

UNADOPTED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
 CITIZENS BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING
 HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
 JUNE 1, 2022

The Regular Citizens Bond Oversight Committee Meeting on June 1, 2022, was called to order by Leticia Covarrubias, Committee Chair at 6:34 pm, In Person/ZOOM meeting of the District Administration building located at 15959 East Gale Avenue, Hacienda Heights, California 91745.

Members present were: Olivia Roberts, Adria Ybarra, Charlie Klinakis, Leticia Covarrubias, Reina Schmitz, Gabriela Navar,

Members absent were: Louis Perez, Philip Kraft

Item No. 1	<p><u>AGENDA REVIEW AND RE-ORDER</u></p> <p>Review and Re-order</p> <p>Leticia: I would like to make a motion to add item #8 to the front of the agenda. I would like to add it after the approval of the minutes.</p> <p>Moved by Leticia Covarrubias and seconded by Adria Ybarra for Agenda review and reorder.</p> <p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p> <p>Moved by Leticia Covarrubias and seconded by Charlie Klinakis to change Discussion item to Action Item</p> <p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p>
Item No. 2	<p>Request to speak to agenda (Non-Agenda) Items</p> <p><u>None</u></p>
Item No. 3	<p>Moved by Olivia Roberts and seconded by Charlie Klinakis for Approval of minutes from previous meeting – April 13, 2022</p> <p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p> <p>Review and Change <u>None</u></p>
<i>Item No. 8 (Item moved)</i>	<p><u>CBOC RESIGNATION AND RE-ORG</u></p> <p>Moved by Charlie Klinakis and seconded by Olivia Roberts for Louis Perez Resignation.</p>

	<p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p> <p>Moved by Leticia Covarrubias and seconded by Olivia Roberts for Reina Schmitz Re-Org.</p> <p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p>
Item No. 4	<p><u>BOND EXPENDITURES</u></p> <p>A. Bond Expenditures</p> <p>Manoj: At this time, I'll have Earl, who is on Zoom, go over the bond expenditures.</p> <p>Earl: Yes, Lelia will be putting that up on the screen.</p> <p>Lelia: Isn't that showing up there?</p> <p>Earl: Not on my end. I can go over them, I have them. It's fine.</p> <p>Lelia: Let me try again.</p> <p>Earl: There will go. We have the expenditures here as of May 25th. Nothing significant to report, as far as anything out of the ordinary. We can see that we had \$783,097.08 in expenditures between April 15th and May 25th. We're moving along. Obviously we are waiting board direction on moving forward with significant portions of the project. Those expenditures are coming in but not as fast as we would be if we were fully underway on projects. One thing I would like to point out, which you can see on this report, just due to the transactions that came through, but also looking at the expenditures on a smaller timeline as if we were looking at them for an entire year. But you can see that the total expenditures and committed amounts went down by \$13,500. If you look at the expenditures, the increase of \$783K and the committed amounts that went down \$796K, that's where the difference is. But the reason for this was that we had a contract, a job, for the unforeseen expenditures that was \$20K. The project finished and they didn't need all of the unforeseen expenditure budget. So, we closed the purchase order, which resulted in this, you maybe looking at it and say, savings perhaps. Not truly really a savings, but it kind of looks that way, of \$13,500. Which, the reason I bring it up is just so that you can know that not all contractors use up the full amount that we might have allotted to them for the project for the unforeseen circumstances. Things that arise during the cost, maybe outside the scope of the original project. That's because, as we said before, we kind of vet everything that needs to be done, and sometimes, you know, they don't need to do the max. This just goes to show that we do close out those purchase orders when they are not needed. And that does happen when you look at expenditures on a bigger timeline. Sometimes those things gets lost in the mix. But in this situation, over the 6 week span, we can see that sticking out a little bit. Just something for you to know and maybe take some solace in that does happen. Beyond that, nothing else to report.</p>

Leticia: Thank you for bringing that to our attention. Who was the contractor?

Earl: Let me pull it up real quick. Sorry, my team told me, but I didn't write that down. It will take me a second.

Leticia: And what was the work for, Earl?

Earl: That also, I didn't write down. The details for it are in the spreadsheet. Let me dig down to them real quick.

Leticia: Okay.

Earl: I did ask my staff member what it was and to show me. Now I have to work my way back there.

Leticia: Okay that's fine.

Olivia: Earl, you'll have those figures for us at the next meeting, correct?

Earl: What was that?

Olivia: You'll have the name of the contractor and the change order that complies to everything for our next CBOC.

Earl: Yeah, I can get that to you by the end of this meeting. In a couple of minutes, I'll get that to you hopefully.

Joel: Earl, I believe it was one of the architects. Does that sound familiar?

Earl: What was that?

