

Colton Joint Unified School District

Commitment to Equal Opportunity



Minutes November 29, 2011

The Measure G – Citizens’ Oversight Committee met on Tuesday, November 29, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. at the Student Services Center in the Board Room, 851 South Mt. Vernon Avenue, Colton, CA 92324.

Opening – Mr. Suchil called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call – by Joanne Medina

Members Present (*absent)

Ms. Elsa Aguilar	Mr. Matthew Hernandez *
Mrs. Christina Benjamin *	Mr. William Hussey
Mr. Ryan Collins – Vice Chair *	Mr. Frank Quezada
Mr. Douglas Duncan	Ms. Raquel Rios
Mr. Daniel Flores (Arrived at 6:00 p.m.)	Mr. Paul Russell
Mrs. Maria Fraser	Ms. Rosemary Speer *
Ms. Linda Gonzalez	Mr. Isaac Suchil - Chair
Mr. Gary Grossich	Mr. Daniel Ybarra

Staff Members Present

Mr. Jaime R. Ayala	Mr. Vince Quinones
Mrs. Joanne Medina	Mr. Darryl Taylor
Mrs. Katie Orloff	

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 22, 2011 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved, motion by Mrs. Rios and seconded by Mr. Russell, and carried on a 10-1-5 vote, Mr. Quezada opposed and Mrs. Benjamin, Mr. Collins, Mr. Hernandez, Mrs. Speer and Mr. Flores were absent. (Mr. Flores arrived after the vote). After approving the minutes as presented, *Ms. Gonzalez requested that a correction be made to the minutes to reflect she did not miss two consecutive meetings as the new member orientation, on May 23rd was not mandatory. After reviewing previous meeting minutes, Mrs. Gonzalez was absent from the September 27, November 8, and November 29, 2010 meetings, therefore the minutes as approved are correct.*

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Suchil opened for public comment. Mr. Suchil recognized community member, Mr. Ed Gregor. Mr. Gregor thanked staff for removing the old signs that were displayed at various sites.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Grossich inquired about the stolen breakers. Mr. Taylor responded a couple of sites have been affected by this type of theft and our builders risk insurance has covered the cost. The District is not aware of any suspects in custody. Other districts have also experienced this type of theft. In addition a different security company has also been put in place. Project sites have added security cameras and motion detectors in addition to modifying security procedures.

Mr. Quezada inquired if the subcommittee was satisfied with the findings of Nigro & Nigro, the auditing firm. Mr. Quezada remarked there is word from the public the subcommittee accused the firm. Mr. Grossich responded he does not recall any member making accusations. The members were not comfortable signing off on a report that they had not reviewed. Ms. Aguilar responded the members have a right to know how they came up with their figures. Mr. Ybarra stated since being on the committee for the past two years the subcommittee members (Mr. Suchil, Mr. Grossich, & Mr. Hussey) are professional, ethical people who devote their time to this committee. Ms. Fraser responded it is not uncommon for a client to question where the numbers came from. Mr. Hussey responded the subcommittee members met with Nigro & Nigro and reviewed the paperwork. The committee wants the best for our students therefore the members have a right to question items and review paperwork.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Member Categories-Mr. Taylor

Mr. Russell is a member of a senior citizen organization. Mrs. Medina will send out a list of the member categories prior to our next meeting.

Inspector of Record (IOR)-Mr. Taylor

Mr. Taylor introduced Scott Saddlemire from Superior Construction Services, Inc. Mr. Saddlemire gave a presentation regarding DSA testing and inspections. (Exhibit A) In 1933 the Field Act was enacted. The Field Act requires that the building designs be based on high level building standards adopted by the state and plans and specifications be prepared by competent designers qualified by state registration. The Division of the State Architect (DSA) is the jurisdictional authority within the State of California that provides enforcement of the Field Act in order to provide safe schools. In addition independent inspections and testing of materials is a requirement and cannot be compromised. This level of oversight is only for schools and hospitals. Furthermore inspectors are closely monitored by the State which decide the level of oversight for a specific project.

