18 So those that receive an advance fund release,  
19 once the Allocation Board approval is done, the advance  
20 amount can be released nearly immediately upon a grant  
21 execution and the same thing for the full fund release.  
22 Once that's approved and a full fund release is sent in, we  
23 can work on the grant agreement and get the actual warrant  
24 issued so it's a very quick process.

25 MS. STRAUSS: And these projects do have the

1 traditional 180 days to submit a fund release from time of  
2 approval, correct?

3 MR. POTTER: They actually have -- there's 180  
4 days for the full fund release to submit. That is correct.  
5 So once they get their advance, they actually have one year  
6 where they can submit their -- they have one year to submit  
7 their final approvals and their full fund release.

8 MS. STRAUSS: Thank you.

9 MR. POTTER: You're welcome.

10 MR. LaPASK: Getting some breaking news over my  
11 phone that there may be a conflict with the CASH conference  
12 for our next stakeholder meeting.

13 So I want to just say that we may be reevaluating  
14 that date and stay tuned. We would certainly do an email  
15 blast if we do change it. It will be posted on our website.  
16 So, that the 10/15 meeting date is tentative right now.

17 This is your chance. Anyone else? Nothing.  
18 Going once -- oh, here we go. So I coerced it.

19 MR. GUILLEN: Regarding districts that are  
20 applying for hardship, can you talk about the criteria  
21 that's required to submit applications for hardship if  
22 that's different than in the past.

23 MR. POTTER: There is no change to the requirement  
24 of how you apply for the program. If you are a financial  
25 hardship district, it is still locked with the same

1     criterial as far as the financial hardship qualifications,  
2     but it does not change any application process between the  
3     third, fourth, and fifth rounds as opposed to the first and  
4     second rounds. It is the same.

5             MR. GUILLEN: Thank you.

6             MS. CEARLEY: Good morning. So you coerced.  
7     Rebekah Cearley from Coalition for Adequate School Housing.  
8     I just wanted to thank you for all the work that you've done  
9     on this program. It is a really important program for our  
10    schools and especially we appreciate the attention that  
11    you've given to the baseline eligibility issue to apply that  
12    retroactively to the projects that already receiving funding  
13    in the first two rounds.

14            We very much appreciate that. That was one of our  
15    primary concerns. We are really pleased to see that  
16    addressed in the trailer bill and thank you for your work on  
17    extending it out to all of the projects.

18            MR. POTTER: Absolutely. Thank you.

19            MR. LaPASK: One more opportunity. Okay. Well,  
20    if there's no other questions, I wanted to thank everybody  
21    for coming today. We are going to have a lottery. Like I  
22    said we're going do that here in just a minute and again, if  
23    you have any comments you didn't think of while you were  
24    here or if you're watching this later and have any ideas,  
25    please send them to us. We'd be happy to get those.

1           You could email any one of us. You could find our  
2 information on the website. For that, I won't tell our  
3 emails right now, but you can find -- it's pretty easy to  
4 find on the OPSC website. We'll be looking forward  
5 receiving that. And I guess with that, we'll see you next  
6 time, but we are going to do our lottery here, so stick  
7 around if you want to check that out. Thank you again.

8                               --oOo--  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
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

LOTTERY

MR. LaPASK: -- of the ping-pong balls are going into the ping-pong ball turner.

MR. POTTER: If you don't mind, go ahead and show the ball numbers to the camera so we can verify those are the ones going in.

MR. NG: 1 for Alisal Union.

MR. LaPASK: 1 for Alisal Union.

MS. RUILOBA: And this order is determined by -- it's a different alphabetical order.

MR. LaPASK: We just put these in alphabetical order.

MR. NG: 2 for Anaheim Elementary.

MR. LaPASK: 2 for Anaheim.

MR. NG: 3 is for Armona Union Elementary.

MR. LaPASK: 3 is for Armona.

MR. NG: And then 4 is for Fontana Unified.

MR. LaPASK: And 4 is Fontana. Okay. So mix it up a little bit first. All right. Ready?

(Turning lottery cage)

MR. NG: All right. Let's slow it down.

MR. LaPASK: Oh, there we go.

MR. NG: And then there's number 4. Number 4 for Fontana Unified.

1 MR. LaPASK: So Fontana will be first. And  
2 continuing until we get the entire order here. All right.

3 (Turning lottery cage)

4 MR. LaPASK: This is riveting.

5 MR. POTTER: Oh, there we go. Okay. Number 2 it  
6 looks like.

7 MR. NG: Yes. Number 2 for Anaheim Elementary.  
8 So number 2 is Anaheim.

9 (Turning lottery cage)

10 MR. POTTER: And there we go.

11 MR. NG: And it's number 1 for Alisal Union.

12 MR. POTTER: Alisal is the third one?

13 MR. NG: Yes.

14 MR. POTTER: And for the fourth?

15 MR. NG: That would be Armona Union.

16 MR. POTTER: Fourth one remaining would be Armona.  
17 Okay.

18 MR. LaPASK: So let's go ahead and read off the  
19 order there again.

20 MR. POTTER: So the funding order as determined  
21 would be -- excuse me -- Fontana would be first. Anaheim  
22 would be second.

23 Alisal, third, and Armona, fourth. And again this  
24 is to determine tiebreaker funding order for the second  
25 round. Thank you.

1                   MR. LaPASK: Thank you. That concludes our  
2 meeting for today. Thank you all for coming.

3                   (Whereupon, at 9:40 a.m., the proceedings were  
4 adjourned.)

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



1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

2

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

5

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

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

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

15 That I am a disinterested person to said action.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on  
17 September 27, 2019.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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