Joel: I believe it was one of the architects.

Manoj: So Earl, will figure this out by the end of this meeting, as he looks into it. Unless we have any other questions, we'll jump into the next item on the agenda. We can come back to this. Is that okay Ms. Covarrubias?

Leticia: That's fine. Are there any other questions?

Charlie: I just had one quick question. On the committed money, you're actually committing to a certain expenditure for whatever item it should be, but on a lot of these items, they have contingencies. Are the contingencies already factored in these monies?

Earl: Yes. So, essentially that's what I was saying with this particular purchase order that we closed out. It was for contingencies. It was set up for \$20K beginning of the project. Now that the project is complete, they didn't need all the contingencies. So, we closed it out and it was showing in that committed amount, but then as we reduce that out, typically when you reduce a commitment, it goes to the expenditures, in which case the

expenditures go up by an amount usually equal to the decrease in the committed amounts. Then you wouldn't see the variance in between them. But in this case, it was for contingencies. We didn't use all the contingencies, so that showed up as a net drop between the expenditures and committed amounts resulting in that negative \$13K. But, yes they do get set up and into consideration and when we don't need them we reduce them. Sometimes, they stick out like today.

Charlie: Thank you.

Leticia: Do we have any other questions? Okay, not hearing any other questions, let's move onto the next item.

Item No. 5 **BOARD BOND PRESENTATIONS**

A. Site Improvements (Information Only)

B. Presentation from Cumming on Timeline – Sites and Progress

Manoj: We did not have a bond presentation, not a special projects presentation to the Board, the last couple of months. We are going to have one on June 9th. When we come back to the CBOC committee, we will have the presentation. But I'll briefly update on what's going on the bond side, as well as, the special projects. It's not a presentation. I'll just verbally tell you what's going on. As you saw from Earl's presentation there has not been much activity on the bond side. That's what Earl had mentioned. Although, we have finished, Jessica will confirm in a couple of minutes, we have finished, almost finished the interim housing at Newton. That was the extensive construction project, so to say, physical construction project that was going on Phase 1 and 2. The remaining 3 schools, Newton, Grandview, and Sparks. The bids, I believe, we have already pre-qualified the contractors, and that's where we are. We expect to have the construction projects start soon with the remaining 3 schools of the bond projects. I'll have Jessica come up in a minute. On the other side, special projects of the house, a couple of big projects that are going on is the LP Pool and Kitchen. We expect to finish the construction here end of August, beginning September. We are very excited! Hopefully we will have the kitchen start the new year. We are planning interim supply of lunch and breakfast from other sites for the first 2-3 weeks at La Puente High School. Once that kitchen is complete, and the health inspectors allows us, because that's the last phase where the health inspectors has to approve the kitchen. We'll be able to start our cooking and distribution of the foods from the La Puente kitchen. The 2nd project that is also going on is the Performing Arts Center. That's in progress. A couple of months back we actually were very excited when our Congresswoman Napolitano presented a check to Board Supervisor Hilda Solis for the Aquatics project. And at the same time, we were actually able to apply. There was a funding opportunity for us. We were able to apply for a \$5 million grant for the Performing Arts Center. That was the gap. The project is about \$25 million for the Performing Arts Center. The District has committed \$20 million from its own Adult Education fund. There was a gap of \$5 million. We were able to apply for the grant. We are excited for the outcome. We'll see what the outcome is. We heard

that we will know about the outcome from the Federal Government, it's an appropriation committee grant in a couple of months. So, that's the Performing Arts Center. The last significant project that is going on is the Wedgeworth interim housing for the Kindergarten. If you drive by Wedgeworth, you'll see the new Kindergarten have almost been relocated. We are waiting for the power and electrical connection. We also got the approval from DSA on the new construction. Remember, we are scoping down the Wedgeworth 2 story building to 1 story, single story, in one of the buildings. We still had to go to DSA for approval and this is approved. So hopefully, in a matter of a couple of months, Joel will come up and describe where we are. With that, Jessica, you want to add something that is going on in the Bond project?

Jessica: Like Manoj said, we are substantially complete with the interim housing. They are working on some punch list items currently and scheduling people. Busy people to get people back on site and finish up their punch lists. Last time, you asked me to formalize the schedules a little bit more because it was a little bit nebulous. At that point, we were pre-qualifying the contractors and we had the packets out to them, and we were waiting for them to come back. The packets have come back. There were a few questions and timing issues. They were asked to have, themselves do it an evaluation. The owners of the projects. Do an evaluation. So some of the owners didn't turn in their papers on time, so we extended that so the owners can get their papers back to us so we can rank them. We will be complete with that evaluation portion of the prequalification on June 8th. So, we will have our contractor group. We had about 26 contractors. And that's a combination of general contractors and sub contractors put in the packets. It seemed like a pretty good turn out. They seemed to be serious. That kind of falls into our bidding process for our next 3 projects. We have established June 13th as the day we would like to advertise for the bond, for the bidders to get documents. Then we'll have another second advertisement. They have until July 20th to review the drawings and make their bids. Then we'll open the bids on July 21st. Then the Board will take that to the Board on August 11th. Then they will sign contracts and we'll try for a notice to proceed for September 5th. This is for the 3. Grandview, Newton and Sparks. Grandview College Prep Academy, Newton Middle School, and Sparks Middle School.

