



Proposition 1D: Kindergarten–University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006

If passed on Nov. 7, this bond measure would provide \$10.416 billion in facilities funds for public education. The bulk of the funding—\$7.329 billion—is earmarked for K–12 schools, with the remaining \$3.087 billion for higher education.

Like past California school bond measures, Proposition ID has funds for new school construction and modernization, overcrowded schools, and joint-use projects. But Proposition ID allocates a larger portion of the funds to modernization than in recent measures and is unique in several ways. Proposition ID:


- Provides the largest sum ever for charter schools—\$500 million—and makes it easier for them to obtain funding for facilities.
- Allocates \$500 million for new or reconfigured career-technical education facilities and equipment.
- Allows up to \$200 million of the new construction and modernization funding to be used for small high schools or “schools within a school.”
- Allocates \$100 million for incentive grants for environmentally friendly construction.
- Requires that \$200 million of the \$890 million allocated to the University of California be used to support medical education programs, with an emphasis on telemedicine (long-distance medical care using computers and telecommunication devices).

Furthermore, Proposition ID is part of a bipartisan package of ballot measures (IA through IE)—approved by two-thirds of the state Legislature and signed by the governor. The package includes \$37.3 billion in bonds to shore up the state’s infrastructure.

Bonds help provide needed classrooms

Most California school districts rely on state-issued general obligation bonds to help them fund school facilities. To qualify for state money, districts must supply matching funds. For new construction, the state and district each pay half the cost. For modernization projects, the state pays 60% and districts pay 40%. Hardship cases, as defined by the Office of Public School

figure 1 | How Proposition 1D funding would be distributed



*Includes almost \$200 million for repairing or replacing buildings that pose an unreasonable seismic risk as determined by the state architect.

EDSOURCE 9/06

Construction (OPSC), are exempt from some or all the matching funds requirement.

Over the past decade, voters have approved a total of \$28.1 billion in state bonds for K–12 school facilities, according to the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO). About \$3.7 billion of these funds had not been spent as of June 2006, according to the OPSC.

However, the OPSC estimates that over the next five years (2006–07 through 2011–2012) California will need more than \$6 billion in state matching funds to build 18,000 new classrooms. Another \$5.3 billion will be needed to modernize more than 61,000 classrooms that are 25 years or older. Together the new and remodeled classrooms would serve almost 2.1 million K–12 students.

Crowded schools and joint-use projects

Under Proposition ID, \$1 billion will be available to districts with severely overcrowded schools to replace portable classrooms with new permanent classrooms, unless the portables are being used to implement a class size reduction program. The districts would also have to remove portables from overcrowded

school sites and reduce the total number of portables within the district. The LAO estimates that 1,800 schools (or about 20% of all schools) are eligible for this funding, which requires a 50% local match except for hardship cases.

The measure also sets aside \$29 million to build or reconfigure existing joint-use facilities, which are used by K–12 schools and other public entities, such as libraries or colleges. And the state can use up to \$21 million from previous bond measures for such purposes. In addition, community colleges, CSU, and UC must annually consider building or remodeling facilities that could be jointly used by more than one higher education institution.

Charter schools

Proposition ID supports the growing charter school movement and relieves pressure on school districts, which are required to provide charter schools of a certain size with facilities that are equal to other district facilities. Besides allocating \$500 million, Proposition ID has rules governing the distribution of funds, including some that change existing law:

- Charter schools that meet certain requirements can apply directly to the state for funding to modernize school facilities.
- The measure gives preference to charters that use existing district facilities. In addition, funds are to be distributed fairly across the state and among grade levels, with preference given to charters that are located in overcrowded districts or low-income areas and to those that are run by nonprofits.
- Under current law, if the state provides facility funds for a charter school, the school district's eligibility for future facility funds for its noncharter schools is reduced accordingly. Proposition ID appears to require this reduction in eligibility only when the charter school provides seats for the district's "unhoused" pupils. (If the number of pupils in a district exceeds seating capacity standards, the district has "unhoused" pupils.) However, the language in the proposition is somewhat open to interpretation. If the measure passes, regulations will clarify this provision.
- A per-pupil funding cap is repealed in favor of a cap based on the maximum costs allowable for new construction.

To qualify, charter school operators must show that they have a track record for operating fiscally sound schools. A 50% local match is also required but can be borrowed from state bond funds and paid back over time.