Mr. Saddlemire also discussed the fee schedule on page eight. A purchase order is generated and any money not used is given back. For instance, the project at BHS was just completed and \$33,000 was left on the purchase order which was given back to the bond fund. They only charge for the services rendered. There is no fixed bid. A RFQ is submitted and prices are given for inspections then the plans are submitted to the State. The State will dictate the level of testing that will occur and how many tests will be needed. The lab is a separate entity from DSA. For GTHS testing & inspection will be approximately two million dollars.

Mr. Hussey inquired about the Leighton inspectors at JBMS. Mr. Saddlemire stated since he was not involved with that project he cannot give specifics on that project, however only an estimate is given and perhaps the job conditions changed.

Mr. Saddlemire stated every school district has the same methods. The inspectors cannot dictate how the contractors do their job. If so the contractor would build that into their price which would end up being more costly rather than conducting a few more inspections.

□ Annual Audit-Mr.Taylor

Mr. Taylor reviewed the annual audit noting items that have been included such as minutes, the Capital Improvement Report and reports specific to projects. The report was circulated to the committee members. The financial audit is from July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010.

Mr. Hussey stated the subcommittee met with Nigro & Nigro. Mr. Hussey expressed concern about a loan from the bond fund. He stated that he committee was not informed of the loan and the reason the committee was informed of the loan was because of the new Board in place. In addition, he does not want to see another loan made from the bond fund.

Mr. Ayala explained the loan that was taken was not an expenditure. If bond money was used to pay a utility bill that would be a clear violation because that is considered an expenditure. In addition the loan did not cease or jeopardize any of our current projects and did not impact any schedule. This loan was not done in any way to keep it from the committee, it was a routine transaction. Furthermore, the loan was paid back with interest.

Mr. Hussey stated the role of the oversight committee is to review expenditures. Mr. Ayala stated the County, VTD (auditors), Nigro & Nigro (bond fund auditors), and the State did not find the District to be in violation.

Mr. Hussey asked why the Board was not informed. Mr. Ayala responded there were many times at the Board meetings in public or in correspondence discussing the District's cash flow problem. Also the Board signed a resolution to borrow from the bond fund. An agenda item was also brought to the Board regarding the repayment of the loan with interest. The loan is also reflected in the District's year-end audit reports.

Mr. Hussey stated the loan may have been discussed in the public arena however after ten minutes of a presentation the audience is lost. The subcommittee's role is to ensure money is accounted for. Mr. Ayala responded that a lengthy e-mail was sent in the past to all the committee members which explained the timing of the loan which had no correlation with the Boards initial decision to not completely build-out the new high school. The e-mail can be re-sent to all the committee members especially since there are new committee members who may not have received this correspondence.

Mr. Grossich commented the committee is responsible for overseeing the bond money and the committee was made aware of the loan after the fact. Communication seems to be the issue.

Mr. Hussey questioned whether the loan from the bond fund was the reason the high school was not going to include all the planned improvements. Mr. Taylor stated GTHS was bid out in 2008 without the stadium, the additional parking lot, the pool and pool buildings, and building C. The \$19 million was loaned from the bond fund after that time. Recently, the State matched funds which gave the District additional bond money at which time the Board then decided to completely build out the entire school.

Mr. Hussey noted page four of proposition 39 section 1.3 regarding furnishings for lease equipment for school facilities. Mr. Hussey questioned if the office space leased for Seville is an allowable expense. Mr. Taylor stated that his understanding is that services and work in direct support of bond projects can be paid from the bond fund.

Mr. Hussey commented the Board should be held accountable. Ms. Fraser stated the current Board still has four existing Board members.

Ms. Rios asked if Nigro & Nigro, the auditing firm, reviewed proposition 39 to see if the District was in compliance. Mr. Taylor responded the auditing firm did review the proposition and found procedures were followed and the District was in compliance.

Mr. Flores suggested if counsel could give their opinion to review and interpret the language. Mr. Ayala stated legal counsel could review the language and draft a letter for the committee members.

Ms. Rios inquired about the bond revenue. Mr. Ayala explained the District sells bonds which then is revenue to the bond fund. When the money was loaned to the general fund it was a loan not an expense. The loan was not revenue to the general fund. The interest that was paid back to the bond fund is revenue to the bond fund.