Manoj: So these are the middle schools. Those are the significant large projects, compared to what we have finished in Phase 1.

Jessica: This time period, where we haven't been building, this has been us incorporating new different scope at the request of the Board. We have gone back to the Architects and they completed their corrections and scope modifications.

Reina: So the changes, you're saying, are to accommodate and please the Board from their requests to modify what was submitted, previously.

Jessica: It wasn't necessarily everything, but there was feedback on the furnishings and the storage in the classrooms. And then we went back and looked at the exact usages of the rooms and things. It's leaner now.

Reina: That would be tables not being used as storage. Was that some of the accommodations?

Jessica: What we did in the first portions of the Phases 1 and 2, we took out all of the built in cabinetry and then we put in tackable wall board. And then we didn't put in new cabinetry in except for the sink. We are now putting in 3 tall storage cabinets for each room.

Reina: Accommodating the needs.

Jessica: Yes. It's not movable furniture. It's built in.

Reina: Thank you.

Jessica: My pleasure.

Olivia: What do you attribute company owners, what prevented them from getting their basic paperwork in on time? Is that concerning?

Jessica: Well, the company owners, I think are just lazy and maybe just didn't remember or they put it to the back of their to do list. So far with the ones that we have received, they've been pretty positive. So, I don't think there's no reluctance to rate the people. I think its just time.

Olivia: Interesting. I would have trouble wanting to take a bid from someone who can't get the basic paperwork in on time. Being in construction industry, I have to tell you that, that would be a big red flag.

Jessica: We had everybody pretty much in the same boat on that. I did speak to the school official who said that he resented that he had to rate a sub contractor who did electrical work. I was shocked that he wouldn't be resentful of having to rate somebody.

Manoj: I agree with Ms. Roberts on that. We have to, from our point of view, do our due diligence and making sure that some of those items are highlighted take into consideration when awarding the bid. Ms. Ybarra has her hands up.

Adria: I do. I had a question on this topic. One, how many packets were received on time versus how many were late? Like, how many did you extend it for?

Jessica: All of the packets were received on time. There were 26. They had missing information from the owners. So, it was all of the packets except for one.

Joel: Jessica hold on. Let me just offer maybe a little bit a point of clarification. As part of the pre-qualification packet, we asked the contractors to do is rate themselves in about 12-15 different scenarios. Or 12-15 different topics. And what we asked to them to do, is not only did we ask them to rate themselves, but send a copy of that same document to

owners of projects that they have done work for. And we asked the owners to send those documents directly back to us. And we as the District were comparing how the contractors rated themselves, as opposed to the owners of those projects. So, if the contractors said, I'm a fantastic contractor and I've done these projects with no change orders. And then we hear back from the owner and the owner has a different opinion. That is what we were going after. When Jessica is saying we got some late, its not necessarily from the contractor, but it's on the owners side. So, that's where we kind of allowed for a little bit extra time for the owners of the projects to get us some of that information.

Adria: All of the contractors submitted their preliminary pre-qualifications packet on time.

Joel: Yes. It's not necessarily that we are implying that the contractors that we are prequalifying are negligent in any manner, it's the owners of those projects, for one reason or another, has taken a little bit of extra time to get that information over to us.

Adria: That's helpful. Thank you. Because the other concern was, you were holding it for maybe one or two that you were waiting for. That helps clarify.

Joel: We are, obviously as we prequalify contractors we want to do our best and due diligence to ensure that we are bringing folks on board that are responsible and will do a good job. But what we don't want to do is, we don't want to, it's a little bit of a balancing act, we don't want that pool of eligible contractors to be so small that we don't necessarily get competitive bids either. So, it's a little bit of a balancing act. As a District we are doing our best to ensure that we have responsible contractors. But we also want a good pool of folks so that we get competitive bids.

Manoj: Thanks for that information. Ms. Ybarra, to confirm that these are not bids, these are just the prequalification's.

Adria: Correct. I know. I'm sorry. The prequalification packets.

Leticia: Joel, so the owners are basically giving referrals. Is that kind of what it is? They are evaluating them, but they are also kind of giving a referral?