Career-tech education

Proposition ID reflects the growing interest in revitalizing career tech or vocational education to help students—particularly those who may not be college bound—prepare for the more sophisticated requirements of today's job market. Advocates also say that hands-on career-tech programs encourage students to stay in high school.

How can I find out more?

For more information, go to EdSource's election page:
www.edsource.org/pubivo_elect1106.cfm

To be eligible for the \$500 million in facilities funding, school districts, county offices of education, and direct-funded charter schools must match state funds (50%) with their own funds or money from private industry groups or a joint powers authority (such as a regional occupational center). The local contribution can be borrowed from state bond funds and paid back over time. In addition, those seeking funding must develop a comprehensive career tech plan and have an active career tech advisory committee.

Only high schools can get new construction funds—up to \$3 million per project. However, both high schools and joint powers authorities can receive modernization funding—up to \$1.5 million per project.

Small high schools

In another effort to keep students in high school, reformers have supported a more personalized environment through smaller learning communities. Under Proposition ID, up to \$200 million can be used to support a state pilot project that encourages the creation of small high schools (500 students or fewer) or "schools within a school." Districts must provide a 40% local match.

"Green" construction

When school districts apply for funding under Proposition ID, they must consider designs and materials that promote environmentally sound construction such as making efficient use of energy and water, or relying on recycled and less toxic materials.

In addition, districts can apply for incentive grants to implement green construction. The proposition allocates \$100 million for this purpose. Districts have to provide matching funds: 50% (new) or 40% (modernization).

Costs of bonds are spread over time

Using general obligation (G.O.) bonds to finance public facilities is like a family taking out a mortgage to purchase a house. Long-term borrowing allows the state to spread the cost of facilities over time. Although state bonds do not require a tax increase, they do use revenues that could be spent for other purposes.

The cost of bonds depends on the interest rates in effect when they are sold and the time period over which they are repaid—typically 30 years for G.O. bonds. If Proposition ID bonds were sold at an average interest rate of 5%, the LAO estimates the cost would be about \$20.3 billion to pay off both principal (\$10.4 billion) and interest (\$9.9 billion). Thus, for every \$1 borrowed, the cost of paying it back is almost \$2. However, after adjusting for inflation, the LAO estimates the cost at considerably less: about \$1.30 for each \$1 borrowed.

As of July 1, 2006, the state had about \$45 billion of infrastructure-related General Fund bond debt, according to the LAO. The measures on November's ballot—propositions IB through IE and Proposition 84—add up to \$42.7 billion in bonds, almost doubling the current debt. If the proposed bond measures were all approved by voters and sold over a 10-year period, the cost would average roughly \$2 billion annually, the LAO says. For Proposition ID only, the average payment would be about \$680 million per year. (To put these numbers in context, total General Fund expenditures are expected to be about \$101 billion in 2006–07.)

Pros and cons of Proposition 1D

Proponents of the measure include Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, state Treasurer Phil Angelides, and a wide range of education and other groups, such as the California State PTA, the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), the League of Women Voters of California, and the California Chamber of Commerce. They say there is a documented and continuing need for funds to modernize facilities, relieve overcrowded conditions, and ensure that schools are earthquake safe.

Opponents of the measure—such as the Libertarian Party, state Senator Tom McClintock, and the California Taxpayer Protection Committee—say the state has too much debt, schools have received enough bond money, and the measure funds untested programs. They also say Proposition ID is unfair because all state taxpayers will have to pay off the bonds for several decades even though not all school districts will receive bond money. ☐



EdSource is a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization established in California in 1977. Independent and impartial, EdSource strives to advance the common good by developing and widely distributing trustworthy, useful information that clarifies complex K-12 education issues and promotes thoughtful decisions about California's public school system.

Reprints, permitted with credit to EdSource. For a version in Spanish, go to: www.edsource.org/spa_pub.cfm

© COPYRIGHT 2006 BY EDSOURCE, INC.

Kindergarten – University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006

Facts at a Glance

Yes on 1D is an investment in our schools, in our children, and in California's future. Providing a quality education for our kids is the most important thing we can do to invest in their future. The best way to grow our economy and create good-paying jobs is to create world-class public schools that give our students the skills they need to succeed in the workforce. ***That's why parents, teachers, business groups and seniors have joined to actively support Yes on 1D.***

Yes on 1D:

Make Schools Earthquake Safe.