Mr. Suchil stated Mr. Grossich, Mr. Hussey, and himself (subcommittee members) will stay after the meeting is adjourned to review the audit report with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Suchil commented since the committee meets only four times a year it is not nearly enough to review all expenditures. Mr. Ayala responded the purpose behind the committee is oversight. It is not the intent of the committee to scrutinize numbers weekly. It is not a requirement to run every expenditure by the committee, if that were to occur weekly meetings would need to be held. The committee's oversight is to ensure the District is in compliance. The committee may not agree with money that is spent on certain projects, however that is not the committee's purpose. Additionally, if the District was not on the right track, the committee has the right to notify the Board in such an instance.

Mr. Hussey noted section 3.2 in the bylaws stating the committee is to review expenditures and inquired if the leasing space for Seville was an operating expense. Mr. Suchil stated he interpreted Seville to be an expenditure, commenting it is convenient to have Seville close in proximity to work on projects. Mr. Ayala suggested sending monthly reports to the committee could be beneficial, however Mr. Flores reminded the committee of possible Brown Act violations that could occur.

Ms. Rios suggested if a timeline or a narrative could be given to the members. Mr. Russell stated projections are on the CIP website. Mr. Taylor also stated the project status sheets are also on the website which are presented to the Board at the board meetings. Ms. Rios suggested perhaps it could be specified on the agenda.

VI. FINANCIAL REPORT

- Mr. Taylor distributed and reviewed the most recent consolidated budget status report (Exhibit B)

VII. MEMBER COMMENT

- Mr. Ybarra wished the committee a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.
- Mr. Ayala thanked the committee and appreciates the committee asking questions and values having the members involved with the committee.
- Mr. Hussey extended an apology to Ms. Gonzalez regarding the absence of two consecutive meetings. He mistakenly overlooked the volunteer orientation meeting.
- Ms. Gonzalez wished the committee a Merry Christmas.
- Mr. Flores commented BHS looks beautiful and it is exciting to see CHS now being built and GTHS is looking beautiful as well.
- Mr. Hussey commented the Highgrove library also had breakers stolen.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – (Quarterly)

- Mrs. Medina will be in contact with the members for the next meeting date

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- There being no further business, the Measure G Citizens' Oversight Committee meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m. Motion by Mr. Russell and seconded by Ms. Gonzalez.



DSA Testing and Inspections

Tuesday November 29th

Presented by

Scott Saddlemire

Superior Construction Services, Inc.



1042 N Mountain Ave.

Suite 147

Upland CA 91786

909 266-4144

DSA Inspections and Testing

Introduction: Scott Saddlemire, Superior Construction Services Inc.

What is DSA and Field Act of 1933?

Design criteria that the architects and engineers are held to by DSA

The role of the inspection team and Laboratory

Proposals and Invoices

Questions and Answers

What is DSA and the Field act of 1933

Division of State Architect, sub division of the Department of General Services,
State of California

Field Act of 1933

Introduction

Parents expect a safe and secure learning environment for their children. Prevention of injury or death due to natural forces such as wind or ground motion depends upon the structural integrity of public school buildings and the bracing and anchoring of furniture and other objects within the classrooms to prevent them from falling on the children. **Parents should be able to assume that once their child enters a public school that the building will shelter the pupils from the powerful forces of nature.** These are the reasons the Field Act was written and enacted.

History of the Field Act

In 1933 the lateral force resistant design of public schools, as well as other buildings throughout the state, was based on estimated wind loads. Engineers assumed that buildings designed to withstand wind forces would also be able to withstand earthquake forces. **The magnitude 6.3 Long Beach Earthquake of March 10, 1933 destroyed 70 schools and another 120 schools suffered major structural damage.** Luckily, the earthquake occurred when the buildings were unoccupied. Hundreds of children might have perished if the earthquake had occurred only a few hours earlier.