Joel: Well, essentially, yes. They're grading the contractors on a specific set of questions we given.

Leticia: I can see why you didn't get any back. Maybe something not negative but it just takes their time, right?

Joel: Correct. The owners of those projects, they could be other school districts, other public entities. They don't necessarily poll the District, Hacienda La Puente or anything. It's kind of a little tough to get that stuff back.

Leticia: Okay, that makes sense. Thank you. Do we have any other questions?

Jessica: It's always nice to be here.

Manoj: Thank you Jessica. Joel you want to add or augment the non bond projects a little bit?

Joel: I think everything was mentioned on everything well. Manoj, I'll say that one point of clarification. So one point of clarification, one of the things that Manoj has mentioned on the Wedgeworth project, is eliminating, the 2 story to 1 story., That is actually, we eliminated, originally there was in the plan when it was a K-8 school, there were 5 separate school buildings. We eliminated one of those in its entirety. And we reduced one from a 2 story to a single story. So we still will have 2, 2 story buildings. We have that bid, it's actually out on the street right now. We are scheduled to open that, receive those bids and open those, June 21st.

Charlie: Was there a mandatory site visit a week ago. A week and a half ago?

Joel: Yes. That is actually a mandatory job walk and that was the 3rd job walk. Contractors only had to attend 1. But we had 3 different job walks.

Charlie: They haven't picked a general contractor yet to fill the project yet.

Joel: There is not general contractor. This is going to be a multi-prime.

Charlie: Thank you.

Joel: But we haven't selected any of those contractors.

Reina: And you say multiple because...

Joel: Multi-Prime. We have a construction manager, Balfour Beatty, who is on that project. And we will open, I think 22 different bid packages. Each contractor (electrical, plumbing, roofing, etc.) will collect bids from all of those sub contractors and award to the lowest in each of those respective trades. Balfour Beatty, in essence, will be the General, in terms of, coordinating all the work.

Olivia: Balfour Beatty is going to be the Construction Manager?

Joel: Yes.

Manoj: If we don't have any questions, Ms. Covarrubias, can we move to item 5c? The Facilities Matching.

Leticia: Yes, please.

C. Facilities Matching Funds Presentation

Manoj: Thank you members of the committee. This is exciting news, when I came in, one the areas I looked at the Bond and I found out that the District has not applied for a State Matching fund. Typically, when Bond projects happen in the school districts, depending on the age of the particular schools, and what projects have been funded or not, typically we build in what we call qualifications of schools for state matching funds. For modernization and also for new construction. We discussed with the Board. The Board approved. This is a very complex process on applying for state matching funds because there are 3 agencies, OPSC (Office of Public School Construction, CDE, and State Allocation Board. 3 different entities with multiple processes of procedures of their own. Unless you are very conversed in this process, it's very difficult to manage that process and put in our application. The Board has authorized hiring CLC consultants for applying for the State Matching funds. What they did was, they did look at our each location at each school sites and find out which eligibility we have. It depends on the enrollment. The program. The nature of the program. Special Ed Classes and other classes. As well as, the age of the school building. This is the presentation they did on May 5th to the School Board. I'll breeze through the presentation because there a few, a couple of slides that I want the members of CBOC to focus on. They first went through the modernization program overview. How the state matches the funds. What's the eligibility? The way it goes is that we have to apply to the State for the matching funds. If the State has funds, then it will disperse. Typically, the State usually has a huge waiting list from all school districts. About 1000 school districts in California. Each of them apply. Depending if the State has funds or not, they will disperse. But right now there is a huge waiting list. I think it's to the tune of \$2 - \$3 billion waiting list on projects. But this Governor has not yes to a state bond election for this 2022. But he did say he was going to allocate \$4 - \$6 billion from general fund for school construction and modernization projects. We will be applying for that projects. Next slide please. If you look at this slide, I'm going to just go briefly. This is a complex process of how the State processes and determine. As you see, in each of the blocks, you'll see there is at least 15-20 steps as to how this process goes through. This consultant is going to work with us, help us, apply on our behalf with the application of the funding, making sure the eligibility is covered. Making sure we have the documents required for the audit. And then to close the audit. Typically this process takes between a year to six years, from the date of application, depending on if the State has funding or not. Next slide please. It looks at the foreplan, prior forms, prepare the eligibility analysis, and summarizes the SAB 53 forms. The State Local Contribution, the ideal match, the State matches 60% to our 40%. The District will put in 40% for modernization. For every \$40 you spend from your bond funds, you'll get about \$60 from the State, if the State has funding and if there is eligibility. Next slide please. That's the process that CLC will go through. Next slide. The current status, the CLC Qualification Process, we went through this process. Next slide please. The status of Prop 51. Prop 51 is the State bond that was passed back in 2016. That fund has been exhausted. State usually issues bonds every once in a while to fund those kind of projects. And then pays back over a period of time. Prop 51 funds are exhausted. New state funds, Legislators