The California State Architect says that more than 7,000 schools aren't earthquake-safe. The safety of our students should be our top priority. Yes on 1D will allocate funds to retrofit and upgrade our schools and colleges to ensure they can withstand the impact of natural disasters like earthquakes. This measure also includes funding directed at our kids' safety, including school security, playground safety, removal of asbestos, and replacing leaky and dangerous roofs.

Relieves Overcrowding.

California classrooms are overcrowded. Students are trying to learn in schools that house 75% more students than they were built to accommodate. By building more classrooms, Yes on 1D will relieve overcrowding, help reduce class sizes and give students a real opportunity to learn.

Invests in Career Technical Education.

Many students who don't plan on going to college need career education and vocational training, but our schools don't have facilities to accommodate them. Yes on 1D updates our schools with new technology and builds vocational education facilities so that all students are given the skills they need to get a job and succeed in life.

Improves Access to Technology in the Classroom.

To prepare for the jobs of the future, our children need to learn with the latest technology. Yes on 1D will help pay for wiring classrooms and providing 21st Century technology for our students.

Invests in Higher Education.

California's community colleges and state universities (UC and CSU) continue to grow exponentially. With community colleges providing instruction to over 2 million students every year, and California's universities expected to grow to accommodate nearly 650,000 students, we need to provide funding to modernize and upgrade teaching and research facilities to remain competitive with other states.

Provides Strict Accountability to Ensure Funds are Spent Properly.

Funds from Prop 1D will be subjected to independent audits, and misusing them is a crime punishable by time in jail. This information will be made available to the public so taxpayers can ensure their money is spent properly and will NOT go to waste.

Official Endorsement List

As of 8/30/06

BOND AUTHOR

- Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez

ELECTED OFFICIALS

- Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
- State Treasurer Phil Angelides
- State Senate pro Tempore Don Perata
- U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer
- U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein

ORGANIZATIONS

- Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
- Association of California Construction Managers (ACCM)
- California Alliance for Jobs
- California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO)
- California Business Roundtable
- California Chamber of Commerce
- California Democratic Party
- California Federation of Teachers (CFT)
- California Labor Federation
- California National Organization for Women PAC
- California Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
- California School Boards Association (CSBA)
- California State Council of Laborers
- California School Employees Association (CSEA)
- California Taxpayers' Association
- California Teachers Association
- Campaign for College Opportunity

ORGANIZATIONS (CONTINUED)

- Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH)
- Congress of California Seniors
- Harris and Associates
- League of California Cities
- Operating Engineers, Local 3
- Orange County Business Council
- Rail Passenger Association of California
- Sacramento Habitat for Humanity
- San Diego County Taxpayers Association
- State Building & Construction Trades Council
- Stonewall Democratic Club, Los Angeles
- Western Growers

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

- Alhambra USD
- Chino Valley USD
- Colton USD
- Corona-Norco USD
- Franklin McKinley SD
- Lakeside SD
- Rocklin USD
- Santa Rita USD

HIGHER ED

- California Community College Board of Governors
- Chico State Alumni Association
- CSU Alumni Association
- CSU Long Beach Alumni Association
- Sacramento State Alumni Association

Facilities Committee
Construction Timing Issues
September 05, 2006

There are several critical issues that need to be decided; first the reevaluation of timing for construction of the Physical Science, Drama Music, and SoMA buildings and second the decision on using a "design build" concept for the parking structure.

The completion of the Sports Pavilion is delayed until at least mid November. If we are unable to complete the refurbishing of the temporary buildings to laboratory prior to the date required to complete the move out of the Physical Science building the remodel will need to be delayed. The delay would need to be until the end of the semester in June. Given a 12 month construction timetable it would take until June of 2008 to complete the project. There are no issues with the funding if the project is delayed.

The swing space for the remodel of the Drama Music building is the same as for the Physical Science building. If the District delays the start of the construction until the 08/09 appropriation there will need to be a request sent to Fred Harris & Walt Reno by October this year. The advantage to delaying the construction is that it would allow Walt to complete a revaluation of the building which would increase the state portion by approximately \$1 million. This would mean that construction could not start prior to July 2008, which is a more realistic date. The District would not lose the funding as the construction is currently in progress (the drawings are funded) and this would be a continuation of the project. The risk is that it would have to wait until the next bond to be funded in full.