Jefferson JR High



Franklin School



John Muir School

The significance of the Long Beach Earthquake was that it drove home to engineers, public officials and the general public that the need to develop measures to resist the effects of earthquakes is a necessary part of public policy. **The level of damage and the extent of the deaths and injuries in Long Beach were perceived as unacceptable outcomes for an event, which could be repeated at any time.** The great number of collapsed public schools led to a public outcry for a remedy to the situation of housing public school students in structures that were unsafe in earthquakes. **On April 10, 1933, the Field Act was enacted. The Field Act requires that the building designs be based on high level building standards adopted by the state and plans and specifications be prepared by competent designers qualified by state registration. The quality of construction was to be enforced through independent plan review and independent inspection. Finally, the design professionals, independent inspector and the contractor had to verify under penalty of perjury that the building was constructed according to the approved plans.**

Primary Successes

The Division of the State Architect (DSA) is the jurisdictional authority within the State of California that provides enforcement of the Field Act in order to provide safe schools. The DSA has been reviewing plans and overseeing the construction of public school buildings for over 70 years. In that time no pupil or teacher has been injured or killed due to the failure of a building from exposure to earthquake, snow, wind or other loads

The Program

The following is a list of elements and procedures that lead to safer building construction. The level of concern about conflict of interest or capability of designers, contractors and users dictates the level of enforcement necessary for each element. The public and policy makers also set the tone for safe public school construction. **In California, where education is compulsory for children, there is a very strong desire to see that school children are not at risk when they attend school. In response to the public's aversion to this risk, the policy makers have written laws that have mandated rigorous enforcement of each of these elements to make sure schools are safe.**

CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE - Codes developed by a large cross section of researchers, engineers and stakeholders establish a minimal accepted standard to ensure safe design of buildings at a practical cost. The code not only establishes the minimum standards, but also is a condensed resource of all the research, analysis and learning from previous mistakes that went into its creation. Codes and standards also evolve as new building materials are developed or discovered that cost less yet resist the forces of nature at least as well as or better than the out-dated materials. Codes are like a recipe. There are great cooks that can cook without a recipe, but the vast majority need guidance just as the vast majority of engineers need the code to provide limits. The code used for California public school construction was the 2001 California Building Code (CBC) which was based on the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) with stricter California amendments incorporated. The new CBC, based on the 2006 International Building Code (IBC), took effect in January 2008.

The enactment of enforceable and adequate codes, rules, or regulations is the first part of the structural safety equation. These rules must encompass a threshold of professional competency for an engineer, as well as minimum design and construction standards. The second part of the safety equation requires a process that assures compliance with these standards in the actual design and construction of school buildings. **Flaws in either the standards or the system for enforcing them can lead to fatal consequences. The goal is to minimize the risk of design or construction that does not meet the minimum code requirements.**

DESIGN - Higher performance objectives for building construction, in addition to collapse prevention, include additional protection to prevent minor injuries, limiting the amount of physical damage to the building, or assuring immediate occupancy and continuous operation for buildings that provide post-disaster emergency response. Policy makers generally decide what performance objective is desired based on their tolerance of risk and financial limitations.

In California, the performance objective for public schools is collapse prevention and minor risk of injury to the occupants, but allows some repairable structural damage. **Since many school campuses have large gathering areas, food service capabilities for large numbers of people, many restrooms and sometimes shower facilities, the public can seek immediate shelter in the safety of a well-constructed school building.**

What are the forces? What materials are available? How do beams, columns, foundations, walls, floors and roofs work together to resist the loads without collapse? Designing buildings to resist the forces of nature, especially earthquakes, is a complex task and requires educated, experienced engineers to develop solutions. Licensing authorities can establish a minimum competency level for structural engineers, which provide further assurance that the design will be successful. Colleges and Universities have provided the basic education which, when combined with experience in building design, has produced individuals throughout the world with the talent to design safe buildings.

Competent engineering is required and cannot be compromised in the creation of construction drawings and specifications. The cost of the structural design of a project is typically less than 2% of the entire construction cost. **Good design provides tremendous benefit at little cost and, with independent inspection, is one of the two most highly recommended elements of the process that insures safe school construction.**

GEOTECHNICAL HAZARD INVESTIGATIONS - Designers need to know the loads in order to design a building that will meet the performance objectives. A site-specific geologic hazard report helps in defining the design parameters. It provides accurate data to reduce the construction costs and identify unacceptable locations for building construction

CONSTRUCTION - Identify approved plans. To avoid substitution of unapproved drawings, contract documents should be stamped and signed by the approving agency or identified as the code complying documents. The benefit of independent review can be lost if approved plans are not properly identified. **The contractor will use the stamped approved plans in order to construct the building and by the inspector to ensure that the contractor has constructed the building in accordance with them. Changes to the design before construction begins and during construction are commonplace. These changes also need independent review, approval and identification as for the approved plans.**

NON-STRUCTURAL HAZARDS - There is a lack of emphasis in the code for design of non-structural elements. Many non-structural elements are located overhead and often come loose and fall when subjected to moderate earthquakes that do not affect the building's structure. The bodies of young children are much more susceptible to falling objects than are adults. Anchoring and bracing televisions, bookcases, etc. to assist them in identifying and mitigating these possible hazards. However, many of these protection devices are defeated as teachers make changes in their classrooms.