are pushing for it. Governor Newsom says, no, I'll fund the State through Prop 98, or State General funds. Next slide please. This is an interesting slide. It shows how much Hacienda La Puente received from the State matching funds. Looks like the last time we received funding was \$64 million back in 2004. AS you can see, its about 18 years or so we have not applied, nor have we received any funding. This is actually what we call the leverage. Its critical that we leverage our spending with the State spending so we can spend more funding for our Facilities projects. Next slide please. This is the overall. This is exciting news. The 21/22. Each year as our buildings age, we kind of develop a new eligibility list. Thumb rule is this, Facility has to be at least 25 years old and we have not spent enough money on the facility. The State has not given us any money. Right now our eligibility is about \$32 million based on our sites. We have a detailed list of our sites a couple slides down. About \$19.7 million from the State, we are eligible. So that's the exciting part of the news. If we spend \$30 million from our side, we will receive about \$20 million. And this \$13 million we are already spending from our bond funds. As you saw, the \$70 million that we are spending from the first phase. Some of the sites area already eligible. And we will apply for the \$19.7 million cap.

Charlie: I had a quick question, please.

Manoj: Sure. Absolutely.

Charlie: On the State matching grant, is that money already allocated by the State?

Manoj: No, you have to apply. You have to be online. Then will go through the examination process. Right now we are on an application hold. They are not even reviewing any applications right now. When our time comes up, they will review the application and certify yes this application has been reviewed and application is now certified. Once the State has the funding, they will provide us the funding. It can be a reimbursement. We've already spent so much money that we will get reimbursed for the funding. And then they go through the audit process.

Charlie: Thank you.

Manoj: it will take us, like I said, anywhere between 1 – 6 years. This guarantees that at some point in time, we'll get that funding of \$19.7 million if apply.

Charlie: Thank you.

Reina: Do you have any knowledge, there's 1000 school districts out there, previously we heard which ones that get constantly support, like the largest District – Los Angeles, for example. Is there any open list of who is applying, historically as we speak? Is it accessible to the District to review? How many people are in the pipeline that has submitted?

Manoj: Yes, for the folks that heard the question, the question was, is there an active list? The list is maintained by the State Allocation Board. Next

time, we'll come with a presentation, we will show you the list, the transparent list of all the school districts and what their eligibility. You are right, there are school districts like Los Angeles Unified and Santa Ana. I worked in Santa Ana Unified. We had our own financing kind of a team in Facilities itself. It was a 7-8 person team. All their work was planning and applying for eligibility. So for small districts, unless you have someone helping us on that, it's difficult to spend and dedicate so much resources just for the financing piece, unless you have a large district and have a lot of projects. We will show you the eligibility list as to where we are at. As soon as we apply and get to the bottom, we slowly creep up as funding is available.

Reina: So, what you said was that the practice for the timelines is 1-6 years.

Manoj: Yes.

Reina: And within this time, you can utilize and spend the money and get 60% of whatever that was spent, once it is approved if you qualify, and granted that.

Manoj: That's correct. For example, we have right now eligibility for \$19.7 million. If we say we spend \$32 million from the Bond projects, the State will refund us \$19.7 million. That we can use for phase 4 and 5 and other future bond projects.

Reina: Thank you.

Manoj: That's how it works. The next slide, this is a small print, kind of displayed on the website. This shows which sites has the most eligibility. It's a difficult ready, but it's broken by each site. What's their estimated grant. What's the district share. Since we are modernizing most of the schools, I'm not too worried because we will be spending money in most of the schools and we will be eligible for the grant in most of the schools. That was exciting for our bond. Suddenly now out of \$148 million that we had allocated for the bond, right now if you think of it, our spending ability has gone up by about \$20 million. So it's \$168 million. I hope over the next 2-3 years, as the District facilities age, we will have more eligibility. We'll use these consultants to apply for more eligibility. I'll go through a couple as we go down the pipeline. This is to give you just a glimpse where we are. We're still working with these consultants to apply for the grant. There are a lot of details that Mr. Duarte, Joel, will be working on to provide some data as to what our enrollment is. The specific programs. The Teachers of that bond. Next slide please. Since we're using this consultant, we also thought it would be appropriate as you heard from the California Governor, the State is opening up Universal Kindergarten. That means all 4 year olds will be eligible to attend public school. Instead of going to preschool, the public schools will run the preschools for 4 year olds. They will come just as regular kids. For those kids, as you know, Transitional Kindergarten has different space requirements. The classroom has to be a larger size compared to a standard classroom. It has to have restroom facilities. The tiny toilets and such. It also needs to have an adjacent playground. The State, when they said, we are interested in opening up Universal Kindergarten, they said that

we are also going to fund school districts for some of the facilities for those 4 year olds. Because now we have to build or repurpose our existing classrooms for the transitional kindergartens. Either we have to build new classrooms or repurpose and make them suitable for transitional kindergarten.

