

**Assembly Education Committee  
Infrastructure Hearings  
Summary of Recommendations**

Item	Issue	Question(s)	Recommendation
<b>NEW CONSTRUCTION</b>			
<b>A</b>	Overview and Estimate of Needs	What is the projected amount of unmet need for new construction projects over the next two years? Four years? Should the Legislature approve bond proposals to fund an estimated two-year need? Four-year need? Eight-year need?	Survey districts on what they think their local needs are. Recommend that the K-12 education bond cover two election cycles for a total of four years of funding.
<b>B. Grant Adequacy</b>			
<b>B1</b>	Adjustment of base per-pupil grant calculation	Does the committee wish to recommend the base per-pupil grant amounts be adjusted? If so, how?	The committee recognized that this is a growing problem that needs to be addressed. The Education Committee encourages an increase in the per pupil grants and that the bond include either an adjusted amount for facilities grants or that it prescribe a process to adjust the current grants.
<b>B2</b>	Adjustment for increased cost of construction		The committee recommends semi-annual adjustments to the per pupil grants.
<b>C. Overcrowded Schools</b>			
<b>C1</b>	Multitrack Year Round Education (MTYRE)- Eliminating penalties and incentives	Should the substantial Enrollment Requirement adjustment be eliminated for districts in MTYRE? Should the school construction eligibility be restored for districts that currently receive Year-Round Grant funds?	The committee recommends that the Conference committee include in the bond statutory changes needed to phase-out both penalties and incentives in existing law that are designed to promote the implementation of MTYRE schedules.
<b>C2</b>	Relieving Overcrowding- Site density/portable classroom exclusions	Should a school facilities bond address overcrowded schools? If yes, how should the state define "overcrowding?" Is the portable classroom exclusion proposed in AB 58 (Nunez) the approach that should be taken?	The committee recommends that the bond define overcrowded schools as schools that have both high density and portable classrooms. For these sites, seats in portable classrooms would be excluded from the count of existing capacity for the purpose determining school facilities funding eligibility on overcrowded schoolsites.
<b>C3</b>	Alternative Enrollment Projection Methods- Extension of AB 491 (Goldberg)	Should the provisions of AB 491 (Goldberg) apply to future bonds?	The committee recommends that the flexibility provided in AB 491 to seek approval of alternative enrollment projection methodologies be extended to future bonds.
<b>C4</b>	Critically Overcrowded Schools (COS) Program	Should the COS program be extended in order to provide additional time for school districts with overcrowded schools to meet project funding requirements?	No. Address eligibility issues instead.

**Assembly Education Committee  
Infrastructure Hearings  
Summary of Recommendations**

Item	Issue	Question(s)	Recommendation
<b>D. Developer Issues</b>			
<b>D1</b>	Repeal of <i>Mira, Hart, Murrieta</i> Line of Cases	Should the provisions in SB 50 (L. Greene), Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998, triggering a return to <i>Mira</i> be repealed?	Pass the issue on to the Conference Committee without recommendation
<b>D2</b>	School Facility Needs Analysis-Credit for Local Revenue	Should the committee recommend the requirement that a school district in the development of its needs analysis calculate a credit in the amount of available local revenues which would be applied against the builder fee?	Pass the issue on to the Conference Committee without recommendation
<b>GOVERNOR'S PROPOSAL</b>			
<b>A</b>	Overcrowded Schools	Should the committee recommend developing a separate program for overcrowded school sites that would not impact the districtwide eligibility system that is currently in place?	See "B2" above
<b>B</b>	Charter Schools	What is the need? How much should be allocated for charter schools in the next round of funding? What is the projected need? Should use of new construction funding be expanded for charter schools? What is the difference between "rehabilitation" and modernization? Should limits (caps) be placed on the funding? If so, what limits are appropriate? Should an inflation factor be included? Should charter school eligibility be based on district eligibility? If so, should districts be consulted (rather than just notified) on the establishment of the facilities?	The Chair recommends the committee adopt the following principles related to charter school facilities: (1) Promote the best use of existing school facilities for charter schools through the provision of appropriate incentives; by assuring the availability of funding to renovate and improve existing facilities to meet the needs of a charter school; and by requiring that, when existing facilities are offered but rejected by a charter school, that the charter school document for the SAB why the existing facilities were unsuitable prior to receiving eligibility for new construction funding. (2) New charter school facilities must not exacerbate overcrowding and must be approved within the context of a school districts master facilities plan. The chair further recommends that this is not a separate allocation.

**Assembly Education Committee  
Infrastructure Hearings  
Summary of Recommendations**

Item	Issue	Question(s)	Recommendation
C	Career Technical Education	Does the committee wish to make a recommendation on an amount for a Career Technical Education Program? How much should be allocated? How would funds be allocated? Does the committee wish to include modernization funding? What would the eligibility calculation be for modernization?	The committee recommends allocating up to \$1 billion for CTE, but to be available for allocation only after appropriation by the Legislature pursuant to the development of state CTE policy that addresses several issues: Ensuring that ROC/ROP's have access to facilities funds; ensuring that low income areas in the state have equitable access; ensuring that we are not creating a system where we isolate students into non-college tracks; ensuring there is a sequence of courses; addressing flexibility in categories for eligibility; and considering other issues that will need to be addressed such as teacher supply.
D	Small High Schools	How does the new program proposed by the Governor relate to the existing pilot program?	Address the operational cost issues. Ensure that expanding the program is a thoughtful process and that we look at the evaluations of the existing pilot program as we move forward. Look at the numbers and what the need is. The committee supports the concept of small schools.
E	Energy Efficiency	Same as Green School discussion	See "C" on next page
F	CEQA Exemption	Is this an issue relevant to the discussion of school facility needs?	Address this issue in separate legislation, not the bond bill.
<b>Other Issues and Needs</b>			
A	Seismic Safety	Does the committee wish to recommend that an amount be included in a school facilities bond for seismic safety evaluation and retrofit?	Authorize a "downpayment" of \$400 million for seismic retrofitting of the most vulnerable school buildings identified by the DSA in the AB 300 report.
B	ADA Compliance	Should the committee recommend that modernization funding be adjusted for the extraordinary costs of compliance with ADA requirements? Should the adjustment be a maximum of 15%?	Provide funding necessary for compliance with ADA and provide an adjustment to the modernization grants, determined based on the report currently being compiled by DSA.

**Assembly Education Committee  
Infrastructure Hearings  
Summary of Recommendations**

Item	Issue	Question(s)	Recommendation
C	Green Schools	Does the committee wish to make a recommendation for future bonds to include funding for all new public school facilities be built to CHPS standards?	Require all new schools to be built to CHPS standards and encourage incentives for school districts to incorporate CHPS standards in modernization projects.
D	Minimum Essential Facilities	Does the committee wish recommend that proposed bonds take into account the funding necessary to build complete schools and the funding needed to provide for new construction or renovation of existing sites to meet minimum essential facility standards, as defined pursuant to future legislation?	The committee requested OPSC to provide information on current policy and on any information available on whether school districts may or may not be putting facility resources to best use. The committee further recommended having a more extensive discussion on this subject when the bill on Minimum Essential Facilities (AB 1846) comes to our committee.
E	Labor Compliance Programs	Should the provisions of AB 1506 (Wesson) apply to future bonds?	Yes the provisions requiring school districts to ensure that prevailing wages are being paid to the construction workers buliding schools with state bond money should apply to future bonds.
F	Joint-Use		The committee recommends \$50 million set aside for Joint-Use and recommends expanding slightly the allowable uses of this funding to include land acquisition and redesign expenses for joint-use projects.