INDEPENDENT INSPECTION AND TESTING - The benefits of controlling the design are lost if the construction does not adhere to the approved plans. Even in areas where there are well-qualified, even certified, builders and experienced workers, portions of the structure are frequently built without being in conformance with the approved plans. One must be on guard against this. The performance of a building in strong earthquakes sometimes rests on what might appear to be a relatively minor detail. Just like a chain, the weakest link might fail, leading to collapse. How often and how rigorously the testing and inspection takes place is dependent on several factors including complexity of the project, competency of the builder, competency of the workers, financial constraints and level of risk aversion.

Independent inspection can add about 2% to the cost of construction and provides great benefit for its cost. To achieve safe construction, independent inspection and testing of materials is a minimum requirement and cannot be compromised. Independent inspection provides a great benefit at little cost and is a highly recommended element of the process that insures safe school construction.

Conclusion

California, being an extremely active state, seismically, must make provisions to protect its student population from the dangers associated with ground movement through the structural design of school buildings. This was mandated by the Field Act and has been accomplished with great success in the 70 years since its passage.

Excerpts from Article by Dennis Bellet

Schools and Hospitals are built to a higher standard than dwellings and commercial buildings.

Architect and Engineers Design, State Approves, and the District Pays for the project. The inspection team and Lab work together to insure all three entities are protected.

Not only does the school provide for a safe place for our children to go to school, it is also a place of refuge in the case of a local disaster in the community. All communities have safe schools to use in the case of a disaster.

Proposals and Invoices

DSA dictates what level inspection will be required on all projects. The level of inspector, the amount of inspectors, and the amount of time that inspector has to spend on that project is set by DSA. They also dictate what tests the lab will have to perform. All of these tests will be required for the state to certify the project. If these tests are not performed, the state will not certify the project.

No matter what Inspection Company or lab you have on your project, all the testing must be done to satisfy DSA.

Please see the sample proposal rate sheet. This is what is negotiated by the district and the DSA company. The contract amount is just an estimate of this rate sheet.

Do not hire a company by the bottom line proposal number. That company is going to have to do the exact same inspection and or lab works as any other company. The important thing to look at is the rate sheet, the rest is just math.

Example,

Company A

DSA Class Inspector

Class 1 per hour	\$78.00
Class 2 per hour	\$73.00
Class 3 per hour	\$68.00
Certified Welding Inspector	\$76.00

Estimated total cost for project: \$39,000.00 (500 hours)

Company B

DSA Class Inspector

Class 1 per hour	\$75.00
Class 2 per hour	\$70.00
Class 3 per hour	\$65.00
Certified Welding Inspector	\$72.00

Clerk \$42.50

Estimated total cost for project: \$45,000.00 (600 hours)

Both companies are using their best judgment to come up with an estimated total hours needed to do the project. Company A estimate is \$39,000.00 and company B is \$45,000.00 If everything else was the same (reputation, close out of other project, works will with district), it would appear that company A is less expensive that company B. This is not the case. Since this is just an estimate, the District only pays for actual hours on the project. Since both companies will have the same DSA requirements, they will have the exact same hours. Let's say the project goes well, and the total DSA inspection hours for this project come in at 450 hours. Company A would be \$35,100.00 and company B will be \$33,750.00.

Even though the Purchase Order was written to company B for \$45,000.00 the district only pays the inspection company for actual hours, in this case \$33,750.00 The remaining \$11,250.00 is not paid out, and stays with the District.