Reina: Are we talking about a model of a, what I'm familiar with is a Montessori model, kind of.

Manoj: It is, kind of. Think of our regular class at any school site. At elementary school sites. We have kindergarten schools, kindergarten classrooms, which are larger, which are about 1350 sq ft. compared to the regular classroom of 960. The kindergarten rooms usually will have restrooms, adjacent restrooms, also will have adjacent playground facilities. Which is separate from the regular elementary schools. We want to keep those first kindergartens and pre kindergarteners a little safer. Kind of in a restricted space. That's what the focus is. That's where the Montessori type where the State said, we are pushing this pre-kindergarten concept but we also need to fund this pre-kindergarten classroom. The State is actually opening up funding eligibility. Our Board, since we said we opened up our District for pre-kindergarten, we will apply for those facilities grants. This is in addition to the State modernization grant. Can you go to the next slide please?

Charlie: I was going to ask you a quick question. To do this retro fit of existing buildings for the 4 year olds, that won't be this bond money? It would be other money?

Manoj: Yes. Definitely. It will be other money. It will be primarily the State money. Although the school district will have to come up with some funding of their own. The Board has not specifically said that the Bond money, because I think the Bond money can be used for our other modernization. We'll try and leverage some of the State money to see where we are.

Charlie: Thank you.

Manoj: The consultant also ran the numbers for our Preschool Programs. Right now, as you will see, Grazide Elementary and Wedgeworth Elementary are the sites based on the enrollment that are coming up that are eligible. We actually have applied for the funding for the preschool. It can be new construction or repurposing the existing site for Grazide and Wedgeworth. The question came up, why Wedgeworth and what does it do for the Wedgeworth new construction? And I explained to the Board the way it works. For example, if the State says that Wedgeworth elementary is eligible for \$4 million for our preschool funding, we have \$50 million for Wedgeworth, for the new construction. The District issued COP for that funding. So instead of using \$50 million from COP, we can use \$45 million of COP funding and \$5 million of the State money to build Wedgeworth. Basically it reduces the Certificates of Participation of \$50 million to \$45 million. That means the District has to pay less of the agreement of the COP. That's how it works. For Grazide, it will probably be a new construction. They have the land. We may have to bring our new

portables, new classrooms for Pre-K. We may have to order one of the portables to work with the Pre-Kindergarten.

Reina: So if you're look at these 2 schools. Let's say there's one at the corner of California and Fairgrove. It's an empty lot. It used to be like a Kindergarten. Used to be full of weeds. 2 weeks ago today, it's clean and ready to build something. Wouldn't that be another targeted area?

Manoj: Yes it is. As eligibility comes up, as you said California Elementary is a perfect example where we have some surplus lot. This consultant is working on some other school eligibility because this is a tight deadline. As you saw from the last bullet. The deadline was April 1, 2022. We were able to just qualify 2 quickly. We are qualifying more schools. There has to be some criteria that has to qualify. We will focus on schools that meet those classrooms on the North side, La Puente Quad and Workman Quad.

Reina: The reason why I mention it is because the need is there. You don't have to build it for them for them to come. They are already there.

Manoj: That's right. Because Amar Child Center has, even though its, our Pre Kindergarten site, which they are. The way the State is saying the program will be integrated will be under one umbrella, Pre-Kindergarten. Which will have Head Start Preschool, as well as, schools Preschools. We are also working on the instructions side. This just means that Facilities, we'll have facilities monies for those. That does not mean that we cannot convert other schools to preschools. Right now, we are running, planning to run, pre kindergarten from most of the schools on the La Puente Quad.

Reina: I'll be very interested to know where I can get somehow involved in looking into it.

Manoj: Sure.

Reina: Thank you.

Manoj: So that was the presentation. We are working on the funding piece. As we know more, we'll come back. Or the consultant will come back and we will know where we are at with the funding piece.

Leticia: Thank you for that. I have one question. I may have missed during your presentation. But the matching funds application, when do you anticipate that the application will be submitted to the State?

Manoj: This is a continuous process. It's a rolling process, as we qualify each school, we'll start applying. Hopefully within the next, I mean the Consultant is working with our Facilities to get the data. Hopefully in June, July, and August we will be submitting 3 or 4 applications that will catch us up. By September, I hope we will complete the application to be eligible for the \$19.7 million.

