The SAB Program Review Subcommittee meeting on January 16

Testify about your district's experience with the SFP Modernization Program. Be prepared to discuss the following items:

1. **An overview of your district's modernization program.** SAUSD has 34 current modernization projects that are either approved by the SAB, under construction, or substantially complete.

2. **Some specific examples of completed modernization work.**

   The following are recent examples of completed modernization projects that received insufficient funds to complete the needed upgrades for aging facilities. Even the project that received the most SFP modernization funding (Santa Ana High School – nearly $15M) did not receive adequate funding to address all identified facilities needs.

Project Name	Date Built	Total Funding	Construction Budget (75%)	Total Committed (To Fund Essential Scope)	Regulatory Scope (Fire, Life/Safety, Access, Structural)	Core Improvements	Educational Program/Core Improvements	Aesthetics	Technology
Fremont ES	1974	$2,570,430	$1,924,935	$2,825,530	Ramps, fountains, FA, restrooms, security system	(unfunded scope: library upgrades)	(unfunded scope: wall replacement & PE equipment)	Flooring	X
Harvey ES	1979	$2,650,620	$1,984,988	$2,927,637	Restrooms, doors, FA	(unfunded scope: library upgrades)	(unfunded scope: wall replacement)	Windows, lighting	X
Hoover ES	1973	$2,624,810	1,968,607	$3,052,136	Door landings, doors, signage, restrooms, FA, fountains, PA, casework, electrical	(unfunded scope: kitchen upgrades)	(unfunded scope: wall replacement)		X
Monroe ES	1973	$2,347,252	$1,757,803	$2,735,538	Restrooms, FA, dropoff, ramp, soffits	(unfunded scope: kitchen upgrades)	(unfunded scope: wall replacement)	Fencing, paint	X
Santa Ana HS	1937	$24,959,435	$18,719,573	$24,109,621	Doors, signage, handrails, ramp, restrooms, theater seating fountains, HVAC electrical	Theater upgrades (unfunded scope: Locker room, gym, & kitchen upgrades)	Tackable walls, whiteboards	Paint, windows, floors	(unfunded scope: classroom technology)
Wilson ES	1953	$6,167,698	$4,265,774	$5,217,584	Lift, elevator, ramp, FA, electrical, HVAC	(unfunded scope: MPR, library & kitchen upgrades; & 50% of Bldgs. B, C, & D)	Tackable walls	Restrooms, drywall, ceilings, casework, paint, doors, flooring, lighting, sidewalks, fencing	X

3. **State vs. district funding – what the program actually covers with the state allowance versus the need.**

The state allowance is insufficient to address the needs of aging facilities, as shown in the examples above. Grants monies typically are sufficient to fund only State regulatory requirements. In some cases, the grant amount does not even fund critical facilities needs. For example, SAUSD has a handful of schools that were built in the 1970s with the open-plan (no walls) classroom design. To solve the problem, make-shift classroom walls have since been put in place, including demountable partitions, or in some cases, rolling cabinets. The original modernization scope of work involved replacing the demountable wall partitions with permanent classroom walls. However, the SFP modernization funding received in 2012 for these projects was only enough to address the access, fire, life, and safety requirements.

In the specific example of Harvey Elementary School, the total estimated project cost to modernize the school was $4,188,155, as shown on the DSA project tracking website. However, the SFP modernization grant amount received was $1,590,372, for a project total of $2,650,620. The permanent wall construction had to be eliminated from the project scope. This issue also occurred at four other elementary schools. These schools still have acoustical distraction issues affecting the everyday education of the students.

4. **Where the current modernization program fails to meet district needs.**

The grant amount is insufficient to fund the needs of 25-year-old facilities. With increasingly costly regulatory requirements consuming most of the modernization grant monies, there are little to no funds to improve aesthetics or the educational environment, such as paint or windows, let alone classroom technology that is so crucial to the way children learn today. In some cases the District used supplemental funding sources, such as E-Rate and SFP Emergency Repair Program grants to fund the remaining scope of needed facilities upgrades.

5. **The proportional share state and local in your experience … with one or more examples.**

6. **The "erosion" and impact of state regulatory requirements diminishing any improvement of the educational learning environment.**

Required construction improvements consume most of the modernization funding, leaving little for educational program upgrades like technology. Without supplemental funding sources, such as Federal E-Rate funding, technology upgrades for the District's modernization projects would not be feasible.

7. **What compelled you to complete the work – major repairs needed, building deterioration, health and safety, AB 300? How did you decide what to include as components of the projects to undertake?**

Community/parent pressure to keep up the aesthetics; improved maintenance; to foster 21st century schools; etc.

8. **Anything else that state leaders should know about modernization under the SFP.**

The formula for modernization eligibility is impractical to address the needs of aging portable buildings. Portables are used by districts to be relocated if needed during fluctuations in enrollment. By having the modernization eligibility follow the DSA A#, a portable's modernization eligibility is erased when it's relocated to another site. Therefore, districts have portables that are well over 20 years old but are not eligible for Modernization.