Reasons not to have fixed price for lab to Inspection Company

1. Conflict of interest. You do not want the inspection company to be making decisions on the integrity of your school based on the company making more money if they don't perform certain inspections or testing.
2. The district only pays for actual hours and or testing that is needed.
3. The inspection company and or lab has no way to know how much time the inspections are going to take, how many tests it will require. Means and methods is up to the contractor, not the inspector or District (Public Bidding Code)



Budget vs. Commitments and Expenditures

Consolidated Budget Status Report

Budget versus Commitments and Expenditures for Multiple Projects (Created 11/29/2011 11:01 am)

Exhibit B

Project Name	Budget		Commitments		Expenditures	
	Total Budget	% Budget Committed	Total Commitments	% Budget Spent	Total Expenditures	Remaining Against Budget
**Program Costs for Measure G						
Birney Elementary Bus Drop/Parking - Project # 47	12,878,934	35.7%	4,596,754	27.5%	3,540,671	9,338,263
Birney Elementary Modernization - Project # 3A	332,865	83.9%	279,184	81.2%	270,407	62,458
Bloomington High School Kitchen & Multipurpose - Project # 1Q	951,000	3.0%	28,600	3.0%	28,600	922,401
Bloomington High School Interim Housing - Project # 1E	7,652,418	9.6%	737,011	4.0%	304,691	7,347,727
Bloomington High School New Math & Science Bldg. - Project # 1E	1,569,837	93.2%	1,463,729	90.8%	1,425,782	144,055
Bloomington High School Stadium Renovation & Expansion - Project # 1N	13,451,813	93.9%	12,633,344	88.0%	11,834,589	1,617,224
Bloomington Middle School Bldg N Exit Addition - Project # 38	5,600,000	5.7%	321,718	5.7%	321,718	5,278,283
Bloomington Middle School Modernization - Project # 3G	66,152	62.3%	41,235	62.3%	41,235	24,917
Colton High School Kitchen & Multipurpose Renovation - Project # 1R	5,802,000	4.8%	277,880	4.8%	277,880	5,524,120
Colton High School Interim Housing - Project # 1F	8,308,956	10.0%	829,406	3.8%	315,175	7,993,781
Colton High School New Math & Science Bldg. - Project # 1F	767,228	81.1%	622,541	72.9%	559,085	208,143
Colton High School Pedestrian Bridge Repair - Project # 37	17,871,431	83.8%	14,972,948	35.9%	6,417,619	11,453,813
Colton High School Stadium Renovation & Expansion - Project # 1M	75,062	8.8%	6,600	6.8%	5,100	69,962
Colton Middle School Modernization - Project # 3I	4,325,000	5.8%	251,838	5.8%	251,838	4,073,162
Colton Middle School New Construction - Project # 3K	5,195,000	12.8%	664,754	12.8%	664,754	4,530,246
Cooley Ranch Elementary Modernization - Project # 2E	9,980,000	2.8%	277,063	2.8%	277,063	9,702,937
Crestmore Elementary Modernization - Project # 2A	1,268,000	5.4%	68,779	5.4%	68,779	1,199,221
Crestmore Elementary Water Remediation - Project # 36	4,765,000	5.2%	246,480	5.2%	246,480	4,518,520
D'Arcy Elementary Fence/Door Improvements - Project # 39	57,242	0.0%		0.0%		57,242
D'Arcy Elementary Modernization - Project # 2B	59,402	72.1%	42,813	72.1%	42,813	16,589
Grand Terrace Elementary Modernization - Project # 3B	1,233,000	7.1%	88,110	7.1%	88,110	1,144,890
Grand Terrace High School (Full Build Out) - Project # 11	1,166,000	2.3%	27,064	2.3%	27,064	1,138,936
Grant Elementary Modernization - Project # 2F	151,373,055	87.1%	131,784,909	69.5%	105,155,192	46,217,862
Grimes Elementary Modernization - Project # 3E	3,731,000	4.3%	161,544	4.3%	161,544	3,569,456
Joe Baca Middle School (MS #5) - Project # 27	454,000	6.1%	27,747	6.1%	27,747	426,253
Jurupa Vista Elementary Drainage Remediation - Project # 40	49,162,432	89.0%	43,745,535	53.4%	26,235,784	22,926,648
Jurupa Vista Elementary Modernization - Project # 2C	65,342	0.0%		0.0%		65,342
JV, RC, Wilson, BMS Fire Alarm & Low Voltage Upgrades - Project # 35	728,000	45.9%	334,304	45.9%	334,304	393,696
Lewis Elementary Basketball Courts/Fence - Project # 41	2,167,851	88.4%	1,917,045	88.0%	1,907,432	260,419
Lewis Elementary Fire Alarm & Intercom - Project # 43	56,702	65.3%	37,030	65.3%	37,030	19,672
Lincoln Elementary Modernization - Project # 2D	458,041	0.0%		0.0%		458,041
Lincoln Elementary Modernization - Project # 2G	3,213,000	5.1%	162,322	5.1%	162,322	3,050,678
Lincoln Elementary Shade Shelter/Parking - Project # 46	3,788,000	5.3%	201,578	5.3%	201,578	3,586,422
McKinley Elementary Bus Drop - Project # 48	227,994	20.4%	46,616	19.5%	44,516	183,478
McKinley Elementary Modernization - Project # 3C	336,321	0.0%		0.0%		336,321
Reche Canyon Elementary Modernization - Project # 2H	569,000	4.4%	24,812	4.4%	24,812	544,188
Ruth Harris Middle School Modernization - Project # 2J	965,000	11.0%	106,375	11.0%	106,375	858,624
San Salvador Modernization - Project # 2I	1,746,000	9.4%	164,845	9.4%	164,845	1,581,155
	3,320,000	7.0%	231,667	7.0%	231,667	3,088,333