Leticia: So there is an application for each site?

	<p>Manoj: There are combined. We can combine sites. Yes, the application goes by site, actually. But we can also combine some of the sites to make one comprehensive package.</p> <p>Leticia: Okay, so the first application, maybe next month, you're thinking?</p> <p>Manoj: Yes. Hopefully, at the end of this month or next month. I'll have to circle back with the Consultant where we are at with the enrollment records and data. We will update the CBOC committee at our next meeting in August.</p> <p>Leticia: If there is a school in declining enrollment, would the school be eligible?</p> <p>Manoj: Yes. Even with declining enrollment schools are eligible. It depends on the enrollment of the school, the programs, and the age. The age of the school primarily drives the eligibility. If the school is already 25 years old and we have not avail this program, even with declining enrollment, we will need money to maintain our deferred maintenance or modernizing those schools.</p> <p>Leticia: Okay. Okay. That's good. Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions before we move on to Forensic Audit Update?</p> <p>Earl: I don't have a question about this, but before we get into the next section, I'll go ahead and answer the question that was asked earlier. The contingencies that we didn't need were for SVA Architects at Workman Elementary School.</p> <p>Leticia: Oh nice. Thank you. And that was which contractor again?</p> <p>Earl: SVA.</p> <p>Leticia: SVA. Good contractors. Thank you Earl.</p> <p>Manoj: But Joel with update SVA Architects. Joel.</p> <p>Joel: SVA Architects was the Architectural firm that was doing the work at Workman Elementary. So when we closed out that contract it was approximately \$14K that we had allotted in the contingency that we did not end up using.</p> <p>Leticia: Oh good. Thank you.</p>
Item No. 6	<p><u>FORENSIC AUDIT UPDATE</u></p> <p>Manoj: I reached out to Eide Bailly. Eide Bailly is the firm that is doing the forensic audit. We have a meeting with Eide Bailly next week. Oh it's tomorrow. Once we get an update, they said they are almost complete with their report. Hopefully we will schedule, depending on how their discussion goes tomorrow, we will schedule the Eide Bailly presentation for the Board on June 30th. That's the target. So just a heads up. We will let you know</p>

	<p>what time the presentation is and obviously the board meeting will be recorded for June 30th if you do not get to the board meeting, you'll be able to review it. We will synthesize the report depending on how extended the report is. Once the report is published, we will send it out to you and we will discuss the contents of it.</p> <p>Leticia: Okay, thank you.</p>
Item No. 7	<p><u>DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES</u></p> <p>Manoj: I am very excited. The Personnel Commission, we closed the application for the position on May 4th. Last month, they are going through, the Personnel Commission goes through their own process, first of all a written test. They have conducted a written test. They are in the process of conducting their interviews. The way they conduct the interview is they have the participant come in. They have questionnaires that they answer to on a zoom platform. Then they are reviewed by peers. Personnel Commission reaches out to other school districts. Facilities Directors of CBO's and have them review the responses from each applicant. Then they rate the applicant and provide us with the eligibility list. Personnel Commission is going to provide the eligibility list to us on June 6th. Hopefully we will have the list by our next board meeting. Once that happens, typically what happens is, the school district then conducts their own interview and it comes up to Executive Cabinet and we will interview and select the candidate. We find one and take it to the Board for the June 30th meeting.</p> <p>Olivia: How many applications were there?</p> <p>Manoj: Personnel Commission says there were 25 applicants. But they will typically screen out 1 or 2, 4 or 5 applications before it comes. The eligibility list has anywhere between 5 - 10. This is a good time because this is coming to the close of a school year. Folks looking for a change at this point of time. And also folks who are interested in joining Hacienda La Puente. I'm excited. I told Personnel Commission and also to our Board that there are 2 positions, Director of Facilities. One would be for our regular non bond projects, repairs and maintenance, regular. And the other would be if we can get specifically to follow Bond and special projects. If we get 2 good candidates, we will select 2. If we get 1 good candidate, we'll select 1. And then, Joel will not like it, but Joel will continue to support our Bonds. That's the status of the Director of Facilities.</p> <p>Leticia: Thank you. Just one question, if you were to get 2 good candidates, which would be awesome, and one of them is for the bond project, what happens when the bond project ends?</p> <p>Manoj: Typically, the Bond projects, as you saw, from our presentation, we have multiple projects going on. Based on my experience, what we find is if we get 1 facilities person to focus both on new construction and repairs and maintenance. Because the new construction projects are always kind of a novelty the person tends to focus more on the construction and the repairs, deferred maintenance gets a backseat. Particularly for a school district of this size, with 31 facilities, I would also want to make sure that our</p>