If the District were to combine the remodel and expansion of DM the District would lose the funding for the remodel. The District would also lose the priority of the remodel and be pushed back to the expansion category which would not get funded. The age of our buildings and current capacity level would make it so the project had a very low priority. The major obstacle to the Districts getting priority is the current occupancy rate. The District scores an 11 out of a possible 50. Also, the District has one of the newest campuses (as far as the age of the buildings go) and the DM building gets zero points as it is "very young" in relation to the other campuses projects.

SoMA is scheduled to begin construction in 07/08. This is not very realistic for several reasons. If the District were to delay the start to the 09/10 fiscal year there could be an additional revaluation which would add approximate 11% to the State allocation. If the start date is more realistic in the 2009 time period it would be in the Districts best interest to delay the project. Again, the argument is that the swing space that is required is the same as the DM building and that there can be no realistic timetable as long as the California Coastal Commission has not given it's approval of the project. The District would not lose the funding as the timing is not in our control, but up to the CCC and the completion of the other projects.

The parking structure could be build under a “design build” contract. The District would need to apply for permission from the chancellor’s office by applying for permission to participate in the AB 1000 pilot project. There are still two places available in the pilot and Walt was excited about SBCC participating. RCC used the design build to complete a parking structure in 14 months from start to completion. 5 months to design and get approval and 9 months in construction. Our architects would work with us to prepare the package and put out the project for bid. RCC has already developed all of the bridging documents and would be able to assist SBCC in the process. I am in the process of setting up an appointment in Riverside to go over the process and documentation requirements.

Construction and Renovation Fund

UNFUNDED DISTRICT PROJECTS		
		Estimated Cost
Health and Safety Projects		
6573	Admin. Bldg – HVAC upgrades	\$ 387,880
6621	Wood Concert Ceiling Reflector Panels, Garvin Theatre	50,000
6622	Repl ceiling tiles, PE halls, women's/men's locker rooms	25,000
6623	Re-engineer & replace light fixtures at stadium	200,000
6618	Update hazardous materials survey (eligible for 100% state funding)	50,000
6619	Update universal access survey for ADA compliance	75,000
6620	Humanities - replace compressors (improve efficiency)	100,000
6588	Natural gas main distribution system replacement - East Campus	60,000
Prioritized Projects		
-	1 DM Air Handler Replacement	248,000
-	1 Chiller coil replacement and coating	189,200
-	1 Humanities - Boiler engineering and replacement	128,000
-	1 Children's Center - misc. repairs and upgrades	100,000
-	1 IDC - Replace carpeting with vinyl flooring	100,000
-	1 Replace bleacher seating - La Playa stadium	50,000
-	1 Schott Center - replace windows (TEST FOR HAZMATSI!)	75,000
-	1 Replace sewer line at PS restrooms COMPLETE	12,000
-	1 Resolve power fluctuations at ESL / ECOC	35,000
6420	1 Phone system (upgrade=main campus, replace=Schott & Wake)	130,000
-	1 Pigeon decontamination and control COMPLETE	22,000
-	1 Install HVAC (split system) - PS-101 COMPLETE	<u>21,000</u>
-	2 Schott Center - emergency generator and lighting system	82,240
6596	2 CC bldg seismic re-glazing (remainder)	298,400
-	2 Install HVAC (split system) - A-214	10,000
-	2 New carpet - A183, MDT classroom, H304, H307, H308	25,000
-	2 New VCT BC101, PE training rm & upstairs locker room	25,000
-	2 Paint interior (misc. OE, Hum, IDC, PE rooms)	25,000
-	2 Replace lockers - women & men's locker rooms	25,000
-	2 Humanitioo Chhillor pump retrofit	25,000
-	2 LRC Heating - install reheat system	25,000
-	2 Repair & refinish trellis @ Student Services building	50,000
-	2 Replace remainder of door locks with electronic locks	180,000
-	2 Replace urinals, toilets and drinking fountains.	50,000
-	2 Upgrade Energy Management System (EMS)	25,000
-	2 Wake Center - resurface parking lot	100,000
-	2 Wake - replace child size plumbing fixtures w/standard	25,000
6561	2 Exterior paint - IDC, DM, BC	100,000
-	2 Replace doors and door hardware - Sports Pavilion	100,000
6531	2 Student Services - air balance	125,000
-	2 Replace seating in PS-101	50,000
-	2 Replace HVAC units in ECC1-15	42,000
6576	3 East campus all-weather bus stop	100,000
6555	3 Horticulture fencing and path	90,000
-	3 Information kiosk improvements at SS building	5,000
6552	3 La Playa turf replacement	55,000
6518	3 Loma Alta Crosswalk ADA Compliance	100,000
6549	3 Sculpture area roof	75,000
-	3 Wake Center - construct office off computer lab	50,000
-	3 Resurface track at La Playa	<u>250,000</u>
TOTAL (UNFUNDED PROJECTS) =		\$ 4,170,720
ADDITIONAL FACULTY REQUESTS - FALL 2006		
-	Student Services - Recarpet second floor (McLellan)	tbd
-	IDC - Replace blinds, third floor (Scharper)	tbd
-	EBS - Hazardous materials storage shed (Spaventa)	tbd
-	Pershing Park - softball facility upgrade (O'Connor)	tbd
-	PE - upgrade all restrooms (O'Connor)	tbd
-	PE - new cabinets and seating in LFC & HPC (O'Connor)	tbd
-	PE - recarpet men's team rm & women's staff locker rm (O'Connor)	tbd
-	PE - paint exterior (O'Connor)	tbd
-	PE - new landscape at ramps, 3rd floor and La Playa (O'Connor)	tbd
-	Kinkos Early Learning Center Healthand Safety Projects	tbd