Budget vs. Commitments and Expenditures

Exhibit B

Project Name	Budget		Commitments		Expenditures		
	Total Budget	% Budget Committed	Total Commitments	% Budget Committed	Total Expenditures	% Budget Spent	Remaining Against Budget
School # 30 - Cedar/Santa Ana Ave. - Project # 34	60,000,000	0.0%	6,782	0.0%	6,782	0.0%	59,993,218
Slover Mt. High School Modernization - Project # 3N	663,000	4.7%	31,347	4.7%	31,347	4.7%	631,653
Terrace Hills Middle School Modernization - Project # 3F	510,000	37.6%	191,615	37.6%	191,615	37.6%	318,385
Terrace Hills Middle School New Construction - Project # 3L	4,821,000	4.0%	194,232	4.0%	194,232	4.0%	4,626,768
Terrace View Elementary Fire Alarm & Intercom - Project # 42	491,630	6.0%	29,500	6.0%	5,000	1.0%	486,630
Terrace View Elementary Modernization - Project # 1J	5,260,000	6.4%	337,528	6.4%	337,528	6.4%	4,922,472
Terrace View Elementary Parking - Project # 50	1,311,696	9.9%	129,605	9.9%	113,177	8.6%	1,198,519
Washington High School Fire Alarm & Intercom - Project # 45	424,992	0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	424,992
Washington High School Modernization - Project # 1K	4,740,000	5.3%	251,090	5.3%	251,090	5.3%	4,488,910
Washington High School Shade Shelter - Project # 49	187,601	8.7%	16,288	8.7%	13,693	7.3%	173,908
Wilson Elementary Modernization - Project # 3D	1,640,000	1.8%	29,403	1.8%	29,403	1.8%	1,610,597
Zimmerman Elementary Fire Alarm & Intercom - Project # 44	546,754	0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	546,754
Zimmerman Elementary Modernization - Project # 1L	5,850,000	5.4%	313,556	5.4%	313,556	5.4%	5,536,444
Totals	412,184,752	53.1%	218,955,123	53.1%	163,292,021	39.6%	248,892,731

****Program Costs for Measure G Includes the following items:**

- AP-Mt. Vernon LLC (rent for Suite 7A) - \$122,220 (thru 2013)
- Colbi Technologies - \$165,625 (1 time capacity increase)
- CJUSD Bond Admin Salaries - \$255,579 (Annual salaries @ 50%)
- Davis Demographics - \$44,052 (2 yr contract)
- Nigro & Nigro - \$24,000 (\$8,000 per yr @ 3 yrs)
- NTD Architects (District wide master plan) - \$312,200 (Lump Sum Fee)
- School Facility Consultants - \$156,080 (\$240,000 total contract, balance divided with project costs above)
- Spectrum Communication (data cables/phones @ Ste 7A) - \$14,902 (one time fee)
- Seville Construction Services (program management) - \$10,252,618 Authorized Fees (does not include \$3,573,765 project management cost, which is included in above budgets)