	<p>repairs and maintenance gets the same focus as the new construction. Your question was, once the bond phase out, typically the person who we hire for bond, and when the projects end, the person will be either focused into something else or if there is no job, then we will have to most probably end that particular position.</p> <p>Leticia: Okay. Thank you. Let's move onto the next item.</p>
Item No. 9	<p><u>CDE WAIVER UPDATE</u></p> <p>Manoj: We did apply to CDE. This was, as I mentioned to the oversight committee, I had personally had discussions with CDE on the waiver process. It's the State Board of Education. There is a blank general waiver form we filled out. They asked for that this needs to be for any general waiver, we need to consult with our associations. So we did the consultation. The next State Board of Education board meeting is on July 13th. And they typically prepare the agenda a month in advance. Our agenda is solid. We will wait for the board meeting, the State Board meeting on 7/13 and 7/14. Hopefully they will grant us the waiver. I looked at some of the SB waivers of this nature of Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee. It's usually a consent item and they just approve, unless there is some protest which I don't anticipate at this point in time.</p> <p>Gabriela: I have a question.</p> <p>Manoj: Sure.</p> <p>Gabriela: Information was brought to me that all 3 of the unions were against this waiver request. Do we know why? Why they were against moving this waiver forward?</p> <p>Manoj: Yeah. In fact, I was a little curious as to when. Like I said, the State Board of Education, the process for general waiver is we need to consult. We don't need to get approval from the associations. And I did explain the process of what the waiver is, what the CBOC committee does. It really does not cross spots with our associations at all. Because the CBOC primary duty is overseeing the Bond expenditures. The reason that we received, again, was nothing to do with particularly with CBOC, it says the Bond was handled not in a proper fashion for the first couple of years. So, they had reservations. The other association, HLPTA, there was an issue with the negotiation, which is outside of CBOC, so they said just because the way that the negotiation went, they were not able to support the Bond waiver request at this point of time.</p> <p>Gabriela: Okay, thank you.</p> <p>Manoj: Thank you Ms. Navar. That was the same question from the Board member as to why the association not in favor. But I really don't honestly see a process where the CBOC committee intercepts with the associations.</p>

	<p>Leticia: Do we have any other questions regarding CDE Waiver Updates? So no other questions, if we can move on to identifying points of discussion for upcoming meeting.</p>
<p>Item No. 10</p>	<p><u>IDENTIFY POINTS OF DISCUSSION FOR UPCOMING MEETING</u></p> <p>Leticia: Does anybody have any item they would like to see at the next agenda on the CBOC meeting?</p> <p>Reina: I would suggest that if there is a possibility through the summer because its upon us, to see whether we can visit the places that are being modernized to see the end results as we did in the beginning when we started, please. That way we can at least find out through the District whether there is also a better way to educate community about what is being done. At least on my end, very little is heard of. I think the fact that we have very little participation. I know the department, the District is doing everything they can to announce the meetings when they are and who is sitting on it. We are trying to do the best we can to oversee how it is done and where its going. I would love to see whether we can, at least go back when the school year starts. And start introducing. Hopefully by then, the pandemic is not as bad as it has been for the last, you know, over 22 months. And then we can celebrate the accomplishments. I don't know. What do you guys think?</p> <p>Leticia: So, Reina, you're saying to schedule site visits? Is that what you're thinking?</p> <p>Reina: To the places that have been completed. To the places that have been more invested on. So, let's be selective.</p> <p>Leticia: Okay. So we can bring that to the next meeting as an agenda item. A listing of sites that have Bond investments. Is there anything else that anyone wants to see? We have our regular standing agenda items that we will have for the next meeting. If there is something that wants to be added, or if something comes to mind, go ahead and send it to Lelia, okay?</p> <p>Charlie: If I could ask if you could close the meeting in memory of the students and teachers who will killed Uvalde last week.</p> <p>Leticia: Yes.</p> <p>Charlie: Thank you.</p> <p>Leticia: Yes. Thank you for that. It was very devastating. Maybe we can add something to the agenda. I know it's not part of the CBOC bond, but the safety of our students. What are we doing at this District? Is that something we can add, although it's not bond related?</p> <p>Manoj: Yes. I think if the CBOC committee itself decides to. It's not a material change in the agenda, just a symbolic item, you should be able to add it.</p>

Item No. 11	<p><u>NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING</u></p> <p>8/3/22</p>
Item No. 12	<p><u>ADJOURN</u></p> <p>Leticia: Yes. I would like to adjourn this meeting and keep the families who have impacted by this devastating tragedy in our prayers and in our thoughts. Thank you very much.</p> <p>Moved by Charlie Klinakis and seconded by Reina Schmitz for Adjournment at 7:40 pm.</p> <p>6 yes 0 No 0 Abstain</p>