

ADOPTED
MINUTES OF THE
MEASURE E
CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2350 West Latham Avenue, Hemet, California 92545
Meeting of September 19, 2002

The meeting of the Measure E Citizens' Oversight Committee was called to order at 6:40 p.m. on Wednesday, September 19, 2002, at the District Administration Office located at 2350 West Latham Avenue, Hemet, CA 92545.

Committee Members Present: Mr. Joe Wojcik, Chairman
 Mr. Gerry Agnes, Vice Chairman
 Mr. James Calkins
 Ms. Michelle Jenkins
 Ms. Margaret (Peggy) Kissack
 Mr. Robert Purbeck, Jr.
 Mr. Rohn West

District Staff Present: Mr. Richard Beck, Assistant Superintendent,
 Business Services
 Ms. Sandy Packham, Director, Facilities Planning
 Ms. Sally Robinson, Attorney, Bowie, Arneson,
 Wiles & Giannone
 Ms. Joyce Brightman, Accountant, Facilities Dept.
 Mrs. Sandy Treece, Administrative Assistant

Committee Members Absent: Ms. Barbara Johnston
 Mr. John McCain

I. PRELIMINARY

A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call

Mr. Wojcik called the meeting to order, indicating that a quorum had been established. Mr. Beck introduced members of staff who were present.

C. Approval of Agenda

On a motion by Mrs. Kissack, seconded by Mr. West, the agenda for the meeting was approved.

D. Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. West, seconded by Mrs. Jenkins, the minutes of the July 19, 2002, meeting was approved as amended by the Committee.

II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

There were no comments from the Committee members.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

IV. SPECIAL ITEMS

A. Financial Reports

Mr. Beck reviewed an analysis of how the district arrived at the amount of the bond and the needs of the schools, the information that was provided to the voters – “List of School Facilities Projects to be Funded with Proceeds of Bonds”, the “Facilities Needs Assessment” prepared by the district’s architects, PJHM Architects, dated January 9, 2001, and updated November 30, 2001, and excerpts from “Status of School Facilities, Needs Assessment and Five Year Plan 2002-2006”.

Bond proceeds have been designated for five new schools and eight modernization projects with 80% state matching funding and 20% district funding. The state had changed the match percentage to 60/40, but AB 40 recently passed, allowing the 80/20 split to districts with applications in by April 2002.

Mr. Agnes and Mr. Wojcik questioned whether the amounts on the lists correlated to the Measure E local funding plan. Mr. Beck explained that the amounts on the Facilities Needs Assessment were fluid and subject to change due to priorities, soft costs, and the current cost of construction, economy, etc.

Mr. Agnes asked whether there was equity in what was being spent on each school. Mr. Beck explained that the district’s goal was to address all health and safety needs at every school. Those schools that are part of the modernization projects will receive more funding due to the matching funds from the state. Measure E was approved for a certain amount of money and was not specific to where the money would be spent. It was to implement a School Facilities Plan and Exhibit A of the bond language. It is the Governing Board’s responsibility to set priorities. The plan would also include funds from the state, developer fees and deferred maintenance.

Ms. Packham distributed the Modernization Funding Summary and explained the constant changes that occur with state funding and the implications to the district. She pointed out that the figures for the modernization projects had changed back and forth twice since the passage of Measure E due to changes at the state level.

Expenditure Summary Report

Ms. Packham reviewed the Expenditure Summary Report, explaining that it includes expenditures so far from Measure E and the State Modernization Grant, as well as a list of proposed expenditures and a summary budget for each school. The report was based on the 60/40 split; and due the recent change in the split and to the complexity of the report, an updated budget will be provided to the committee on a monthly basis reflecting the 80/20 split.

Mr. West questioned the order of priority and the lack of specifics in Exhibit A of Measure E, that the district could spend the money however it chose. Ms. Packham explained that on the modernization projects, the expenditures must follow the requirements of the Division of State Architect (DSA). This includes ADA requirements such as access accommodations, fire alarms, and health, life safety issues, as well as asbestos removal. Mrs. Jenkins said it was important that the public understand about these requirements. She also mentioned about the replacement of playground equipment. Mr. Beck explained that Ms. Packham was a certified playground safety inspector. Ms. Packham explained that, based on the Playground Safety Act, all playground equipment must now meet the state requirements.

Mr. Agnes asked for a summary of money being spent and where for the most important needs. Health and Safety issues are a top priority. Mr. Beck said that the Board will be making the final decisions on how the discretionary monies are spent.

Ms. Packham explained how priorities may change as a result of emergency situations. Ms. Packham explained that something had been done at each school during the summer. All schools now have lunch shelters and are getting security fencing.

She stated the fact that sometimes while making a change or an upgrade, it will trigger the need to bring another area up to code requirements. Many of the improvements to the schools will not be visible to the public; it may be in infrastructure. There are no superficial extra items included in the project lists.

Mr. Beck explained that some building maintenance issues, such as roofing, are being handled with deferred maintenance moneys.

B. Project Update

The Committee reviewed the monthly Project Update. Ms. Packham reported that the Harmony and McSweeny Elementary School projects were on schedule. She also reported on the numerous projects completed during the summer including a critical electrical renovation at Acacia Middle School.

C. Statutory Report of Measure E Oversight Committee

Ms. Sally Robinson reviewed the information provided regarding the required report from the Citizens' Oversight Committee. An outline was provided as a possible matrix for the report. The committee discussed the time lines for the report. Mr. West asked whether a report would be required for the 2001/2002 fiscal year since the committee had only had one meeting during that time on June 19, 2002. Ms. Robinson indicated that the committee must report each year from the time the committee is formed. Mr. Beck indicated that the district's annual audit report would be prepared and presented to the Governing Board in November, that the committee's report would be tied to that report. It was determined that the Ad Hoc committee would discuss these issues and report back to the Oversight Committee at the November meeting.

D. Measure E Tax Rates

Mr. Beck reviewed with the committee information provided from the Riverside County Office of Education regarding the tax rates and bond interest repayment schedule. The current rate is \$36.29 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation.

E. Term and Election of Officers

Ms. Robinson explained that the current officers' term would expire in July 2003. Due to the committee's meeting schedule, officers would need to be elected in May 2003 or a special meeting would have to be scheduled in June. The committee decided to make the decision at the March 2003 meeting.

F. Future Issues for Committee Consideration

Mr. Beck suggested providing the committee with examples of contracts, bids and architect's agreement. He also suggested photos of ongoing projects.

Mr. Wojcik requested a summary of areas where the district is saving money, such as reusing architectural plans, unexpected costs and savings.

G. Project Site Inspection

The committee discussed the possibility of visits to the various schools to see firsthand the construction projects. Mr. West moved, seconded by Mrs. Kissack, to schedule group visits three to five schools each quarter until all schools have been visited. Ms. Packham will develop a schedule and committee members will attend, if possible. Committee members also discussed visiting schools individually and reporting back to the group at the next meeting.

H. Ad Hoc Committee

Mr. Beck was instructed to schedule a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee before the meeting in November. Issues to be considered by the Ad Hoc Committee were the content, format, frequency of the annual report.

I. Other

Mr. Beck stated that Proposition 47 would provide \$36.5 million if it passes in November, according to the information prepared by the district's Facilities Department.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 8: 53 p.m.