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE -- COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
RESOURCE REQUESTS FINAL RANKINGS 2006-07**

Ballet Order	RESOURCE REQUESTS, INSTITUTIONAL AND VPs' PRIORITIES	FUNDS	VOTING SCORES														Total Voting Points	Cum \$	
			CPC1	CPC2	CPC3	CPC4	CPC5	CPC6	CPC7	CPC8	CPC9	CPC10	CPC11	CPC12	CPC13	CPC14			
	Institutional (1&2) & VP (3-20) Priorities																		
8	Admissions & Records - Sr. A&R Tech	\$68,626	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	16	\$68,626
1	Security - 2-FT Security Officers Phase I	\$118,330	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	20	\$186,956
2	Educational Programs - Implementation of first year Partnerships for Student Success Program	\$370,000	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	20	\$556,956
11	Scheduling Office - FT Catalog/schedule Specialist	\$63,551	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	3	21	\$620,507
13	Biological Sciences - 1/2 time Lab Tech, 12 months	\$37,554	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	21	\$658,061
3	Business Services - FT Payroll Technician	\$54,300	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	22	\$712,361
17	HR/LA - Technician 1 (Confidential)	\$60,248	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	5	23	\$772,609
12	Earth & Planetary Sci., FT Lab Tech	\$75,109	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	3	1	1	6	24	\$847,718
4	Facilities & Operations - Maintenance Tech	\$74,794	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	3	7	25	\$922,512
18	DTC/ITC Initiatives	\$300,000	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	8	26	\$1,222,512
7	Security - Augment PT Staffing for Parking Conditions Support	\$26,790	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	3	3	2	9	28	\$1,249,302
6	Accounting - 1/2 time Acct. Tech I for Accounts Payable	\$28,043	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	3	2	2	10	30	\$1,277,345
5	Facilities & Operations - Automotive Technician (create new classification)	\$69,597	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	11	31	\$1,346,942
15	Credit/NC Outreach Hispanic population & AB540	\$70,000	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	11	31	\$1,416,942

Att. 4

16	Continuing Ed - Transition Coordinator (Non-Credit to Credit) for ESL, Adult H.S., short-term Voc Ed Students	\$68,626	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	12	32	\$1,485,568
19	Information Technology/DTC - Identity Management	\$13,000	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	13	32	\$1,498,568
14	Physical Ed/Health Ed - Convert LTA from hourly to FT (\$75,109-(\$13,650) current hrly.)	\$61,459	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2	3	2	1	14	33	\$1,560,027
10	Dual Enrollment Prog Specialist (\$40k available in Tech-Prep grant for one-time funds)	\$74,618	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	15	35	\$1,634,645
9	Dual Enrollment Coordinator (Carol Flores) 11 to 12 mo., lateral, Tech Prep to District Funds	\$82,848	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	16	36	\$1,717,493
20	Information Technology/DTC Wireless Access	\$25,000	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	17	39	\$1,742,493
TOTAL		\$1,742,493																	

Number of 1's	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	20	<u>98</u>
Number of 2's	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7		20	<u>99</u>
Number of 3's	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6		20	<u>83</u>

8